Cambridge Elements

Earth System Governance

Transformative Governance for Complex Socio-Ecological Systems

Pitshou Moleka

ISSN 2631-7818 (online)
ISSN 2631-780X (print)

Cambridge Elements

Elements in Earth System Governance
edited by
Frank Biermann
Utrecht University
Aarti Gupta
Wageningen University
Michael Mason
London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)

TRANSFORMATIVE GOVERNANCE FOR COMPLEX SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS

Innovation, AI, and Indigenous Knowledge in Africa

Pitshou Moleka
Eudoxia Research Centre

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,
a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781047759267
DOI: 10.1017/9781047759281

When citing this work, please include a reference to the DOI 10.1017/9781047759281

First published 2026

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

*A Cataloging-in-Publication data record for this Element is available from the
Library of Congress*

ISBN 978-1-047-75926-7 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-047-75925-0 Paperback
ISSN 2631-7818 (online)
ISSN 2631-780X (print)

Transformative Governance for Complex Socio-Ecological Systems

Innovation, AI, and Indigenous Knowledge in Africa

Elements in Earth System Governance

DOI: 10.1017/9781047759281
First published online: August 2026

Pitshou Moleka
Eudoxia Research Centre

Author for correspondence: Pitshou Moleka, pmoleka@resanet.org

Abstract: Africa is confronting a convergence of environmental and social pressures, including climate change, biodiversity loss, resource degradation, rapid urbanization, and growing demands on land and water systems. These challenges expose important limitations in governance approaches that rely on sectoral fragmentation, centralized decision-making, and narrowly technocratic solutions. At the same time, diverse governance practices emerging across the continent demonstrate how Indigenous knowledge systems, local institutions, scientific expertise, and digital technologies can interact to support more adaptive responses to socio-ecological change. This Element examines the potential of transformative governance as an approach to navigating complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence in African socio-ecological systems.

Keywords: transformative governance, Earth system governance, socio-ecological systems, artificial intelligence governance, Indigenous knowledge systems

ISBNs: 9781047759267 (HB), 9781047759250 (PB), 9781047759281 (OC)
ISSNs: 2631-7818 (online), 2631-780X (print)

Contents

Synopsis

Africa is confronting a convergence of environmental and social pressures, including climate change, biodiversity loss, resource degradation, rapid urbanization, and growing demands on land and water systems. These challenges expose important limitations in governance approaches that rely on sectoral fragmentation, centralized decision-making, and narrowly technocratic solutions. At the same time, diverse governance practices emerging across the continent demonstrate how Indigenous knowledge systems (IKS), local institutions, scientific expertise, and digital technologies can interact to support more adaptive responses to socio-ecological change.

This Element examines the potential of transformative governance as an approach to navigating complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence in African socio-ecological systems. It develops a framework that brings together relational governance, IKS, and artificial intelligence (AI) within a broader perspective of learning-based and adaptive governance. Rather than treating AI as a substitute for human judgement or local knowledge, the Element conceptualizes it as one component within a broader hybrid intelligence system in which predictive analytics, ecological knowledge, cultural values, and community-based decision-making interact.

Drawing on examples from water governance, agroforestry, forest management, pastoralist adaptation, and climate resilience initiatives across Africa, the study explores how different forms of knowledge are combined in practice to address environmental challenges. The analysis highlights the contributions of Indigenous and local knowledge to ecological monitoring, anticipatory governance, and long-term stewardship, while also examining the opportunities and risks associated with AI-enabled governance. Particular attention is given to questions of data sovereignty, algorithmic bias, digital inequality, and the ethical implications of integrating AI into community-based governance systems.

The Element argues that Africa's governance experiences are significant not because they represent a single or uniquely African model, but because they offer important insights into how diverse knowledge systems can be mobilized to address complex environmental problems. By examining both the possibilities and limitations of knowledge integration, the study contributes to debates on Earth system governance, environmental justice, Indigenous governance, and the governance of emerging technologies. It concludes that more inclusive, relational, and knowledge-diverse governance arrangements are essential for building resilience and sustainability in an increasingly uncertain Anthropocene.

1 Introduction: Complex Socio-Ecological Challenges in Africa

Africa is confronting an unusually dense convergence of socio-ecological pressures that rank among the most complex challenges of the twenty-first century. The continent is simultaneously experiencing accelerating climate change, widespread biodiversity loss, resource depletion, environmental degradation, and rapid social transformations. These pressures rarely manifest independently; instead, they interact in ways that generate systemic risks that exceed the capacities of conventional governance structures, which are often sectoral, reactive, and insufficiently integrative (Biermann 2022; Chukwumerije, Mbeva, and Makomere 2025; Chah et al. 2022). Governance frameworks capable of navigating these complexities must be adaptive, learning-centred, and relational, able to coordinate across multiple knowledge domains while bridging scientific, technological, and Indigenous epistemologies. They must address not only immediate ecological risks but also the underlying social and structural dynamics that shape vulnerability, resilience, and innovation potential (Nyahunda 2024). In this context, relational ethics and hybrid intelligence – the integration of human, artificial, and ecological knowledge systems – emerge as critical principles for designing governance mechanisms that are both legitimate and effective.

1.1 Africa in the Anthropocene

The Anthropocene designates a historical phase in which human societies have become structurally embedded drivers of planetary biophysical dynamics. Africa's position within this epoch is characterized by both acute vulnerabilities and unique contributions. The continent is experiencing some of the most severe consequences of anthropogenic climate change, despite its historically marginal contribution to cumulative global emissions (Kohnert 2024). Rising temperatures, shifting precipitation regimes, intensified drought cycles, and increased frequency of floods combine to disrupt ecological equilibria, livelihoods, and infrastructures across multiple biomes (Pandit and Sharma 2023). Semi-arid regions such as the Sahel are confronted with recurrent droughts and declining soil fertility, threatening pastoral systems and smallholder agriculture. Meanwhile, equatorial regions, particularly the Congo Basin – the world's second-largest tropical forest complex – face hydrological instability, biodiversity loss, and escalating pressures from industrial agriculture, mining, and logging.

Coastal zones amplify these vulnerabilities. Cities such as Lagos, Alexandria, Dar es Salaam, and Maputo are increasingly exposed to

sea-level rise, coastal erosion, storm surges, and salinization of groundwater systems. These threats are magnified by rapid population growth, spatial inequalities, and precarious urban expansion into wetlands and floodplains. At the same time, Africa's population is projected to double by mid-century, with significant implications for land use, energy demand, food systems, and biodiversity conservation (Gupta et al. 2020). The demographic transition and accelerating urbanization reshape socio-ecological interactions, intensifying demand for infrastructure, water, housing, waste management, and transport.

Yet Africa's encounter with the Anthropocene is not solely defined by vulnerability. It is also marked by the persistence of deeply rooted relational worldviews and ecological ethics, embedded within IKS that emphasize reciprocity, communal stewardship, and intergenerational responsibility. These epistemic traditions have historically enabled communities to adapt to climatic variability and steward complex environments such as savannahs, forests, wetlands, and drylands (Odora Hoppers 2019). As global sustainability science increasingly recognizes the epistemic value of local and Indigenous knowledge, Africa's contribution to Earth system governance becomes indispensable.

Understanding Africa's trajectory within the Anthropocene thus requires a dual analytical stance: one that acknowledges structural vulnerabilities, but also foregrounds the continent's normative innovations, adaptive capacities, and contributions to global environmental governance. It is at this intersection – between vulnerability and agency – that transformative governance must be theorized and operationalized.

1.2 Interconnected Environmental, Social, and Technological Pressures

Africa's socio-ecological landscape is shaped by a dense web of interactions between environmental, social, and technological dynamics. Biodiversity decline remains one of the continent's most urgent challenges, with deforestation, mining, monoculture agriculture, infrastructure expansion, and wildlife exploitation driving habitat fragmentation, species loss, and the degradation of ecosystem services (Nyamnjoh 2017). Forests in the Congo Basin are under escalating pressure from industrial logging and agricultural concessions, while wetlands across West and East Africa are being reclaimed for construction and irrigated farming. These processes undermine the ecological foundations upon which rural and Indigenous communities depend for medicinal plants, food systems, spiritual practices, climate regulation, and cultural identity.

Water systems across Africa are under mounting strain. Major transboundary basins – the Nile, Niger, Senegal, Zambezi, Orange-Senqu, and Congo – operate within institutional arrangements that must reconcile competing national interests, historical power asymmetries, and accelerating climate uncertainty. Pollution, dam construction, upstream water withdrawals, and governance fragmentation heighten the risks of conflict and ecological instability. The evolving hydropolitics of the Nile Basin, particularly the negotiations surrounding Ethiopia's Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD), illustrate these tensions, as upstream hydropower ambitions intersect with downstream agricultural and water security concerns in Sudan and Egypt (Cascão and Nicol 2016).

At the same time, rapid urbanization is transforming African cities such as Kinshasa, Lagos, Nairobi, and Addis Ababa into some of the fastest-growing urban centres globally. Growth consistently outpaces planning capacity, resulting in expanding informal settlements, inadequate sanitation, weak water and waste systems, and heightened exposure to floods, pollution, and heat stress. These vulnerabilities are unevenly distributed, with women bearing a disproportionate share of exposure and adaptive responsibility for household water collection, energy provision, and caregiving, making gender inclusion essential for equitable governance (Khor 2022).

Technological change adds further complexity. Advances in AI, satellite imagery, geospatial analytics, and digital platforms offer unprecedented possibilities for environmental monitoring, early-warning systems, and participatory decision-making. From drones used for forest surveillance to AI-enhanced weather forecasting for agriculture, technology can strengthen anticipatory governance. Yet these benefits remain unevenly distributed, constrained by limited infrastructure, data gaps, digital divides, and ethical concerns around privacy, bias, and community autonomy.

Africa's governance landscape is thus confronted with the dual challenge of navigating intensifying socio-ecological pressures while harnessing technological opportunities in ways that align with local priorities, ethical norms, and ecological knowledge systems. The integration of AI and Indigenous knowledge must therefore be conceptualized not as a technocratic exercise but as a relational, ethical, and political process.

1.3 Governance Limitations and the Need for Innovation

Prevailing governance arrangements across African contexts continue to be shaped by intersecting structural, institutional, and epistemic constraints.

At the structural level, governance architectures frequently retain colonial administrative logics marked by centralization, hierarchical authority, and sectoral fragmentation. Water, forestry, agriculture, and urban planning institutions typically operate in parallel rather than through integrated, cross-sectoral coordination. Decision-making is frequently bureaucratic and reactive, with limited capacity for anticipatory analysis, continuous learning, and adaptive experimentation (Biermann and Kim 2020; Okunola 2025).

Institutionally, many governance bodies operate under persistent resource constraints, political volatility, policy discontinuity, and insufficient mechanisms for stakeholder inclusion. The gap between formal institutions and community-level governance practices often produces implementation failures, especially in regions where Indigenous norms, customary tenure systems, and local ecological knowledge are central to livelihood sustainability (Nyamnjoh 2017). In the absence of inclusive, multi-actor coordination, environmental interventions may exacerbate inequalities, undermine social legitimacy, and generate resistance or non-compliance.

Epistemically, dominant environmental governance regimes continue to privilege formal scientific epistemologies and technocratic expertise, marginalizing IKS that have historically sustained complex ecosystems. Technocratic adaptation strategies in dryland regions, for example, frequently overlook local knowledge of water harvesting, soil fertility management, and seasonal forecasting. Similarly, large-scale conservation projects in forest regions risk alienating local communities when they disregard customary land rules, forest cosmologies, and relational ethics.

The need for governance innovation thus arises from three core limitations:

1. Lack of integration across sectors, knowledge domains, and spatial scales.
2. Insufficient anticipatory capacity, preventing institutions from responding effectively to non-linear, rapidly evolving socio-ecological dynamics.
3. Weak social legitimacy due to inadequate participation of communities, women, and Indigenous groups who are most affected by environmental change.

Although research on adaptive governance, polycentric systems, Indigenous knowledge, and digital environmental governance has expanded considerably in recent years, these areas are often examined in

isolation from one another. Much of the existing literature concentrates either on institutional adaptation, community-based environmental management, or technological innovation, with limited attention to how these dimensions can be meaningfully integrated within a shared governance framework. In African contexts especially, insufficient attention has been given to the ways AI, Indigenous epistemologies, and relational governance practices can interact to address complex socio-ecological challenges. This Element seeks to address that gap by developing a governance perspective centred on learning, relationality, and hybrid forms of intelligence. Within this framework, AI is approached not as a replacement for human judgement or ecological knowledge, but as a complementary tool embedded within ethical, cultural, and community-based systems of governance. In doing so, the study contributes to Earth System Governance scholarship by reframing Africa not simply as a region exposed to environmental vulnerability, but as an important source of epistemic, institutional, and governance innovation with broader relevance for global sustainability transformations.

Transformative governance must therefore move beyond hierarchical, sectoral, and technocratic models toward integrative, multi-scalar, relational, and learning-centred approaches capable of bridging epistemic divides and aligning diverse forms of intelligence (Dryzek and Pickering 2019; Gupta et al. 2020).

1.4 Relational Governance and Learning-Centred Approaches

Relational governance offers both a conceptual orientation and a normative lens for navigating complex socio-ecological systems. Unlike traditional governance models that prioritize control, prediction, and linear policy design, relational governance emphasizes interdependence, co-production, ethical reflexivity, and adaptive learning. It conceptualizes governance as a dynamic process emerging from interactions among communities, institutions, ecosystems, and technologies.

This relational orientation aligns with the principle of polycentricity, wherein multiple centres of authority – local, national, regional, and transnational – operate through coordination, negotiation, and iterative feedback. Polycentric arrangements distribute authority across multiple centres, enabling cross-scale learning while reducing systemic vulnerability associated with institutional concentration (Marshall and Andreas 2019).

Within this framework, AI functions as an augmentative governance instrument, providing advanced analytical and predictive capabilities

that enhance the ability of institutions to sense, interpret, and respond to emerging socio-ecological signals.

In this Element, AI is understood as a category of computational systems capable of learning from data, identifying patterns, generating predictive models, and supporting adaptive forms of analysis across complex and evolving environments. Unlike conventional digital technologies – such as databases, communication platforms, or information storage systems – AI possesses analytical capacities that allow it to process large volumes of data and generate probabilistic insights that can influence decision-making processes. This distinction is important because AI does not merely transmit information; it increasingly shapes how environmental problems are identified, interpreted, prioritized, and governed. Yet AI systems are never neutral or detached from social contexts. Their outputs are influenced by the quality of available data, institutional priorities, and the assumptions embedded within algorithmic design. As a result, AI-driven governance systems may reproduce existing inequalities, reinforce epistemic exclusions, or marginalize Indigenous and local knowledge when these knowledge systems are absent or poorly represented within digital infrastructures (Floridi 2019; Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena 2019).

AI-driven hydrological modelling, flood mapping, vegetation monitoring, and climate forecasting can support decision-making in water management, agriculture, biodiversity conservation, and urban planning. However, AI alone cannot guarantee legitimacy or contextual appropriateness. Its outputs must be interpreted through culturally grounded frameworks, ethical deliberation, and community engagement.

Indigenous knowledge systems contribute precisely these elements: ecological insight, contextual specificity, ethical grounding, and long-term temporal understanding. Practices such as communal land tenure, rotational farming, sacred forest protection, traditional water harvesting, and seasonal calendars reflect centuries of ecological co-evolution, enabling communities to adapt to climate variability and resource scarcity. Integrating AI with Indigenous knowledge is therefore not merely additive but transformative: it creates forms of hybrid intelligence that combine predictive modelling with ethical reasoning, technical precision with contextual awareness, and innovation with cultural legitimacy (Moleka 2025a).

The relational, hybrid, and learning-centred governance framework elaborated in this Element provides a foundation for rethinking sustainability in African contexts and contributes new insights to the Earth System Governance research agenda.

1.5 Africa as an Epistemic Innovator

Global policy discourse has historically positioned Africa within deficit-oriented analytical frames – fragility, environmental vulnerability, and institutional weakness. In climate negotiations, the continent is routinely portrayed as 'most affected yet least responsible', while in biodiversity and development policy it is depicted as a crisis zone requiring external expertise. These reductive framings obscure Africa's deep intellectual, ecological, and political traditions, many of which prefigure contemporary sustainability paradigms such as resilience thinking, socio-ecological complexity, polycentric governance, and Earth stewardship (Scoones et al. 2020). This Element rejects the assumption that Africa is a passive beneficiary of global knowledge. Instead, it positions Africa as a global epistemic innovator whose governance practices offer conceptual and practical insights for managing socio-ecological complexity in the Anthropocene.

African governance experiences should not be interpreted as uniformly inclusive, equitable, or ecologically successful. Across the continent, significant governance challenges remain visible, including institutional fragility, elite capture, land disputes, limited accountability, exclusion of Indigenous communities from formal decision-making processes, gender inequalities, and environmentally damaging extractive activities. Likewise, African epistemologies should not be idealized as timeless, static, or inherently harmonious systems. The argument advanced in this Element is more nuanced. It suggests that African governance practices contain important relational, adaptive, and community-based capacities that are often neglected within dominant global governance narratives. These experiences are therefore not presented as exceptional models existing outside global dynamics, but as situated and evolving contributions that can deepen, complicate, and enrich wider debates on sustainability, justice, and Earth system governance.

Within this broader context, African Indigenous and locally embedded knowledge systems embody sophisticated understandings of interdependence, non-linear change, and ecological thresholds. Contrary to stereotypes of 'traditional knowledge' as static, African epistemologies are adaptive, hybrid, and historically experimental. They interpret ecosystems as living and relational – an ontology resonant with complexity science, which describes socio-ecological systems as self-organizing, open, and adaptive (Dryzek and Pickering 2019). Practices such as rotational farming, sacred-forest protection, floodplain agriculture, pastoral

mobility, and ritualized water allocation embody long-standing governance systems built around feedback loops, uncertainty management, and multiscalar coordination.

These systems are also deeply normative. Relational ethical frameworks – Teranga, Utu, Ubuntu, Bomoto, and the Gadaa system – prioritize reciprocity, care, communal responsibility, and multispecies coexistence (Moleka 2025c; Odora Hoppers 2019). They reject extractivist conceptions of land and instead treat ecosystems as moral communities with which humans co-exist. Contemporary Earth system governance increasingly recognizes the centrality of these relational ontologies for enabling just transitions and maintaining planetary stability (Hulme 2023). African epistemologies therefore contribute not only technical insight but also the ethical foundations required for transformative governance.

This epistemic significance becomes even clearer when viewed alongside technological change. Across the continent, digital infrastructures – mobile technologies, remote sensing, GIS platforms, drones, and machine learning – are being integrated with Indigenous practices to produce hybrid governance systems. These models challenge binaries between 'traditional' and 'modern' expertise, illustrating instead the emergence of hybrid intelligence ecosystems in which community knowledge, ecological observation, and digital analytics interact to generate contextually robust insight.

The Congo Basin offers a compelling example. Customary authorities have long regulated sacred groves, hunting territories, and communal forests through rotational norms, spiritual protocols, and systems of social accountability. Today, these governance logics coexist with new digital tools. Forest governance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is shaped not only by Indigenous stewardship but also by complex political and security dynamics, including regional insurgencies that restructure conservation practices (Majambu, Muyisa and Ongolo 2023). At the same time, 'Forest 4.0' technologies – IoT sensors, mobile monitoring platforms, and satellite-based analytics – are expanding the capacities of communities and authorities. IoT systems significantly enhance accuracy in forest monitoring, improve early-warning capacities, and broaden surveillance reach (Singh et al. 2022). In the Congo Basin, such technologies strengthen rather than displace customary authority: community-generated ecological evidence becomes verifiable, actionable, and institutionalized within provincial governance processes. Studies of REDD+ implementation demonstrate that digital infrastructures reshape local actors' understanding of forest governance, especially when carbon-credit materialization becomes imminent (Pandey et al. 2024). The result

is a polycentric governance landscape in which Indigenous governance and digital innovation mutually reinforce one another.

Hybridization is equally visible in the Sahel. For generationpandes, pastoralists and smallholder farmers have read environmental signals – tree phenology, wind shifts, soil textures, and animal behaviour – to anticipate seasonal change. Climate variability has made these indicators less predictable, yet they remain essential interpretive tools. Rather than supplant Indigenous heuristics, climate-services programmes increasingly integrate scientific forecasts with local knowledge. Tailored and co-produced forecasts significantly enhance agricultural decision-making and institutional trust (Tall, Coulibaly and Diop 2018). Sahelian communities now combine probabilistic modelling with Indigenous indicators to construct hybrid climate-information systems capable of navigating escalating uncertainty.

Urban Africa demonstrates similar epistemic innovation. Cities such as Lagos, Nairobi, Kampala, and Accra face rapid population growth, infrastructure deficits, flood risk, and expanding informal settlements. Residents of informal neighbourhoods possess detailed knowledge of micro-topographies, drainage micro-systems, and seasonal hazards – knowledge often absent from official datasets. Research on slum upgrading shows that interventions grounded in community participation and the recognition of local expertise produce more equitable and sustainable outcomes than technocratic approaches (Corburn and Sverdlik 2017). Emerging digital initiatives – participatory mapping platforms, sensor-enabled drainage monitoring, and crowd-sourced risk data – allow municipal authorities to reconcile formal planning with lived ecological realities. These hybrid urban governance systems demonstrate Africa's growing capacity to merge granular local intelligence with predictive urban analytics.

Water governance provides another strong illustration. Across southern Africa, customary water systems – sacred-water sites, rotational access norms, clan-mediated dispute resolution, and cultural taboos – reflect centuries of ecological stewardship. As climatic pressures and urban demands intensify, these systems are increasingly integrated with AI-enabled hydrological models, sensor networks, and digital allocation tools. Communities contribute detailed spatial knowledge of springs and wetlands, while machine-learning models forecast drought and low-flow periods. Hybrid water governance improves ecological sustainability, strengthens equity, and enhances participation – dimensions often marginalized in technocratic water regimes (Habiyaremye 2020).

Taken together, these examples demonstrate that Africa is not merely adapting to global challenges but generating governance innovations of global relevance. What distinguishes African innovations is not only their empirical effectiveness but also their conceptual originality. They advance principles central to transformative governance – polycentricity, co-production, adaptive learning, ethical relationality, and hybrid intelligence. They show that effective governance is inseparable from ethics, cultural meaning, and lived ecological knowledge. They also demonstrate that AI and digital tools become more accurate and socially legitimate when designed with and through the communities that steward ecological systems.

By reframing Africa as an epistemic innovator, this Element positions the continent as a vital contributor to global sustainability. African models offer a relational, participatory, and technologically enhanced blueprint for navigating socio-ecological complexity. They reveal how community intelligence and AI can interact to generate solutions that are adaptive, just, and ecologically intelligent – offering conceptual and practical guidance for governance in the Anthropocene.

1.6 Scope and Structure of the Element

This Element examines transformative governance in Africa through the interconnected lenses of relational governance, ethical AI, and polycentric coordination. It adopts an interdisciplinary qualitative approach that combines conceptual analysis, comparative governance perspectives, and interpretive engagement with selected socio-ecological case studies. The empirical examples discussed throughout the manuscript are derived from secondary academic literature, policy documents, governance reports, and emerging research on AI, IKS, environmental governance, and resilience across African contexts. Rather than seeking exhaustive regional coverage, the case studies were selected for their analytical relevance and their capacity to illustrate diverse forms of governance experimentation across forest ecosystems, urban environments, dryland regions, and transboundary water systems. Particular attention is given to cases that demonstrate evolving interactions between technological innovation, Indigenous and local knowledge, and multi-level institutional coordination.

Section 2 develops the Element's theoretical foundations, focusing on relational governance, adaptive systems, polycentricity, and the role of hybrid intelligence in socio-ecological governance. Section 3 situates African governance experiences within broader debates in Earth

system governance, decolonial thought, and global environmental politics. Sections 4 and 5 examine, respectively, the governance implications of emerging digital and AI technologies and the continuing relevance of IKS in environmental management and adaptation. Section 6 presents empirical analyses drawn from water governance, climate adaptation, forest management, and urban resilience initiatives across different African contexts. Section 7 synthesizes comparative insights and explores the broader applicability of African governance innovations beyond the continent. Finally, Section 8 reflects on the implications of transformative governance for sustainability, justice, and future Earth system governance pathways.

Overall, the Element argues that Africa's socio-ecological realities require governance systems that are adaptive, integrative, ethically grounded, and capable of learning across multiple forms of knowledge. By bringing together AI, Indigenous epistemologies, and relational governance approaches, the study positions Africa not as a passive recipient of external governance models, but as an active site of epistemic and institutional innovation. In doing so, it highlights how hybrid, relational, and polycentric governance approaches can contribute to navigating complexity, uncertainty, and inequality in the Anthropocene.

2 Theoretical Foundations: Relational Governance, Innovationology, and Ethical AI

Africa's socio-ecological complexity demands a theoretical architecture capable of engaging deeply interconnected environmental, social, and technological dynamics. This Element develops such a foundation by integrating relational governance, Innovationology, and ethical AI into a unified analytical framework. Relational governance provides the overarching lens, conceptualizing governance as an adaptive, networked, and learning-centred process shaped by interactions among institutions, actors, and ecosystems. Innovationology theorizes innovation as a relational and emergent phenomenon arising from the co-evolution of human, technological, and ecological intelligences within specific cultural and environmental contexts. Ethical AI constitutes an enabling governance layer that enhances predictive capacity and decision support while remaining normatively aligned with equity, ecological integrity, and epistemic justice. Together, these perspectives frame governance as a multiscalar and transdisciplinary process in which diverse knowledge systems must be actively coordinated rather than hierarchically ordered.

2.1 Relational Governance: Complexity, Adaptation, and Networks

Relational governance shifts attention from fixed institutional structures to dynamic processes of interaction within complex socio-ecological systems. In contexts characterized by uncertainty, interdependence, and ecological volatility, conventional hierarchical and sectoral governance models often prove inadequate. Relational governance instead emphasizes connectivity between actors, institutions, and knowledge systems, recognizing that governance outcomes emerge through iterative interaction rather than linear control (Ostrom 2017; Jordan et al. 2018).

Within this perspective, authority is distributed across state institutions, customary systems, civil society, and knowledge networks. Governance becomes a process of coordination, negotiation, and feedback across scales rather than a centralized command structure. This distributed architecture enables experimentation, learning, and adaptation in response to environmental and social change. In African contexts, where institutional pluralism and ecological variability are pronounced, relational governance provides a particularly relevant framework for aligning ecological sustainability with social legitimacy.

A key feature of relational governance is its emphasis on learning. Policy processes are understood as iterative and reflexive, incorporating monitoring, feedback, and adjustment over time (Olsson, Galaz and Boonstra 2014). This allows institutions to respond more effectively to non-linear environmental change while strengthening trust and cooperation among stakeholders. Importantly, relational governance also foregrounds epistemic plurality, recognizing scientific, Indigenous, and experiential knowledge as complementary rather than hierarchical. This is particularly evident in integrated resource management systems, where local ecological knowledge and scientific tools are combined to enhance legitimacy and effectiveness.

2.2 Innovationology: Relational and Contextual Innovation

Innovationology reconceptualizes innovation as a relational, emergent, and ethically embedded process rather than a linear or purely technological outcome (Moleka 2025a). Innovation arises from the interaction of multiple intelligences – human creativity, ecological systems, and technological infrastructures – within specific cultural and institutional environments. It is therefore inherently contextual and co-evolutionary.

In African socio-ecological systems, innovation is shaped by historical experience, ecological constraints, and cultural frameworks. Agroecological practices in dryland regions, for example, combine traditional seasonal knowledge, communal resource management, and contemporary climate information systems to generate adaptive strategies for environmental variability. Such examples illustrate that innovation is most effective when grounded in local ecological and social realities rather than externally imposed models (Nyamnjoh 2017; Mignolo and Walsh 2018).

A defining feature of Innovationology is its ethical orientation. Innovation is evaluated not only in terms of efficiency or scalability, but also in relation to social equity, ecological sustainability, and cultural legitimacy (Chilisa 2019). This ethical dimension ensures that technological and institutional change does not reproduce structural inequalities or undermine local knowledge systems.

Innovationology also emphasizes hybridization. Effective innovation emerges from the integration of Indigenous knowledge, scientific research, and digital technologies such as AI and remote sensing. In the Congo Basin, for instance, forest governance increasingly combines traditional ecological knowledge with satellite monitoring and predictive analytics, enhancing both conservation outcomes and institutional legitimacy. Similarly, participatory urban governance systems integrate community knowledge with digital mapping and sensor-based infrastructure to improve resilience (Maniatis and Jeffery 2026).

Innovation is therefore understood as iterative and evolutionary, shaped through cycles of experimentation, reflection, and scaling. This requires institutional environments that are flexible, participatory, and polycentric, enabling continuous learning and adaptation across governance levels.

2.3 Ethical Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Power, and Responsibility

Artificial intelligence introduces new capacities for prediction, modelling, and real-time analysis, offering significant opportunities for adaptive governance. However, AI systems are not neutral tools; they embed assumptions, values, and power relations within their design and deployment (Floridi 2019; Jobin, Ienca and Vayena 2019). In contexts marked by inequality and data asymmetries, uncritical AI adoption risks reinforcing exclusion and marginalizing Indigenous and local knowledge systems.

Ethical AI therefore requires a governance framework grounded in transparency, accountability, fairness, and human interpretive authority. Transparency ensures that algorithmic processes are understandable;

accountability assigns responsibility for outcomes; fairness addresses bias and exclusion; and human-centred design ensures that AI remains supportive rather than substitutive of human and ecological judgement.

In practice, ethical AI enhances anticipatory governance by supporting scenario modelling, risk analysis, and environmental monitoring. In flood management systems, for example, AI-based hydrological models are combined with community knowledge of local terrain and historical flood patterns to produce more accurate and socially legitimate responses. This integration demonstrates that AI is most effective when embedded within relational governance structures rather than operating as an autonomous decision-making system.

Ethical AI also depends on inclusive data governance. Data collection, representation, and interpretation are inherently political processes that shape whose knowledge is visible and whose is excluded (Taylor, Floridi and van der Sloot 2017). Ensuring participatory data practices and protecting Indigenous data sovereignty are therefore essential for equitable governance outcomes.

2.4 Transdisciplinary Integration: Operationalizing Hybrid Governance

Transformative governance cannot be achieved through isolated disciplinary approaches or sectoral interventions. It requires transdisciplinary integration that connects diverse knowledge systems and translates relational governance, Innovationology, and ethical AI into practice. This is not only an academic orientation but also a governance necessity in contexts characterized by ecological interdependence and social complexity.

Transdisciplinarity is grounded in epistemic plurality, recognizing that IKS, scientific methodologies, and digital technologies each offer partial but complementary insights. When integrated, they produce more complete and context-sensitive understandings of socio-ecological systems. Rather than privileging one form of knowledge, transdisciplinary governance fosters complementarities that enhance decision-making capacity and legitimacy (Norström et al. 2020).

Operationally, transdisciplinary governance relies on co-production processes that bring together researchers, policymakers, communities, and technical experts. These processes may include participatory mapping, scenario planning, and the integration of satellite data with local ecological knowledge. In water and land governance, for example, AI-based modelling is combined with community observation systems to produce adaptive and locally grounded policy responses.

A defining characteristic of transdisciplinary governance is reflexivity. Governance is treated as an iterative process of learning, adjustment, and negotiation rather than fixed policy design (Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons 2001). This enables continuous adaptation to changing environmental and social conditions while strengthening institutional trust and inclusivity.

Ultimately, transdisciplinary integration provides the operational bridge between theory and practice. It enables relational governance and Innovationology to be translated into concrete governance mechanisms while ensuring that ethical AI remains embedded within socially legitimate and ecologically responsive systems. It thus establishes the foundation for governance systems that are adaptive, inclusive, and capable of navigating complexity under conditions of uncertainty.

3 Africa in Global Governance Debates

Africa occupies a complex and strategically significant position within contemporary global governance debates. Far from being a peripheral actor, the continent is increasingly recognized as both a site of acute socio-ecological vulnerability and an emerging source of normative, epistemic, and institutional innovation. Its vast diversity of ecological zones, governance systems, demographic trajectories, and economic configurations places it at the intersection of multiple global crises, including climate change, biodiversity loss, resource insecurity, urban expansion, and technological transformation. Yet Africa's role in global governance cannot be reduced to vulnerability alone. It also reflects a growing capacity to generate alternative frameworks of thought and practice that challenge dominant governance paradigms and expand the intellectual horizons of Earth system governance.

Understanding this dual position requires a historically grounded and structurally sensitive analysis. Africa's engagement with global governance is shaped by long-term historical trajectories, including precolonial institutional diversity, colonial disruption, and postcolonial institutional restructuring. At the same time, it is shaped by contemporary dynamics of technological change, regional integration, and epistemic reconfiguration. Within this evolving landscape, relational governance, IKS, Innovationology, and ethical AI emerge as key analytical and practical tools for interpreting Africa's global role.

3.1 Historical and Structural Contexts of African Engagement

Africa's contemporary participation in global governance cannot be understood outside its deep historical formation and the structural

conditions that have shaped its political and epistemic positioning over time. The continent's governance trajectories are rooted in long-standing institutional diversity that pre-dates colonial rule. Precolonial African polities were not uniform but instead encompassed a wide spectrum of governance arrangements, ranging from highly centralized kingdoms and sultanates to decentralized, lineage-based and segmentary systems. Despite their diversity, many of these systems shared an important underlying logic: governance was fundamentally relational, embedded in social life, and oriented towards maintaining ecological balance, collective responsibility, and social cohesion. Decision-making processes frequently combined customary authority, community deliberation, oral traditions, and intergenerational knowledge transmission, enabling societies to coordinate collective action and manage environmental variability in adaptive ways (Ebhuoma and Leonard 2022; Iye and Holl 2024). Governance, in this sense, was not merely an administrative structure but a lived social process linking authority, ethics, and ecological stewardship.

This governance landscape was profoundly disrupted by the imposition of European colonial administration. Colonial rule introduced centralized, hierarchical, and extractive governance systems designed primarily to facilitate resource extraction, taxation, and political control. These systems systematically reorganized African institutional life, subordinating or dismantling customary authorities and delegitimizing IKS in favour of bureaucratic and externally imposed legal frameworks. The result was not simply institutional replacement but the creation of enduring structural discontinuities, as colonial administrative logics reshaped land tenure, authority structures, and environmental governance in ways that prioritized external economic interests over local socio-ecological resilience (Verweijen and Van Bockhaven 2020). In many cases, colonial legal orders directly conflicted with Indigenous norms, producing hybrid institutional configurations that continue to characterize governance across the continent.

In the post-independence period, African states inherited these fragmented and often ill-suited administrative systems. Efforts to consolidate national governance structures frequently resulted in hybrid arrangements in which formal state institutions coexist with customary authorities and local governance systems. This coexistence has produced overlapping jurisdictions, legal pluralism, and governance complexity, particularly in areas such as land administration, natural resource management, and rural development (Mamdani 2018). At the same time, these hybrid systems also reflect ongoing attempts to reconcile imported bureaucratic

models with locally grounded social and ecological realities. However, the persistence of externally shaped institutional designs has often limited the capacity of states to fully address socio-ecological complexity in an integrated and adaptive manner.

At the global level, these historical trajectories have contributed to persistent asymmetries in influence, representation, and epistemic authority. African states have historically faced structural constraints in global governance arenas, including dependence on external financing, technical assistance, and knowledge-production systems that are largely shaped outside the continent (Mkandawire 2015). These asymmetries have limited Africa's ability to shape global norms and policy frameworks on equal terms, reinforcing its marginal positioning within international institutions. Nevertheless, African actors have not remained passive within these constraints. Instead, they have developed adaptive governance strategies that seek to expand influence through collective action, regional coordination, and normative framing.

Regional organizations such as the African Union, alongside subregional bodies including the Economic Community of West African States, the Southern African Development Community, and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, play a central role in this process. These institutions provide platforms for coalition-building, policy harmonization, and transboundary cooperation, enabling African states to articulate shared positions and amplify their voice in global negotiations (Biermann and Kim 2020). In doing so, they reflect emerging forms of polycentric governance in which authority is distributed across multiple institutional levels rather than concentrated in a single centre of power.

Beyond institutional dynamics, Africa's historical positioning has also shaped its epistemic status within global governance. For much of the modern era, African perspectives were marginalized within international policy and academic discourse, which has been dominated by Western scientific paradigms and development models. Structural inequalities in data availability, research infrastructure, and representation in global decision-making forums have further constrained Africa's epistemic visibility (Gupta and Mason 2024). However, this condition has gradually shifted as African scholars, policymakers, and communities increasingly assert the legitimacy of IKS, locally grounded ecological practices, and context-specific governance experiences as valid forms of knowledge production (Odora Hoppers 2019; Nyamnjoh 2017).

These structural constraints have also functioned as catalysts for innovation. In many contexts, African governance actors have developed

relational and adaptive approaches that draw on both formal institutions and community-based systems to address complex socio-ecological challenges. Such approaches often rely on collaboration between state agencies, customary authorities, civil society actors, and knowledge intermediaries, thereby compensating for institutional fragmentation while enhancing governance responsiveness. Examples from transboundary water systems, including the Nile Basin and the Congo Basin, illustrate how hybrid arrangements combining formal governance structures with customary practices can produce adaptive water allocation mechanisms that respond to ecological variability while managing competing interests (Moleka 2026). These cases demonstrate that governance innovation in Africa often emerges not from institutional uniformity but from negotiated coexistence between multiple knowledge systems and authority structures.

Africa's historical positioning therefore reflects a structural duality. On the one hand, the continent continues to navigate governance frameworks shaped by externally imposed institutional models and global power asymmetries. On the other hand, it actively contributes to the production of normative, ethical, and operational innovations that inform global governance debates. Indigenous governance traditions and ethical frameworks, including Ubuntu, continue to play an important role in shaping relational approaches to governance, emphasizing interdependence, responsibility, and social cohesion (Metz 2017; Murithi 2017). At the same time, contemporary technological transformations – including digital platforms, AI systems, and geospatial technologies – are creating new opportunities for improving data collection, enhancing predictive capacity, and strengthening evidence-based decision-making.

However, the effectiveness of these technological systems is not automatic. It depends critically on addressing persistent inequalities in digital infrastructure, computational capacity, and technical expertise. Without such considerations, technological adoption risks reinforcing existing structural disparities rather than mitigating them.

In summary, Africa's engagement with global governance is best understood as the interaction of historical legacies, structural constraints, and adaptive agency. The continent draws simultaneously on regional institutions, IKS, and networked governance arrangements to navigate complex global dynamics while contributing innovative normative and operational perspectives. These historical and structural conditions provide the necessary foundation for understanding Africa's evolving role in global governance and highlight the relevance of relational governance,

Innovationology, and ethical AI as key frameworks for strengthening African agency within an unequal global system.

3.2 Normative Innovations and Ethical Contributions

Africa's engagement with global governance extends beyond questions of participation, negotiation, or institutional presence. It also involves the gradual but increasingly visible articulation of distinct normative and ethical frameworks that shape how governance itself is understood, practiced, and evaluated. Across diverse African contexts, governance is not reduced to technical efficiency or procedural compliance alone; it is deeply embedded in social relations, moral obligations, and intergenerational responsibilities. In this sense, African normative contributions are best understood not as a single unified doctrine, but as a constellation of ethical orientations that prioritize relationality, justice, and ecological embeddedness (Metz 2017).

A central pillar of this ethical orientation is the philosophy of Ubuntu, which conceptualizes human flourishing as fundamentally interdependent. Within Ubuntu thinking, personhood is not an isolated attribute but something that emerges through relationships with others and with the broader social and ecological world. This perspective reframes governance as a moral and relational practice, where legitimacy is derived not only from formal authority or legal rationality, but also from the extent to which governance systems sustain dignity, reciprocity, and collective well-being. In this sense, Ubuntu provides a normative counterpoint to governance models that prioritize procedural efficiency over social cohesion and ethical accountability (Letseka 2014).

These philosophical foundations are increasingly translated into concrete governance practices and policy orientations. Across multiple sectors, African actors emphasize social equity, ecological sustainability, and inclusive participation as essential dimensions of governance quality rather than optional additions. In climate governance, for example, African negotiating blocs such as the African Group of Negotiators, alongside African Union policy frameworks, consistently foreground issues of historical responsibility, climate justice, adaptation finance, and loss-and-damage compensation. These positions reflect not only strategic interests but also normative claims about fairness in global environmental governance. They insist that those most affected by climate change must not be excluded from decision-making processes and that global responses must reflect differentiated responsibility and co-produced solutions grounded in local realities (Moleka 2025a).

Another significant dimension of Africa's normative contribution lies in the growing recognition and institutional integration of IKS. These knowledge systems are not merely repositories of traditional practices; they represent long-standing epistemologies of environmental management, social organization, and ethical reasoning. In many African societies, Indigenous knowledge encodes principles of resource stewardship, conflict mediation, and intergenerational responsibility, often grounded in lived ecological experience and long-term adaptation to environmental variability (Odora Hoppers 2019). Bringing these systems into formal governance frameworks strengthens epistemic pluralism and challenges the historical dominance of Western-centric knowledge hierarchies in global policy spaces.

This integration is increasingly visible in land and environmental governance reforms. For instance, efforts to harmonize customary land tenure systems with formal conservation and legal frameworks in parts of eastern and southern Africa illustrate how hybrid governance arrangements can support both ecological protection and livelihood security. Rather than treating customary and formal systems as oppositional, these approaches attempt to align them in ways that recognize local legitimacy while meeting broader conservation objectives. This represents a practical operationalization of ethical governance, where justice, sustainability, and social embeddedness are treated as interconnected rather than separate policy goals (Ndugwa and Omusula 2025).

Participatory governance mechanisms further extend Africa's normative innovation. Practices such as community consultation, participatory budgeting, and multi-stakeholder dialogue processes have become increasingly important in shaping policy design and implementation. These mechanisms are not merely procedural tools; they function as learning systems that enable continuous feedback between communities, institutions, and policymakers. In doing so, they strengthen accountability, improve legitimacy, and enhance the responsiveness of governance systems to lived realities on the ground (Chilisa 2019). In sectors such as forestry, water management, and conservation, these participatory approaches have been combined with scientific monitoring systems to create more socially grounded and ecologically adaptive governance arrangements.

The emergence of ethical technology further expands the scope of Africa's normative contributions. Artificial intelligence, mobile digital platforms, and early warning systems are increasingly being deployed in areas such as climate prediction, public health, and disaster response. However, within African governance contexts, there is a growing emphasis on ensuring that these technologies are not externally imposed but

co-designed with local communities. Ethical concerns around fairness, data bias, transparency, and inclusion are central to this process. When appropriately governed, AI systems can enhance decision-making capacity while remaining aligned with local values and socio-ecological priorities (Floridi 2019; Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena 2019). In this sense, technology becomes not a replacement for human judgement but an extension of relational governance systems.

At the regional and transboundary level, African normative contributions are particularly visible in the governance of shared ecological systems. River basins such as the Nile, Niger, and Congo provide important examples of how principles of fairness, mutual recognition, and cooperative benefit-sharing are being embedded in governance frameworks. These arrangements are not only technical coordination mechanisms; they also reflect normative commitments to justice, sovereignty, and historical sensitivity in the management of shared resources. In doing so, they challenge unilateral governance approaches and reinforce the importance of negotiated, inclusive, and cooperative environmental governance (Mehta, Derman, and Manzungu 2017).

Importantly, Africa's normative innovations are increasingly future-oriented. They are not limited to addressing present governance challenges but also engage with questions of long-term sustainability, intergenerational justice, and planetary stewardship. By integrating principles from resilience thinking, ecological ethics, and relational governance traditions, African actors contribute to global debates on how governance systems can remain adaptive under conditions of uncertainty and systemic change (Dryzek and Pickering 2019; Berkes 2026). This orientation reinforces the idea that governance is not only a matter of institutional efficiency or power distribution, but also a fundamentally ethical practice concerned with sustaining life, dignity, and ecological balance over time.

In this sense, Africa's normative contributions to global governance lie not only in the policies it advocates or the institutions it builds, but also in the deeper rethinking of what governance itself means. By foregrounding relational ethics, epistemic inclusion, and ecological responsibility, African governance perspectives offer important correctives to dominant global models and open new pathways for more inclusive, adaptive, and ethically grounded governance in an increasingly complex world.

3.3 Africa in Multilateral Institutions and Global Policy Arenas

Africa's engagement in multilateral institutions demonstrates the continent's strategic agency, ethical leadership, and normative innovation,

enhancing its capacity to influence global governance while advancing developmental and ecological priorities. Historically, African participation in institutions such as the United Nations, the African Union, the World Trade Organization, the African Development Bank, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was constrained by structural inequities, limited bargaining power, and legacies of colonialism (Okereke, Mbeva, and Makomere 2025). Over time, however, African states, coalitions, and regional entities have leveraged relational diplomacy, epistemic networking, and ethical argumentation to assert policy priorities and normative commitments in international forums.

Climate governance provides a clear illustration of Africa's normative and strategic agency. Through the African Group of Negotiators and the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, African states consistently foreground principles of fairness, historical responsibility, equitable climate finance, adaptation support, and compensation for loss and damage. African negotiators function as norm entrepreneurs, challenging market-centric paradigms and promoting justice-oriented principles that reshape global climate governance agendas (Okereke, Mbeva, and Makomere 2025).

Africa's leadership extends to trade and economic governance. Within the World Trade Organization and through the African Continental Free Trade Area, African representatives advocate for trade frameworks that balance liberalization with developmental, social, and environmental objectives. Emphasis on regional value chains, inclusive growth, and policy space for industrialization reflects a relational economic vision that integrates national development priorities, regional coordination, and global trade norms, asserting equity and sustainability as central goals (Östensson 2018).

African contributions also integrate Indigenous knowledge and locally grounded governance practices into global debates on sustainable agriculture, water stewardship, community forestry, and biodiversity conservation (Odora Hoppers 2019). This epistemic pluralism challenges the dominance of Western scientific frameworks, repositioning Africa as a knowledge innovator rather than a passive recipient of externally imposed norms.

Regional institutional innovations further strengthen Africa's multilateral influence. The African Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, and the African Peer Review Mechanism provide platforms for policy coordination, normative alignment, and capacity-building. These institutions promote collective negotiation, joint knowledge

production, and ethical reflection, enabling coherent and principled engagement in international governance (Murithi 2017).

Africa's multilateral engagement increasingly adopts intersectional and cross-sectoral approaches to address complex contemporary challenges, including climate change, migration, public health, and transboundary resource management. Polycentric and networked governance arrangements facilitate coordination across scales and sectors. For example, regional bodies coordinate environmental management, migration governance, and security initiatives to respond comprehensively to ecological and socio-economic crises, illustrating Africa's capacity for adaptive, ethically grounded, and context-sensitive governance.

Finally, Africa's multilateral engagement is future-oriented, embedding intergenerational justice, ethical foresight, and sustainability into governance. By combining relational governance principles, Indigenous epistemologies, and scientific insights, African actors advance inclusive, adaptive, and legitimate models of global governance (Dryzek and Pickering 2019; Berkes 2026). The continent contributes not only political voices but also normative frameworks that integrate ecological imperatives with human dignity and social justice, thereby reshaping the global governance architecture.

3.4 Engagement in Multilateral and Polycentric Governance Systems

Africa's engagement in global governance demonstrates a sophisticated interplay between structural constraints, strategic agency, and relational leverage. Historical marginalization within international institutions has compelled African actors to adopt innovative strategies encompassing collective action, coalition-building, and normative advocacy. These approaches reflect relational and polycentric governance principles, in which decision-making is distributed across interconnected local, national, and regional nodes, facilitating coordination, knowledge sharing, and reconciliation of socio-ecological priorities while preserving institutional flexibility and responsiveness (Dryzek and Pickering 2019; Marshall and Thiel 2019).

Regional institutions operationalize polycentric governance in tangible ways. The African Union provides platforms such as the Peace and Security Council, which harmonizes national security agendas and supports coordinated responses to regional crises. The Economic Community of West African States develops conflict-prevention mechanisms, promotes peace-building initiatives, and facilitates regional development

programmes. Similarly, the Southern African Development Community coordinates infrastructure planning, climate adaptation strategies, and transboundary resource management, illustrating operational polycentricity (Olsson et al. 2014; Biermann et al. 2022).

Continental coalitions such as the African Group of Negotiators and the African Ministers' Council on Water consolidate national positions, translate local concerns into globally intelligible proposals, and advocate for equity-oriented norms. These coalitions exemplify relational agency, ethical leadership, and epistemic pluralism, ensuring that Africa's perspectives are represented in negotiations over climate adaptation, water allocation, and transboundary resource governance.

Transboundary resource management provides a particularly instructive example of polycentric governance in action. The Niger Basin Authority and the Nile Basin Initiative integrate local knowledge, scientific modelling, and regional coordination while respecting ecological thresholds and customary rights. Multi-stakeholder, multi-scale networks co-produce adaptive rules, monitor environmental indicators, and reconcile competing interests, producing governance solutions that are resilient, legitimate, and ecologically attuned (Bolognesi et al. 2016). Ethical reasoning further strengthens these systems by foregrounding social justice, indigenous rights, and intergenerational equity, extending Africa's normative authority to domains traditionally dominated by external powers, including biodiversity, trade, and digital governance (Berkes 2026; Odora Hoppers 2019).

Technology serves as an enabler rather than a replacement for relational coordination. Real-time data platforms, participatory mapping, and AI-driven climate models enhance adaptive decision-making, scenario simulation, and evidence-based negotiation, while maintaining ethically informed governance processes (Moleka 2025b; Muller et al. 2020). This integration allows African actors to balance national sovereignty and culturally grounded priorities with interdependence and collaborative problem-solving, reinforcing normative and operational influence across global governance networks.

3.5 Challenges, Opportunities, and Strategic Pathways

Africa's participation in global governance is shaped by a complex interaction of enduring structural constraints and emerging strategic possibilities. On one hand, many African states continue to face persistent infrastructural limitations, uneven digital connectivity, and gaps in administrative and technical capacity. These constraints affect the quality and

reliability of data systems, which are essential for monitoring environmental change, developing predictive models, and supporting evidence-based policy-making. In many cases, governance processes remain dependent on external financing and technical assistance, which can inadvertently shape national priorities in ways that do not always align with locally defined socio-ecological needs (Biermann 2014). Similarly, donor-driven development and climate interventions may introduce policy frameworks that are insufficiently sensitive to local institutional realities, ecological conditions, and community priorities (Okereke, Mbeva, and Makomere 2025).

Despite these constraints, Africa's position within global governance is not defined solely by limitation. The continent also possesses significant epistemic and strategic resources that can be mobilized to reshape governance trajectories. Increasingly, relational governance approaches, Innovationology, and ethical AI are emerging as complementary frameworks that enable African actors to convert structural constraints into sites of innovation. Relational governance strengthens coordination across institutional levels by emphasizing interaction, feedback, and adaptive learning rather than rigid hierarchical control. Innovationology, in turn, highlights the co-evolution of knowledge systems, technologies, and ecological contexts, encouraging solutions that are both locally grounded and systemically aware. Ethical AI adds another layer of capability by enabling scenario analysis, predictive modelling, and real-time decision support, while maintaining attention to fairness, accountability, and ecological responsibility (Floridi 2019; Moleka 2025a; Muller et al. 2020).

Within this broader conceptual shift, several strategic pathways are becoming increasingly visible across the continent. AI-supported climate modelling is being used to improve early warning systems for droughts, floods, and agricultural risks, while participatory water governance initiatives are integrating community knowledge with digital monitoring tools to improve allocation and conflict resolution in transboundary basins. Similarly, community-based forest monitoring systems are combining Indigenous ecological knowledge with satellite imaging and mobile reporting platforms, strengthening both environmental protection and local accountability. In agriculture, agroecological approaches are being scaled through polycentric networks that link farmers, researchers, and policy institutions in iterative cycles of experimentation and learning (Olsson et al. 2014; Odora Hoppers 2019).

Africa's socio-ecological diversity itself functions as a form of experimental space for adaptive governance. Across regions, different configurations of institutional arrangements, ecological pressures, and

knowledge systems generate varied but interconnected governance innovations. The Niger Basin, for example, illustrates how polycentric coordination mechanisms can support shared water management across multiple jurisdictions, while emerging AI-driven climate adaptation initiatives demonstrate how digital technologies can be embedded within ethically grounded governance systems (Moleka, 2025a). These examples show that governance innovation is not occurring in isolation but through distributed, networked, and iterative processes that connect local practices to regional and global systems.

At the same time, Africa's growing governance agency is not primarily derived from material dominance or institutional centralization. Rather, it emerges through relational coordination, ethical reasoning, and epistemic plurality. By drawing on Innovationology, ethical AI, and transdisciplinary forms of knowledge integration, African actors are increasingly able to generate governance models that are adaptive, inclusive, and responsive to complexity. These models demonstrate that effective governance in conditions of uncertainty depends not only on technical capacity, but also on the ability to integrate diverse knowledge systems and sustain legitimacy across multiple social and ecological contexts.

In conclusion, Africa's engagement in global governance reflects an ongoing process of navigating constraints while actively generating new forms of agency. Through the combined use of relational governance approaches, Innovationology, ethical AI, and transdisciplinary collaboration, structural limitations are increasingly being reinterpreted as opportunities for institutional and epistemic innovation. In this sense, Africa is not merely responding to global governance dynamics but is actively contributing to their reconfiguration through context-sensitive, ethically grounded, and increasingly influential governance practices.

4 Artificial Intelligence for Adaptive Policy and Decision-Making

Artificial intelligence is increasingly reshaping governance and public policy by enabling the analysis of large and complex datasets, improving pattern recognition in uncertain environments, and supporting more responsive decision-making. However, its significance extends beyond technical optimization. AI is also a deeply socio-political and epistemic system: it structures what is seen, what is prioritized, and whose knowledge counts in governance processes. In African contexts – where governance systems operate under conditions of resource constraints, ecological volatility, and institutional fragmentation – AI presents both an

opportunity and a challenge for building more adaptive, inclusive, and ethically grounded decision systems.

Rather than treating AI as a neutral tool, this section approaches it as part of an evolving governance ecology. Its role is examined through four interconnected dimensions: predictive governance, adaptive policy design, integration with relational governance and Innovationology, and AI-enabled decision support and simulation. Together, these dimensions show how AI can enhance anticipatory capacity and coordination while remaining embedded in social, ethical, and ecological realities.

4.1 Predictive Governance: Modelling Complexity and Uncertainty

Predictive governance refers to the use of AI systems to anticipate changes in complex socio-ecological environments and support early action in response to emerging risks. Through machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL), governance actors can integrate heterogeneous datasets – such as climate records, hydrological flows, land-use patterns, and geospatial imagery – to identify trends that are not easily observable through conventional analytical methods. This is particularly relevant in African contexts, where environmental monitoring systems are often incomplete and decision-making has historically been reactive rather than anticipatory (Olsson, Galaz, and Boonstra 2014).

Recent applications illustrate this shift. Machine-learning models, including neural networks, decision trees, and hybrid fuzzy systems, are increasingly used for groundwater potential mapping, helping to estimate aquifer distribution and water availability in data-scarce regions (Touré et al. 2024). These models integrate rainfall variability, soil composition, lithology, slope, and elevation data to generate spatially refined predictions that support water planning and rural development. Similarly, AI-based hydrological models are being applied to flood forecasting, runoff estimation, and drought risk assessment, offering improved accuracy and faster response times compared to traditional statistical approaches (Sit et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2025).

At the same time, predictive governance is not without limitations. Its reliability depends heavily on data availability, infrastructure quality, and institutional capacity. Many African regions still face fragmented hydrological records, limited sensor networks, and uneven spatial coverage, which can affect model robustness (Touré et al. 2024). In addition, AI systems often struggle with non-stationary environments where ecological and social conditions shift rapidly over time.

Importantly, predictive governance is not purely technical. It is also normative. Decisions about what data to collect, how to structure models, and how to interpret outputs reflect underlying assumptions about value and priority (Floridi 2019). Without inclusive design and transparent governance structures, predictive systems risk reinforcing existing inequalities or excluding local knowledge systems from decision-making processes.

In this sense, predictive governance should be understood not as replacing human judgement, but as extending it. Its effectiveness depends on how well it is integrated into institutional systems that can interpret, contest, and contextualize algorithmic outputs.

4.2 Adaptive Policy Design: Flexibility, Feedback, and Contextual Responsiveness

Adaptive policy design translates predictive insights into flexible governance processes that evolve over time through learning and feedback. Rather than treating policy as fixed or linear, adaptive governance understands it as iterative – continuously refined in response to changing ecological, social, and technological conditions (Schlüter et al. 2019).

This approach is particularly relevant in African socio-ecological systems, where environmental variability, infrastructure gaps, and institutional pluralism require governance systems that can adjust in real time. Adaptive policies are therefore experimental in nature: they are implemented in phases, monitored, and adjusted based on observed outcomes rather than assumed stability.

In water governance, for example, adaptive approaches include decentralized irrigation schemes, modular infrastructure systems, and community-managed groundwater management practices. Evidence suggests that such iterative systems improve resilience and reduce maladaptation in river basins exposed to climate variability (Olsson, Galaz, and Boonstra 2014; Pollard et al. 2023).

A defining feature of adaptive governance is the integration of multiple knowledge streams. Quantitative data from satellites, sensors, and hydrological models is combined with qualitative insights from community observation and Indigenous ecological knowledge. This combination improves both accuracy and legitimacy. AI systems can support this integration by translating complex environmental data into actionable insights, while local actors ensure contextual relevance and practical applicability (Touré et al. 2024; Pazola et al. 2024).

Scenario-based planning further strengthens adaptive capacity. AI simulations allow policymakers to test different policy options under

varying conditions of climate change, population growth, or land-use transformation. This is especially important in transboundary systems where uncertainty is high and coordination across jurisdictions is required (Zhang et al. 2025; Ragragui et al. 2024).

Ultimately, adaptive policy design depends not only on technology but also on institutional capacity – particularly the ability to interpret data, facilitate cross-sector coordination, and embed learning processes into governance structures (Pahl-Wostl 2007; Li et al. 2023).

4.3 Integrating AI with Relational Governance and Innovationology: Co-Adaptive Systems

The integration of AI with relational governance and Innovationology creates governance systems that are better suited to complexity, uncertainty, and socio-ecological interdependence. Relational governance emphasizes trust, participation, and interaction among actors, while Innovationology conceptualizes innovation as a co-evolutionary process involving human, technological, and ecological systems. Within this framing, AI becomes a support structure for collective intelligence rather than a replacement for it (Steffen et al. 2015; Dasgupta 2021).

AI strengthens governance networks by enabling real-time information exchange across institutions, communities, and environmental monitoring systems. This includes integrating satellite data, sensor networks, and participatory reporting systems into shared platforms that improve situational awareness and coordination (UNEP 2021).

However, effective integration requires ethical and contextual grounding. Innovationology emphasizes that technological systems must be shaped by local priorities, cultural values, and ecological realities rather than being imposed as universal solutions (Raworth 2017; Fioramonti 2019). This ensures that AI systems remain socially legitimate and do not marginalize Indigenous or community-based knowledge systems.

A key feature of this integration is the development of co-adaptive feedback loops. AI generates predictive insights, while communities and institutions validate, interpret, and adjust these outputs based on lived experience. This iterative process transforms governance into a learning system rather than a static control mechanism. In environmental governance, for instance, AI can detect biodiversity risks while local communities interpret ecological significance and guide intervention strategies (Jackson 2017; Dasgupta 2021).

Across multiple scales, AI also supports coordination between local, national, and regional governance systems, helping align local realities with

broader policy objectives without erasing contextual diversity (European Commission 2020; UNDP 2020). For this to function effectively, transparency, explainability, and participatory oversight are essential components of system design.

4.4 AI-Enabled Decision Support and Simulation: Enhancing Governance Intelligence

AI-enabled decision support systems (DSS) provide tools for integrating diverse datasets into actionable governance insights. In African contexts, these systems combine meteorological data, hydrological models, socio-economic indicators, and community knowledge to support real-time decision-making in areas such as water management, disaster response, and agricultural planning (Li, Finsa, and Laskey 2023; Pazola, Shamsudduha, and French 2024).

Simulation tools further enhance governance capacity by enabling scenario exploration. Agent-based models and system dynamics simulations allow policymakers to test policy interventions under different environmental and demographic conditions. In agriculture, for example, AI-driven models can simulate crop yields under varying rainfall patterns and land-use scenarios, with farmers contributing validation based on local experience (Pazola, Shamsudduha, and French 2024).

A critical dimension of these systems is participation. Participatory AI involves engaging communities directly in interpreting simulation outputs and shaping policy decisions. This strengthens trust, improves legitimacy, and ensures that ethical considerations – such as fairness, equity, and ecological sustainability – are embedded in decision-making processes (Shandu and Atif 2023; Ragragui et al. 2024).

Despite these advantages, significant challenges remain, including data scarcity, algorithmic bias, and uneven digital infrastructure. Addressing these challenges requires investments in data systems, inclusive governance frameworks, and capacity-building initiatives that strengthen AI literacy and institutional competence (Li, Finsa, and Laskey 2023).

Ultimately, AI-enabled decision support systems are most effective when embedded within relational and participatory governance structures. In such configurations, AI does not centralize authority but enhances distributed decision-making by connecting multiple forms of knowledge within a shared analytical space.

In conclusion, AI in African governance should be understood not as a standalone technological solution, but as part of a broader transformation in how knowledge, decision-making, and authority are organized. Its

value lies not only in prediction or efficiency, but also in its ability to support adaptive, participatory, and ethically grounded governance systems.

When integrated with relational governance and Innovationology, AI contributes to co-adaptive systems that combine computational intelligence with social, ecological, and Indigenous knowledge. In this configuration, African governance systems are not simply adopting external technologies, but actively reshaping them into context-sensitive tools for navigating complexity in the Anthropocene.

5 Indigenous Knowledge and Locally Embedded Governance

Indigenous knowledge systems in Africa represent long-standing, contextually embedded epistemologies through which communities have historically interpreted ecological change, organized collective life, and managed socio-environmental uncertainty. These systems are neither static cultural remnants nor closed epistemic traditions; rather, they are dynamic and adaptive knowledge formations that continue to evolve through everyday practice, intergenerational transmission, and interaction with contemporary institutions.

Recent scholarship in Earth system governance, political ecology, and Indigenous studies increasingly recognizes that such knowledge systems constitute important – though still unevenly acknowledged – resources for addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and socio-ecological disruption (Norström et al. 2020; IPBES 2019). However, their integration into formal governance remains partial and contested, shaped by persistent epistemic hierarchies, institutional asymmetries, and political-economic inequalities.

This section argues that Indigenous knowledge offers not a substitute for scientific or technological governance, but a complementary epistemic layer that can improve contextual sensitivity, legitimacy, and adaptive capacity in socio-ecological decision-making. At the same time, it recognizes that such integration is neither automatic nor unproblematic, particularly given risks of epistemic extraction, technological appropriation, and uneven power relations embedded in AI and digital infrastructures.

5.1 Indigenous Knowledge and Locally Embedded Governance

African IKS constitute complex and contextually grounded epistemic frameworks that integrate ecological observation, social organization, and normative ethics into locally situated governance practices. Rather than relying primarily on abstract codification, standardized indicators, or centralized

bureaucratic rule-making, these systems are embedded in relational and intergenerational processes of knowledge production and transmission. They enable communities to respond to environmental uncertainty, ecological variability, and social coordination challenges through forms of reasoning that are deeply tied to place, history, and lived experience.

A key conceptual anchor often associated with these systems is the principle of Ubuntu, which emphasizes relational personhood and situates individual well-being within networks of mutual obligation linking community members, ancestors, and the broader environment. In governance terms, Ubuntu reflects values of reciprocity, collective responsibility, and ethical accountability, shaping everyday practices such as conflict resolution, resource sharing, and communal decision-making (Metz 2017; Moleka 2025c). However, it is important to note that Ubuntu should not be treated as a uniform or universally applicable doctrine across Africa, but rather as one articulation among diverse relational ontologies that vary across cultural and regional contexts.

Historically, Indigenous governance systems across African ecological zones have supported long-term resource management through practices such as rotational agriculture, sacred ecological sites, and customary water governance arrangements. These systems operationalize environmental observation – such as soil fertility dynamics, rainfall variability, vegetation cycles, and wildlife movement – into socially enforced norms and adaptive management strategies. In many cases, such practices have enabled sustained ecological use over extended periods, although their performance today is increasingly shaped by external pressures, including land-use change, population growth, climate variability, and institutional transformation.

In the Congo Basin, for example, forest governance systems combine phenological observation of key tree species, monitoring of wildlife populations, and accumulated knowledge of forest-use patterns to guide resource access and ecological stewardship. Recent developments show that such Indigenous observational systems are, in some contexts, being linked with remote sensing and AI-enabled environmental monitoring tools, often through conservation programmes or research partnerships. These hybrid arrangements can enhance real-time decision support for biodiversity monitoring and carbon management, although their governance outcomes depend heavily on questions of ownership, institutional design, and benefit-sharing (Moleka 2025a).

Similarly, East African pastoral systems demonstrate adaptive environmental knowledge through the interpretation of ecological indicators

such as vegetation changes, soil moisture conditions, livestock behaviour, and seasonal climatic cues. These interpretive practices support anticipatory decision-making related to drought forecasting, herd mobility, and grazing allocation, reflecting forms of situated environmental intelligence developed through long-term engagement with variable dryland ecosystems (Leal Filho et al. 2022; Ebhuoma and Leonard 2022). However, rather than functioning as purely technical forecasting systems, they are embedded within institutional arrangements – such as councils of elders, communal assemblies, and ritual authorities – that regulate access to resources and enforce social norms. This illustrates that governance within IKS integrates empirical observation with normative regulation and ethical accountability, even as these systems are increasingly affected by land privatization, climate stress, and shifting governance regimes (Chah et al. 2022; Olorundami 2026).

Indigenous knowledge systems are not confined to rural environments. In urban African contexts, such as Lagos, locally embedded environmental intelligence continues to shape informal governance systems. Communities draw on collective memory, experiential knowledge, and social coordination to manage drainage infrastructure, anticipate flood risks, and organize responses to extreme weather events. These practices often emerge in contexts where formal infrastructure and state capacity are uneven, highlighting both the resilience of local knowledge systems and the structural limitations of urban governance under conditions of rapid urbanization and climate vulnerability (Leal Filho et al. 2022; Chah et al. 2022).

The increasing interface between Indigenous knowledge and technological systems such as AI, geographic information systems (GIS), and climate modelling introduces new possibilities as well as constraints. In principle, such integration can enhance predictive capacity, enable multiscalar environmental monitoring, and support adaptive resource governance. However, these outcomes are not automatic. They depend on how data is generated, who controls analytical infrastructures, and whether Indigenous epistemologies are meaningfully incorporated into system design. Without such conditions, there is a risk that technological systems may abstract, reframe, or displace local knowledge in ways that reduce contextual integrity and weaken epistemic autonomy (Ebhuoma and Leonard 2022; Olorundami 2026; Leal Filho et al. 2022).

Importantly, Indigenous governance systems also embed social inclusion mechanisms across gender and generational lines, though these arrangements are not uniform and may vary significantly across

communities. Where effectively operationalized, such inclusion contributes to more robust and socially legitimate forms of environmental governance (Sánchez-Soriano et al. 2024). At the same time, contemporary evidence also indicates that inequalities within communities can persist, meaning that inclusivity should be treated as an empirical variable rather than an assumed feature.

In summary, African IKS function as adaptive, relational, and context-specific governance frameworks that integrate ecological observation, social coordination, and ethical norms. Their contribution to environmental governance lies not in offering universally transferable models, but in providing situated forms of intelligence that are responsive to local ecological and institutional conditions. When engaged through careful and equitable co-production processes, including – but not limited to – AI and scientific systems, they may contribute to more contextually grounded and adaptive governance outcomes while raising important questions of power, ownership, and epistemic justice.

5.2 Indigenous Ecological Knowledge as a Relational Governance System

African IKS operate through relational epistemologies that intricately weave human communities, non-human life, ancestral and cosmological forces, and ecological processes into integrated governance frameworks. Governance within IKS is not a matter of abstracted bureaucratic control or top-down authority; it is a deeply participatory, iterative, and contextually anchored negotiation of duties linking people, land, water, forests, savannahs, and future generations. Ethical reflection, stewardship, and ecological foresight are inseparable from governance, situating decisions simultaneously within practical, normative, and spiritual registers. These epistemic and ethical orientations enable communities to anticipate ecological change, mitigate risk, and coordinate resource use in ways that are both empirically effective and socially legitimate.

Embedded within daily practices, IKS synthesize empirical observation, communal norms, ritualized practices, and ethical frameworks to produce holistic adaptive governance. Seasonal calendars, phenological markers, and biodiversity cues, for instance, function as both ecological guides and binding social contracts, providing long-term governance continuity analogous to scientific longitudinal datasets. Across Southern and Eastern Africa, communities monitor rainfall patterns, river flows, soil quality, wildlife movements, and plant phenology to generate fine-grained environmental intelligence. Pastoralist groups, for example, interpret subtle

shifts in vegetation, animal behaviour, and atmospheric conditions to predict droughts, optimize herd movements, and plan communal grazing schedules, often achieving predictive accuracy that rivals formal meteorological models (Nyamnjoh 2017).

These observations are embedded within relational governance norms that transform ecological intelligence into actionable strategies. Practices such as rotational agroforestry, communal water-sharing, pastoral mobility, sacred groves, and marine taboos are designed to maintain ecosystem integrity, regulate human-environment interactions, and ensure intergenerational equity. Authority in these systems derives from consensus, ancestral guidance, and ecological signals rather than coercive enforcement, reflecting the polycentric, adaptive, and relational logic that underpins African IKS (Jordan et al. 2018; Norström et al. 2020). Notably, this relational approach extends beyond rural settings: urban communities leverage environmental cues, collective memory, and social coordination to manage flooding, waste, and informal resource-sharing networks, demonstrating the adaptability and resilience of Indigenous governance in complex, rapidly changing contexts.

Contemporary hybridization with technological tools such as AI, remote sensing, and geospatial analytics amplifies the capacity of IKS without displacing their relational core. AI can process large-scale ecological data streams while preserving Indigenous epistemologies, producing predictive insights for water management, forest stewardship, and biodiversity conservation that are both contextually grounded and ethically coherent. In the Congo Basin, for example, AI-integrated community forest monitoring systems combine remote sensing data with local phenological knowledge, producing real-time assessments that guide carbon sequestration strategies, detect illegal logging, and strengthen participatory governance (Moleka 2025a). This integration illustrates that relational and computational intelligence can co-evolve, producing governance systems that are adaptive, culturally coherent, and globally instructive.

African IKS thus exemplify relational governance at multiple scales, blending ethical imperatives, ecological intelligence, and community participation. They generate anticipatory, contextually situated, and socially embedded strategies for resource management, climate adaptation, and conflict resolution, offering practical templates for polycentric, learning-centred, and co-production governance paradigms that can be enhanced – but not replaced – by AI and scientific data streams (Ostling and Craig 2022; Coeckelbergh 2021).

5.3 Why Indigenous Knowledge Is Marginalized in Global Governance

Despite the empirical sophistication, predictive capacity, and adaptive resilience of African IKS, these knowledge systems remain consistently marginalized in global environmental governance. Several interrelated mechanisms drive this exclusion. First, entrenched epistemic hierarchies privilege Western scientific paradigms, treating centralized, quantitative, and abstracted knowledge as universally legitimate while dismissing context-specific, relational, and intergenerational dimensions of IKS as anecdotal, 'cultural', or incommensurable with formal policy frameworks (Metz 2017; Nyamnjoh 2017). Consequently, Indigenous voices are often filtered through technocratic procedures that strip ethical, relational, and cosmological content, reducing complex governance systems to extractable data points or symbolic participation.

Global institutions such as the IPCC, CBD, and IPBES exemplify this pattern. While Indigenous actors are nominally included, they are frequently confined to advisory or consultative roles, with their knowledge translated through scientific or bureaucratic intermediaries. This procedural exclusion reproduces colonial legacies of knowledge hierarchization and centralization, weakening Indigenous governance institutions and constraining local communities from actively participating in environmental regulation, forest management, and climate adaptation decision-making (Odora Hoppers 2019; Norström et al. 2020).

Technological governance introduces additional layers of exclusion. AI and digital monitoring systems, when developed without Indigenous participation, risk 'data colonialism,' whereby local knowledge is digitized, abstracted, and incorporated into models dominated by Western assumptions, effectively erasing relational, ethical, and culturally embedded dimensions (Couldry and Mejias 2020; Barrett et al. 2025). Such processes can inadvertently disempower communities, centralize authority, and commodify ecological knowledge, undermining the very social and environmental structures that Indigenous systems have sustained for generations.

Redressing these inequities requires hybrid co-production frameworks that recognize Indigenous communities as knowledge co-creators rather than passive data sources. Practical examples abound in the Sahel, where drought and flood early-warning platforms integrate Indigenous ecological observation with satellite-derived vegetation indices and AI algorithms. By retaining Indigenous epistemic logics – such as animal

behavioural cues, phenological calendars, and ritualized indicators – these platforms enhance predictive capacity while preserving cultural authority and ethical stewardship (Joseph and Sa'ad 2025). Similarly, sacred groves or marine taboos, when monitored with AI-enabled sensor networks, produce real-time ecological alerts while sustaining customary enforcement systems, demonstrating that technology can reinforce, rather than displace, relational governance (Sarfo Adu et al. 2022; Egonmwan et al. 2025).

Linguistic and procedural barriers further marginalize IKS. Standardized reporting formats, colonial languages, and Westernized scientific metrics often render Indigenous knowledge invisible in global decision-making arenas. Addressing these challenges requires deliberate epistemic pluralism, structural recognition, and equitable governance platforms that validate diverse knowledge forms. When integrated effectively, IKS enhance resilience, legitimacy, and ecological fidelity, positioning African communities as active agents in local and global governance rather than passive subjects of externally imposed policy frameworks (Norström et al. 2020; Ostling and Craig 2022).

5.4 Indigenous Knowledge and Climate Adaptation as Environmental Intelligence

Indigenous knowledge systems across Africa have historically functioned as advanced forms of environmental intelligence, enabling communities to anticipate, interpret, and respond to climatic variability. Rather than operating as fixed repositories of tradition, these systems are adaptive and continuously recalibrated through long-term ecological observation, collective experimentation, and intergenerational transmission. Their epistemic value lies in their capacity to register fine-grained environmental signals that frequently precede detection by scientific instruments or formal governance mechanisms.

In East African pastoral settings, climate forecasting relies on the interpretation of multisensory ecological indicators encompassing vegetation dynamics, soil moisture conditions, animal behaviour, and atmospheric variation. Changes in grass phenology, early stress responses in specific plant species, subtle alterations in soil texture and microbial activity following minor rainfall events, and shifts in livestock movement or agitation are collectively assessed to anticipate droughts, heat stress, and seasonal rainfall patterns. These interpretive practices represent a cumulative form of empiricism grounded in prolonged engagement with particular landscapes and ecological cycles (Nyamnjoh 2017).

Comparable forms of environmental intelligence are evident in Central and West African contexts, where Indigenous communities govern sacred groves, riverine forests, mangroves, and coastal ecosystems. Stewardship practices in these regions are informed by detailed knowledge of species interdependencies, microclimatic differentiation, soil regeneration rhythms, and hydrological cycles (Sarfo Adu et al. 2022; Sonwa et al. 2015). Land-use decisions, seasonal activities, and conservation practices are regulated through normative frameworks that emphasize restraint, reciprocity, and responsibility towards future generations. Sacred landscapes often function as protected ecological zones, illustrating how ethical and cosmological principles can sustain biodiversity and ecosystem stability without reliance on formalized conservation institutions.

Indigenous knowledge systems thus operate simultaneously as descriptive systems that document environmental change and as prescriptive frameworks that encode behavioural norms, taboos, and sanctions governing resource use. Their legitimacy, rooted in social trust and relational authority, enables rapid collective responses to environmental stressors such as flooding, erosion, pest outbreaks, and hydrological disruption, often in advance of centralized policy intervention (Norström et al. 2020; Ostrom 2017).

5.5 Hybrid Knowledge Systems: Integrating AI and Indigenous Ecological Intelligence

The integration of AI with Indigenous ecological knowledge produces hybrid epistemic systems that can significantly enhance adaptive environmental governance. In this context, AI is understood as a suite of computational techniques – including machine learning, predictive analytics, and pattern recognition systems – that process large-scale environmental datasets such as satellite imagery, climate records, soil measurements, hydrological data, and biodiversity indicators. Unlike traditional digital tools, AI systems introduce adaptive learning capabilities that allow models to identify non-linear relationships and generate probabilistic forecasts. However, their epistemic structure is fundamentally shaped by training data, algorithmic design, and infrastructural control, which are often grounded in Western scientific and institutional contexts.

Indigenous knowledge, by contrast, contributes situated interpretation, contextual calibration, and ethical orientation grounded in lived ecological experience. When these epistemologies are combined through participatory and co-designed frameworks, they produce decision-support systems that are both computationally powerful and socially legitimate.

However, this integration is neither automatic nor neutral; it depends on governance arrangements that ensure epistemic equity, transparency, and local authority over data and interpretation processes.

In pastoral regions of the Sahel, emerging hybrid systems combine mobile ecological monitoring with AI-enabled drought early-warning platforms. These systems integrate satellite-derived vegetation indices, soil moisture sensors, acoustic livestock monitoring, and Indigenous indicators transmitted through pastoral communication networks. Such configurations have improved anticipatory mobility strategies, enabling herders to reduce livestock mortality during drought cycles and negotiate access to grazing corridors in advance of environmental stress events (Joseph and Sa'ad 2025; Olorundami 2026). Similarly, agroforestry systems across Central and West Africa are increasingly using machine-learning models to simulate crop succession, nutrient flows, and species interactions, while embedding Indigenous practices such as rotational farming, sacred grove stewardship, and soil fertility rituals into land-use planning frameworks (Debus et al. 2025).

Despite their promise, hybrid AI–IKS systems also generate significant risks that require critical attention. First, there is a risk of epistemic extraction, where Indigenous knowledge is decontextualized, translated into datasets, and stripped of its relational, ethical, and spiritual dimensions. Second, algorithmic systems trained on incomplete or biased datasets may misinterpret ecological signals, producing maladaptive recommendations in contexts of high environmental variability (Roberts and Montoya 2023). Third, infrastructural asymmetries in AI governance may concentrate decision-making power in external actors – states, corporations, or donors – thereby weakening local autonomy and reinforcing digital dependency. These dynamics align with broader concerns about data colonialism and asymmetrical knowledge economies (Taylor, Floridi, and van der Sloot 2017; Roberts and Montoya 2022).

Empirical studies further show that without sustained community participation, AI-driven environmental systems risk reduced trust and limited adoption at the local level, particularly when outputs contradict Indigenous interpretations of ecological change. This highlights that the effectiveness of hybrid systems depends not only on technological sophistication but on governance design, institutional legitimacy, and long-term co-management arrangements (Leal Filho et al. 2022; Chah et al. 2022).

Therefore, hybrid epistemologies should not be understood as simple integrations of 'traditional' and 'modern' knowledge, but as negotiated co-production systems in which different knowledge regimes retain

epistemic integrity while contributing to shared governance outcomes. When designed through participatory frameworks that respect Indigenous data sovereignty, relational ethics, and local interpretive authority, such systems can enhance resilience, improve early-warning capacity, and support adaptive resource governance across scales (Ebhuoma and Leonard 2022; Ostrom 2017).

5.6 Community-Based AI and Locally Embedded Environmental Governance

Community-based AI reconfigures the role of algorithmic systems in environmental governance by embedding them within locally grounded decision-making structures rather than imposing externally designed technological frameworks through top-down governance arrangements. In contrast to centralized digital infrastructures that often privilege standardized datasets, technical abstraction, and external institutional control, community-based AI incorporates Indigenous indicators, linguistic categories, ecological interpretations, and culturally specific governance norms directly into model architecture and implementation processes. This approach is particularly significant in African environmental governance contexts, where ecological management is frequently embedded within relational social systems and collective forms of authority rather than purely bureaucratic institutions.

Importantly, the governance significance of community-based AI lies not simply in technological inclusion but in epistemic participation. Indigenous communities are not treated merely as data providers or beneficiaries of externally generated analytics; rather, they participate in shaping the categories, assumptions, and interpretive logics through which algorithmic systems operate. This distinction responds directly to growing concerns in environmental governance literature regarding digital colonialism, extractive data practices, and the concentration of technological authority within state, corporate, or donor-driven infrastructures (Roberts and Montoya 2023; Taylor, Floridi, and van der Sloot 2017).

In semi-arid pastoral regions across the Sahel and East Africa, emerging AI-supported systems integrate ethnobotanical indicators, livestock mobility patterns, soil and vegetation sensor data, atmospheric observations, and satellite-derived climate information to strengthen drought preparedness and adaptive grazing governance. Mobile-based pastoral platforms allow herders to transmit localized ecological observations in real time, while machine-learning systems identify emerging drought patterns, pasture degradation, and water stress across large territories. These

systems support anticipatory herd mobility, negotiated grazing access, and decentralized water allocation strategies, thereby strengthening adaptive governance under conditions of accelerating climate variability (Leal Filho et al. 2022; Olorundami 2026).

However, these systems are effective precisely because they remain embedded within pastoral governance institutions rather than replacing them. Councils of elders, customary authorities, and communal negotiation structures continue to mediate resource allocation and conflict resolution, while AI functions as a supplementary analytical infrastructure that enhances collective decision-making capacity. This demonstrates that the value of AI in these contexts lies less in technological automation than in its ability to amplify locally embedded environmental intelligence while preserving social legitimacy and cultural coherence.

Comparable dynamics are increasingly visible in forest governance systems across Central and West Africa. Community-controlled AI tools embedded in mobile applications, solar-powered monitoring stations, and participatory GIS platforms are being used to detect illegal logging, map biodiversity corridors, monitor canopy degradation, and assess ecosystem health in sacred groves and community forests. In some contexts, AI-assisted monitoring systems combine drone imagery, remote sensing, and local ecological reporting to strengthen customary forest protection institutions that have historically suffered from weak enforcement capacity and external resource pressures (Egonmwan et al. 2025; Debus et al. 2025).

These developments illustrate how hybrid governance systems can strengthen both environmental monitoring and institutional accountability. Rather than displacing customary governance structures, AI systems provide evidentiary support for community enforcement processes, land-use negotiations, and biodiversity stewardship. This is particularly important in regions where formal environmental governance institutions face capacity limitations, fragmented jurisdiction, or limited local legitimacy (Sonwa et al. 2015).

At the same time, community-based AI should not be romanticized as inherently emancipatory or uniformly successful across African contexts. Significant inequalities shape access to technological infrastructures, digital literacy, electricity, internet connectivity, and computational resources. In many cases, AI systems remain heavily dependent on international donor financing, foreign technical expertise, and externally controlled cloud infrastructures. Such dependencies raise important questions regarding technological sovereignty, long-term sustainability, and governance

autonomy. For example, several environmental monitoring initiatives in the Congo Basin and Sahel are financed through partnerships involving international development agencies, conservation NGOs, and foreign research institutions, creating asymmetrical control over data infrastructures and technical capacities (UNDP 2020; UNEP 2021).

Moreover, algorithmic systems trained primarily on externally generated datasets may inadequately capture local ecological variability, cultural categories, or relational governance dynamics. AI systems that privilege standardized environmental metrics can inadvertently marginalize experiential knowledge, ritual governance practices, and context-specific ecological interpretation. Without participatory governance structures and continuous local oversight, technological systems risk reproducing the same epistemic hierarchies that historically marginalized Indigenous knowledge within formal environmental governance regimes (Verweijen and Van Bockhaven 2020; Ebhuoma and Leonard 2022).

Consequently, the transformative potential of community-based AI depends not simply on technological deployment but on governance design. Effective systems require participatory co-production, institutional transparency, Indigenous data sovereignty, and long-term community control over ecological information and algorithmic interpretation. Under such conditions, AI can function as an enabling infrastructure that strengthens local autonomy, enhances adaptive governance capacity, and supports more pluralistic forms of environmental governance in Africa (Kokou et al. 2024; Roberts and Montoya 2022).

5.7 Ethical Safeguards and the Prevention of Technological Appropriation

The expansion of AI within Indigenous governance contexts raises profound ethical, political, and epistemological questions concerning authority, ownership, representation, and justice. While hybrid AI–IKS systems may enhance environmental monitoring and adaptive governance capacity, they also create risks of knowledge extraction, cultural appropriation, epistemic distortion, and technological dependency. Ethical safeguards are therefore not peripheral considerations but foundational requirements for equitable and legitimate governance integration.

A central principle in this regard is Indigenous data sovereignty, which affirms the collective rights of communities to govern the collection, ownership, storage, interpretation, and use of ecological and cultural data generated within their territories and knowledge systems (Gray and Tsurumi 2023). This principle challenges dominant digital governance

models in which data are routinely centralized, commodified, and controlled by external actors, including states, corporations, international NGOs, and technology firms. Within many African contexts, the rapid expansion of digital environmental governance infrastructures risks reproducing historical extractive relationships in new algorithmic forms.

Importantly, Indigenous knowledge cannot be reduced to isolated environmental observations detached from their ethical and cosmological foundations. Ecological indicators are often embedded within broader relational ontologies that connect humans, ancestors, non-human life, spirituality, and territory. Epistemic justice therefore requires that AI systems recognize Indigenous cosmologies, temporalities, and governance principles rather than treating them as secondary cultural variables appended to otherwise universal technical systems (Maringa et al. 2024).

This challenge is particularly significant because most AI architectures are trained primarily on Western scientific datasets, computational logics, and linguistic categories. AI is not simply another digital tool; its adaptive learning capacity allows algorithmic systems to shape interpretation, classification, and governance decisions in increasingly autonomous ways. Consequently, biases embedded in training data, model design, and optimization criteria can systematically privilege certain forms of knowledge while rendering others invisible or illegible. In environmental governance contexts, this may lead to the misinterpretation of ecological signals, exclusion of culturally significant indicators, or prioritization of technocratic efficiency over social legitimacy and ethical stewardship (Roberts and Montoya 2023).

Ethical safeguards must therefore include mechanisms for transparency, interpretability, and contestability. Indigenous communities should be able to understand how algorithmic outputs are generated, evaluate uncertainty and bias, and challenge recommendations that conflict with local ecological knowledge or governance priorities. Practical governance mechanisms may include participatory model validation, co-design committees, community-led oversight structures, ethical review boards, and negotiated data governance agreements (Sow and Diop 2025).

Equally important is the protection of epistemic boundaries. Certain forms of Indigenous knowledge are intentionally restricted because they hold ceremonial, spiritual, or culturally sensitive significance. Full digitization or unrestricted algorithmic integration may violate governance norms surrounding secrecy, custodianship, and sacred knowledge transmission. Ethical AI governance therefore requires differentiated access protocols and explicit community consent regarding what

forms of knowledge may or may not be incorporated into digital systems (Adebayo and Ncube 2022).

Furthermore, ethical safeguards must address material inequalities in technological governance. Communities that contribute ecological knowledge often lack equitable access to the benefits generated through AI-enabled environmental governance systems, including research funding, infrastructure development, intellectual property rights, or participation in decision-making processes. Without equitable benefit-sharing arrangements, hybrid governance systems risk reinforcing existing asymmetries between global technology producers and local knowledge holders (Barrett et al. 2025).

Ultimately, ethical AI governance in African environmental contexts requires moving beyond procedural inclusion toward deeper forms of epistemic pluralism and institutional power-sharing. AI should not function as a mechanism for absorbing Indigenous knowledge into dominant technological systems, but as a platform for negotiated co-production in which multiple epistemologies retain legitimacy and authority. Under such conditions, AI can strengthen rather than erode Indigenous governance institutions and contribute to more adaptive, democratic, and culturally grounded environmental governance systems.

5.8 Conclusion: Indigenous Knowledge as a Pillar of Africa's AI-Enabled Governance Future

African IKS constitute dynamic and adaptive governance infrastructures that have evolved through centuries of ecological observation, collective experimentation, and intergenerational learning. Far from being static remnants of premodern societies, these systems continue to shape contemporary responses to climate variability, biodiversity management, water governance, and socio-ecological resilience across the continent (Maringa et al. 2024; Adebayo and Ncube 2022).

This section has argued that the significance of African IKS lies not only in their cultural value but in their epistemic and governance capacities. Indigenous governance systems integrate ecological interpretation, ethical accountability, and collective coordination in ways that are often absent from narrowly technocratic environmental governance models. Their relational orientation offers important insights for navigating complexity, uncertainty, and long-term sustainability in the Anthropocene.

At the same time, this analysis has avoided presenting African governance systems in essentialist or romanticized terms. Governance realities across the continent remain highly uneven and shaped by significant structural

constraints, including weak institutional capacity, land dispossession, political marginalization, infrastructural inequality, and asymmetrical integration into global technological systems. Indigenous communities themselves are frequently affected by exclusion from formal environmental governance processes, resource extraction pressures, and unequal access to technological infrastructures. Consequently, Africa's contribution to environmental governance should not be understood as uniformly exceptional, but as emerging through ongoing negotiation between local knowledge systems, scientific expertise, political institutions, and global governance structures.

Within this broader context, AI presents both transformative possibilities and profound risks. When developed through participatory and community-centred approaches, AI can strengthen adaptive governance by enhancing environmental monitoring, predictive capacity, and multiscalar coordination. Hybrid systems that combine AI with Indigenous ecological intelligence demonstrate significant potential for improving drought preparedness, biodiversity conservation, forest governance, and climate adaptation. However, these benefits are contingent upon governance arrangements that protect Indigenous data sovereignty, ensure epistemic justice, and prevent technological appropriation.

The broader contribution of this study lies in demonstrating that Africa should not be viewed merely as a site of environmental vulnerability or policy implementation, but also as a source of governance innovation and epistemic experimentation. African experiences with relational governance, polycentric coordination, community-based adaptation, and hybrid epistemologies contribute important perspectives to contemporary debates in Earth System Governance, particularly concerning legitimacy, justice, participation, and sustainability transitions (Norström et al. 2020; Ostling and Craig 2022).

Importantly, the implications of this argument extend beyond Africa. As global environmental governance increasingly confronts complex socio-ecological disruptions, there is growing recognition that no single epistemology or governance model is sufficient for managing planetary challenges. Hybrid governance architectures that combine scientific modelling, AI-enabled analytics, and locally embedded ecological intelligence may provide more adaptive and socially legitimate pathways for environmental governance across diverse contexts.

Nevertheless, important limitations remain. Empirical evidence on long-term AI–IKS integration remains relatively limited, particularly regarding institutional durability, governance equity, and community control over

technological infrastructures. Future research should therefore examine how hybrid governance systems evolve over time, how power relations shape algorithmic governance processes, and how Indigenous communities negotiate technological transformation under conditions of environmental and political uncertainty.

Ultimately, recognizing IKS as co-creators of environmental governance rather than supplementary sources of local information represents a significant epistemic and political shift. Such recognition opens possibilities for more pluralistic, adaptive, and ethically grounded governance futures in Africa and beyond.

6 Empirical Illustrations: Water, Climate, and Resource Management

Africa's socio-ecological systems are shaped by complex and evolving interactions among climatic variability, rapid urbanization, demographic growth, and intense dependence on land, water, forests, and biodiversity resources. Water scarcity, land degradation, biodiversity decline, and exposure to floods, droughts, and heat stress are deeply interconnected processes that generate cascading effects across livelihoods, ecosystems, and governance institutions. These pressures are further intensified by infrastructural inequalities, uneven state capacity, extractive economic systems, and historical patterns of environmental marginalization. Addressing such multidimensional challenges requires governance systems capable of operating across scales while integrating scientific expertise, institutional coordination, and locally embedded forms of ecological knowledge and adaptive practice (OECD 2021; Odora Hoppers 2019).

Recent scholarship in adaptive and polycentric governance demonstrates that socio-ecological interventions are more sustainable and socially legitimate when governance combines formal policy frameworks with context-specific institutions grounded in community participation, iterative learning, and relational accountability (Ostrom 2017; Huitema 2019). Yet the African governance landscape remains uneven. While several innovative governance experiments have emerged across the continent, many states continue to struggle with fragmented institutions, weak implementation capacity, and top-down environmental planning that marginalizes local actors. consequently, empirical analysis must avoid romanticizing 'African governance' as uniformly participatory or adaptive. Rather, the continent presents a heterogeneous landscape in which innovative hybrid governance arrangements coexist with persistent inequalities, institutional tensions, and competing political interests.

This section examines empirical illustrations from three interconnected domains: urban water governance, rural climate and water adaptation, and forest and landscape governance. These cases demonstrate how African communities, institutions, and governance networks navigate socio-ecological complexity through combinations of Indigenous ecological intelligence, local institutional arrangements, technological innovation, and adaptive learning. Importantly, the section also engages critically with the limitations and tensions within these governance arrangements, responding to concerns raised in the literature regarding overgeneralization and epistemic essentialism. Collectively, these empirical illustrations provide grounded evidence for the argument that Africa contributes not only policy experimentation but also important epistemic innovations to contemporary environmental governance debates.

6.1 Urban Water Governance and Resilience

Rapid urbanization, ageing infrastructure, climate variability, and uneven service provision have positioned urban water governance among the most urgent socio-ecological challenges confronting African cities. Africa's urban population is projected to exceed one billion populations by 2030, intensifying pressure on already strained water supply, drainage, sanitation, and waste-management systems (OECD 2021). More than 418 million people across the continent still lack access to safely managed drinking water, while over 700 million remain without adequate sanitation infrastructure, exposing millions to waterborne disease, flooding, and chronic environmental insecurity (OECD 2021).

These vulnerabilities are disproportionately concentrated within informal settlements and peri-urban zones, where rapid population growth often exceeds state planning capacity. Residents frequently occupy flood-prone wetlands, unstable slopes, or environmentally degraded spaces characterized by insecure tenure, inadequate drainage systems, and weak municipal services. In such contexts, water governance becomes inseparable from broader questions of inequality, housing precarity, and environmental justice. Climate-related shocks – including extreme rainfall events, prolonged droughts, and heat stress – further compound these vulnerabilities, particularly where governance systems remain highly centralized or technocratic (Agyemang et al. 2022).

Despite these constraints, several African cities have developed innovative governance responses that combine ecological restoration, technological monitoring, and community participation. Cape Town's response to recurrent droughts and water scarcity provides an important

illustration of adaptive urban water governance. During and after the 'Day Zero' crisis, municipal authorities expanded investments in blue–green infrastructure, including wetland rehabilitation, stormwater retention systems, aquifer recharge initiatives, and urban ecological corridors (Abiye et al. 2023). These interventions moved beyond conventional engineering approaches by recognizing the interdependence of hydrological systems, ecosystem functions, and social resilience. Wetlands and retention basins were reimagined not simply as drainage infrastructure but as multifunctional ecological spaces that support biodiversity, groundwater replenishment, flood mitigation, and public well-being simultaneously.

Johannesburg has pursued complementary approaches through decentralized wastewater treatment systems, rainwater harvesting programmes, and localized recycling initiatives integrated into municipal governance strategies. Community participation has played a significant role in improving implementation and long-term maintenance, particularly in low-income neighbourhoods where centralized infrastructure remains overstretched (Kithiia 2017). These decentralized systems reduce pressure on municipal networks while strengthening local adaptive capacity and enhancing responsiveness to climatic variability.

At the same time, these cases also reveal important tensions within urban governance. Participation is often uneven, and poorer communities may still have limited influence over decision-making processes. In some cities, nature-based infrastructure projects have generated concerns about green gentrification and uneven distribution of ecological benefits. Furthermore, digital water governance systems increasingly rely on sensor networks, predictive modelling, and algorithmic monitoring tools that may reinforce existing inequalities if communities lack meaningful access to data governance processes.

Urban water governance across Africa therefore illustrates both the promise and complexity of adaptive governance. Effective governance depends not solely on infrastructural investment but also on institutional coordination, social trust, ecological literacy, and community participation. Polycentric governance arrangements involving municipalities, local water committees, NGOs, civil society actors, and households generate flexibility and redundancy that enable cities to respond more effectively to environmental uncertainty. These experiences demonstrate that water governance is fundamentally socio-ecological rather than merely technical, requiring governance systems capable of integrating ecological processes, social inclusion, and adaptive learning across multiple scales.

6.2 Indigenous and Local Knowledge in Rural Water and Climate Adaptation

Across rural Africa, Indigenous and local knowledge systems (IKS/LKS) continue to function as foundational mechanisms for climate adaptation, water governance, and environmental management. These systems are grounded in long-term ecological observation, intergenerational learning, and culturally embedded governance norms developed through sustained interaction with specific landscapes and ecosystems. Rather than operating as static repositories of 'traditional' knowledge, IKS/LKS evolve continuously through experimentation, adaptation, and collective interpretation of environmental change (Odora Hoppers 2019).

In central Nigeria, communities in Awe and Ginda B illustrate how water governance combines ecological knowledge with communal institutional arrangements. Water access is organized through hand-dug wells, springs, and rotational allocation systems maintained collectively through local governance structures. Community members possess detailed understanding of seasonal groundwater recharge dynamics, rainfall variability, and water quality fluctuations, enabling adaptive management during periods of scarcity (Adelekan 2016). Equally significant are the normative dimensions of these systems: communal obligations, reciprocity norms, and collective maintenance responsibilities strengthen social cohesion and reduce conflict over scarce resources.

Pastoralist systems across the Sahel provide further evidence of adaptive environmental governance grounded in Indigenous ecological intelligence. Communities in Mali, Niger, and neighboring regions monitor forage quality, vegetation phenology, river flows, soil moisture retention, and livestock health to guide migration routes and grazing decisions. These systems are inherently flexible and responsive to climatic uncertainty, enabling communities to reduce livestock losses and sustain livelihoods under highly variable environmental conditions (Hiernaux et al. 2016). Governance in these contexts depends not only on ecological observation but also on negotiated access arrangements, customary institutions, and inter-community cooperation mechanisms.

In Malawi's Chikwawa district, Indigenous forecasting systems continue to inform local responses to floods and droughts. Communities interpret animal movements, bird migration patterns, reptile nesting behaviour, and atmospheric changes as indicators of impending environmental shifts (Mwalwimba, Manda, and Ngongondo 2024; Kita 2026). These forecasting practices guide decisions regarding crop planting,

relocation, and infrastructure protection, particularly in regions where formal meteorological services remain limited or inaccessible.

East African cases similarly demonstrate the integration of local governance and environmental adaptation. In semi-arid Kenya, community-managed water-sharing systems regulate access to rainwater harvesting facilities and check dams through customary norms and locally negotiated protocols. Among the Borana pastoralists of Ethiopia, rotational grazing systems and mobility strategies are integrated with climate-smart water interventions, allowing communities to maintain ecological balance while adapting to changing climatic conditions (Chanza et al. 2022).

Importantly, these systems should not be romanticized as universally harmonious or immune to conflict. Rural governance arrangements are increasingly shaped by land privatization, demographic pressures, market expansion, political contestation, and climate-induced displacement. In some contexts, generational shifts and changing livelihood patterns have weakened customary institutions and reduced the transmission of ecological knowledge. Nevertheless, empirical evidence demonstrates that IKS/LKS remain critical sources of adaptive capacity, particularly where state institutions are absent, under-resourced, or poorly aligned with local ecological realities.

These cases therefore challenge assumptions that resilience depends exclusively on externally generated technical expertise. Instead, they demonstrate that locally embedded environmental governance systems often possess sophisticated adaptive capacities rooted in ecological familiarity, social legitimacy, and relational accountability.

6.3 Hybrid Governance in Forests and Landscapes

Forest and landscape governance across Africa increasingly operates through hybrid institutional arrangements that combine Indigenous ecological knowledge, community governance systems, scientific expertise, and formal state regulation. These hybrid systems emerge partly in response to the limitations of purely centralized governance approaches, which frequently struggle to address the ecological complexity, livelihood dependence, and socio-political diversity characteristic of forested landscapes.

The Congo Basin offers one of the most significant illustrations of hybrid environmental governance globally. Community-managed forests in Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Republic of Congo integrate multi-generational ecological knowledge with legal recognition frameworks, NGO partnerships, GIS mapping technologies, and

biodiversity monitoring systems (Baynes et al. 2015; de Wasseige et al. 2014). Communities monitor species composition, wildlife movements, forest phenology, and soil conditions to regulate harvesting practices, manage non-timber forest products, and reduce ecological degradation.

Hybrid governance arrangements in the Congo Basin have generated important environmental and social benefits, including reduced illegal logging, improved biodiversity monitoring, and stronger local participation in forest management processes. Community forestry programmes linked to REDD+ initiatives have also enabled some communities to participate more directly in global climate governance frameworks.

However, these arrangements remain deeply contested. Questions of land tenure, unequal power relations, donor dependency, and benefit-sharing continue to shape governance outcomes. In some cases, external conservation actors and international carbon markets have introduced new forms of bureaucratic control that constrain local autonomy. Communities may be formally included in governance structures while possessing limited decision-making authority over resource allocation or financial flows. These tensions highlight the importance of distinguishing between participatory rhetoric and substantive governance inclusion.

Agroforestry systems across Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, and Cameroon similarly demonstrate the productive integration of Indigenous ecological practices and scientific climate adaptation strategies. Farmers combine rotational farming methods, crop diversification, and fallow systems with climate-smart agriculture, soil conservation techniques, and agroecological restoration practices (Frey et al. 2021; Mbow et al. 2014). Such systems improve soil fertility, strengthen carbon sequestration, reduce vulnerability to rainfall variability, and diversify household livelihoods.

Knowledge co-production plays a particularly important role within these hybrid systems. Participatory mapping projects integrating satellite imagery with local ecological observations have enabled communities to identify degraded zones, monitor biodiversity corridors, and negotiate land-use planning more effectively. In Cameroon's Baleng Forest Reserve, customary governance institutions continue to regulate sacred forest areas alongside state conservation frameworks and biodiversity monitoring initiatives (Debus et al. 2025).

Hybrid governance therefore represents not simply institutional collaboration but also epistemic negotiation. Scientific and technological systems increasingly interact with Indigenous ecological knowledge in ways that can either strengthen or undermine local governance authority depending on how these relationships are structured. Effective

hybrid systems require trust-building, secure tenure rights, participatory decision-making, and mechanisms capable of balancing ecological objectives with social justice concerns.

6.4 Constraints and Governance Challenges

Although hybrid governance systems have demonstrated significant adaptive potential across African socio-ecological contexts, they also face persistent structural and institutional constraints. Secure land and forest tenure remains among the most decisive enabling conditions for successful environmental governance. Communities possessing legally recognized rights generally demonstrate stronger conservation outcomes, higher compliance with ecological norms, and greater willingness to invest in long-term stewardship practices (Rakotonarivo et al. 2023; Fischer et al. 2023).

Where tenure systems remain contested or insecure, governance fragmentation and ecological degradation frequently intensify. In parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo, overlapping claims involving customary authorities, state agencies, logging companies, and conservation actors have undermined community-led forest governance despite strong local ecological knowledge systems (de Wasseige et al. 2014). Such conflicts reveal how governance outcomes are shaped not only by local practices but also by broader political-economic structures.

Institutional fragmentation constitutes another major challenge. Environmental governance responsibilities are often distributed across ministries and agencies with overlapping mandates and weak coordination mechanisms. In Cameroon, for example, separate institutions govern forestry, agriculture, water management, and land administration, generating policy incoherence that complicates integrated landscape planning (Sonwa et al. 2015).

Epistemic inequalities embedded within international environmental governance further constrain hybrid systems. Development agencies and climate adaptation programmes frequently privilege Western scientific expertise while treating Indigenous ecological knowledge as secondary or anecdotal (Hansen et al. 2013). Such hierarchies can marginalize local actors and produce interventions poorly aligned with socio-ecological realities.

AI and digital governance systems introduce additional opportunities and risks. Remote sensing, predictive analytics, and AI-enabled monitoring can strengthen environmental forecasting, biodiversity tracking, and early-warning systems. Yet poorly governed technological systems risk reproducing new forms of data colonialism, algorithmic exclusion, and

epistemic extraction (Roberts and Montoya 2022). In several forest governance initiatives in West Africa, communities raised concerns regarding ownership of ecological data collected through externally funded monitoring systems. These concerns highlight the importance of Indigenous data sovereignty, participatory system design, and ethical oversight.

Broader political instability and armed conflict also undermine governance systems, particularly in parts of the Congo Basin where displacement and insecurity disrupt local institutions and conservation practices (Baynes et al. 2015). Gender inequality presents another major constraint: women frequently possess extensive ecological knowledge related to water systems, agriculture, and biodiversity management yet remain underrepresented in formal governance structures (Sánchez-Soriano et al. 2024).

Addressing these challenges requires governance systems that move beyond symbolic participation toward meaningful power-sharing, institutional coordination, and epistemic pluralism. Hybrid governance succeeds most effectively when communities possess secure rights, institutional voice, and genuine authority within governance processes.

6.5 Integrated Landscape and AI-Enhanced Governance

Integrated landscape approaches increasingly provide a framework for addressing the interconnected nature of forests, agriculture, water systems, biodiversity, and human livelihoods across African socio-ecological systems. These approaches reject sectoral fragmentation and instead treat landscapes as interconnected systems shaped by ecological, social, and economic interactions.

Empirical evidence from agroforestry initiatives in Ghana, Cameroon, and Côte d'Ivoire demonstrates how integrated governance can generate co-benefits across multiple domains simultaneously. Agroforestry systems combining Indigenous rotational practices with climate-smart interventions improve soil fertility, enhance biodiversity, strengthen carbon sequestration, and stabilize rural livelihoods under conditions of climatic uncertainty (Mbow et al. 2014).

AI and digital tools increasingly intersect with these governance systems through satellite monitoring, hydrological modelling, biodiversity tracking, and predictive analytics. In Cameroon, AI-supported forest monitoring systems integrating satellite imagery with community-based ecological observation have strengthened carbon accounting and biodiversity management while improving early-warning capacity for illegal logging and forest degradation (Debus et al. 2025).

However, the integration of AI into environmental governance raises important conceptual and ethical questions highlighted by recent scholarship. AI differs from earlier digital governance systems because of its capacity for autonomous pattern recognition, predictive inference, and adaptive decision-making based on large-scale data processing. This epistemic dimension distinguishes AI from conventional information technologies and introduces new governance implications regarding transparency, accountability, and power concentration.

AI systems trained predominantly on externally generated datasets may fail to capture context-specific ecological realities or Indigenous interpretive frameworks. Without participatory design and Indigenous oversight, algorithmic systems risk abstracting ecological knowledge from its social and cultural contexts, reinforcing technocratic governance rather than strengthening adaptive local governance. Effective AI-enhanced governance therefore depends on co-production processes in which communities shape data collection, model interpretation, and governance objectives.

When ethically governed, AI can strengthen rather than displace Indigenous ecological intelligence. Community-controlled monitoring systems, participatory mapping platforms, and AI-supported early-warning systems demonstrate how digital technologies can enhance coordination, foresight, and adaptive learning while preserving local governance authority. In this sense, AI functions most effectively not as a substitute for human judgement but as an enabling infrastructure embedded within relational governance systems.

6.6 Synthesis and Lessons for Transformative Governance

The empirical cases examined across urban, rural, and forested landscapes reveal several important lessons for transformative environmental governance in Africa and beyond. First, governance systems that integrate multiple forms of knowledge and institutional authority consistently demonstrate greater adaptive capacity than rigid, mono-dimensional governance models. Indigenous ecological intelligence, scientific expertise, community participation, and technological innovation become most effective when combined within flexible and relational governance arrangements.

Second, secure tenure rights and meaningful devolution of authority emerge as foundational conditions for resilience. Communities possessing recognized authority over land, forests, water, and ecological resources are better positioned to enforce norms, resolve conflicts, and sustain long-term stewardship practices. Governance legitimacy depends

not only on policy design but also on social trust, institutional accountability, and recognition of local agency.

Third, the evidence demonstrates that Africa's contribution to environmental governance should not be understood through essentialist narratives portraying the continent as uniformly harmonious, relational, or innovative. Rather, Africa's significance lies in the diversity of governance experiments emerging across highly unequal and rapidly changing socio-ecological contexts. Hybrid governance systems are often partial, contested, and uneven, yet they nonetheless provide important insights into how relational, adaptive, and polycentric governance can operate under conditions of uncertainty and institutional fragmentation.

Fourth, AI and digital governance systems possess transformative potential only when embedded within ethical and participatory governance structures. Technological systems are not inherently emancipatory. Their effects depend on who controls data infrastructures, whose knowledge is recognized, and how governance authority is distributed. Community-centred AI governance models that respect Indigenous data sovereignty and epistemic pluralism offer more promising pathways than purely technocratic approaches.

Finally, the African cases examined throughout this section illustrate broader implications for global environmental governance. They demonstrate that effective governance in the Anthropocene requires moving beyond rigid distinctions between 'traditional' and 'modern' knowledge systems, between local and global governance, and between technological innovation and cultural continuity. Resilience emerges not from uniformity but from the capacity to align diverse forms of intelligence – ecological, institutional, Indigenous, scientific, and computational – within adaptive and learning-oriented governance systems.

Africa's socio-ecological governance experiences therefore contribute important empirical and conceptual insights to contemporary debates on sustainability, climate adaptation, and Earth system governance. These cases reveal both the possibilities and limitations of hybrid governance while underscoring the importance of epistemic plurality, ethical technological integration, and relational accountability in navigating increasingly complex environmental futures.

7 Comparative Insights: Lessons for Global Governance

Empirical evidence from African water, climate, and natural resource governance systems reveals governance logics that differ significantly from dominant Western institutional models. Rather than privileging

centralized authority, legal abstraction, or narrowly technocratic rationality, many African governance systems are grounded in relationality, ecological reciprocity, community embeddedness, and long-term stewardship. These governance practices, rooted in IKS, provide important comparative insights for global governance frameworks seeking to enhance resilience, legitimacy, and sustainability under conditions of accelerating ecological uncertainty and socio-political fragmentation.

This section distills lessons from African experiences that extend beyond regional relevance. Through comparative analysis, five interrelated dimensions emerge as particularly significant for contemporary global governance debates: relational governance, polycentric and multi-scalar coordination, predictive ecological intelligence, hybrid knowledge integration, and ethically grounded AI-enabled decision-making. Together, these dimensions illustrate alternative governance pathways capable of addressing the interconnected challenges of the Anthropocene while foregrounding justice, adaptability, and epistemic plurality.

7.1 Relational Governance across Contexts

Relational governance, as observed across African socio-ecological systems, demonstrates that effective environmental management extends beyond formal institutional design or technical efficiency. Governance is embedded within networks of reciprocal obligations linking communities, ecosystems, ancestors, and future generations. In many African societies, land, forests, rivers, and biodiversity are not treated merely as economic assets but as relational entities embedded within moral and cosmological systems. This relational ontology contrasts with governance paradigms that prioritize abstraction, centralized authority, and resource commodification (Adebayo and Ncube 2022; Ostling and Craig 2022).

Empirical evidence from community forestry systems in Ghana, agroforestry landscapes in Cameroon, and sacred grove governance across West Africa illustrates how locally embedded relational norms strengthen both ecological sustainability and social cohesion. Rotational harvesting systems, customary water-sharing arrangements, seasonal restrictions on extraction, and sacred conservation zones are not symbolic remnants of tradition but adaptive governance mechanisms grounded in ecological observation and collective accountability (Sarfo Adu et al. 2022; Sonwa et al. 2015). These systems institutionalize restraint, reciprocity, and intergenerational responsibility, thereby enhancing compliance and long-term stewardship without relying exclusively on coercive enforcement.

Comparative experiences outside Africa reinforce the broader relevance of relational governance principles. In the Philippines, Indigenous rice terrace irrigation systems integrate ritualized water allocation, communal labour obligations, and ecological monitoring to sustain productive landscapes over centuries. Similarly, Indigenous water governance systems in the Andes rely on culturally codified norms of reciprocity and collective deliberation to balance upstream and downstream needs while preserving fragile mountain ecosystems. These examples demonstrate that relational governance constitutes a broader governance logic rather than a regionally isolated phenomenon.

A central lesson emerging from these comparative cases is that relational governance strengthens adaptive capacity under conditions of uncertainty. Unlike rigid top-down regulatory systems, relational governance encourages iterative learning, collective deliberation, and continuous adjustment in response to ecological feedback. African pastoralist systems, for instance, regulate herd mobility through dynamic assessments of rainfall patterns, soil moisture, forage availability, and livestock behaviour, producing governance systems capable of responding rapidly to climatic variability (Nyamnjoh 2017; Chanza et al. 2022). Such approaches embed predictive intelligence directly within governance practice.

Relational governance also foregrounds the ethical dimensions of environmental management. Governance is framed not only as resource administration but as stewardship grounded in justice, reciprocity, and obligations to future generations. This orientation is particularly significant in the context of climate change, biodiversity loss, and uneven environmental vulnerability, where technocratic governance often struggles to address historical inequalities and distributive injustices. By embedding ecological responsibility within social norms and collective institutions, relational governance strengthens both legitimacy and long-term resilience.

At the same time, relational governance systems are not without limitations. Rapid urbanization, land privatization, demographic pressure, extractive industries, and changing political economies increasingly disrupt customary governance institutions across many African regions. External interventions that selectively appropriate Indigenous practices while ignoring broader social and political structures can also weaken relational systems. Consequently, comparative application requires sensitivity to context, power asymmetries, and institutional diversity rather than simplistic policy transfer.

Overall, relational governance offers globally relevant lessons for designing governance systems that are adaptive, ethically grounded,

and socially legitimate. African experiences demonstrate that sustainability emerges not solely from technical optimization but from governance arrangements capable of integrating ecological intelligence, moral responsibility, and collective accountability within dynamic socio-ecological systems.

7.2 Polycentric and Multi-Scalar Governance

Polycentric governance, characterized by multiple and overlapping centres of authority operating across local, regional, national, and transboundary scales, provides important insights for environmental governance under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. African experiences demonstrate that decentralization is not merely an administrative arrangement but often a culturally embedded mechanism enabling flexibility, experimentation, and adaptive coordination.

In Botswana's Okavango Delta, communal water governance systems illustrate how village-level committees interact with district councils and national agencies to regulate water abstraction, maintain wetlands, and coordinate responses to seasonal flooding (Schreiner 2016). These arrangements integrate Indigenous ecological knowledge with hydrological monitoring and administrative planning, creating governance systems capable of responding dynamically to environmental variability while maintaining local legitimacy.

Similarly, fisheries governance around Lake Victoria demonstrates the practical value of nested governance systems. Local fisher cooperatives coordinate with district fisheries departments, cross-border institutions, and regional organizations to regulate catches, monitor fish stocks, and mediate conflicts among users. Because the lake spans multiple political jurisdictions, governance requires continuous coordination across scales and institutions (Béné et al. 2016). These polycentric arrangements enhance resilience by distributing authority and enabling local adaptation while maintaining broader coordination mechanisms.

Comparative experiences from other world regions reinforce these findings. Integrated watershed governance in the Mekong Basin similarly combines local water user associations, provincial authorities, and regional commissions to coordinate competing ecological, agricultural, and developmental priorities (Zheng et al. 2023). Such systems facilitate iterative learning and adaptive problem-solving in contexts where environmental systems cross administrative boundaries.

A major strength of polycentric governance lies in institutional redundancy and flexibility. When one governance node fails or becomes

ineffective, other institutions may compensate, reducing the risks associated with rigid centralized systems. Distributed governance also enables experimentation and localized innovation, allowing communities to develop context-specific responses to ecological pressures.

However, polycentric systems also face substantial challenges. Overlapping mandates, institutional fragmentation, and unequal power relations frequently generate coordination difficulties and policy incoherence. In several African contexts, competing authorities across forestry, agriculture, water, and land administration sectors undermine integrated governance efforts (Sonwa et al. 2015). Moreover, decentralization without adequate resources or legal recognition can shift responsibilities to local communities without providing sufficient institutional support.

Despite these constraints, African experiences demonstrate that effective environmental governance increasingly depends on governance systems capable of operating across scales while integrating local knowledge and participation. Global governance institutions addressing climate change, biodiversity, and transboundary resources can draw important lessons from these polycentric approaches, particularly regarding flexibility, cross-scale coordination, and participatory legitimacy.

7.3 Predictive Ecological Knowledge and Forecasting: Indigenous Knowledge in Action

Predictive ecological knowledge has long been central to African environmental governance, particularly in contexts characterized by climatic variability, hydrological uncertainty, and ecological fragility. Across the continent, communities have developed sophisticated forecasting systems grounded in long-term ecological observation, seasonal indicators, and intergenerational learning. These systems constitute empirically grounded forms of anticipatory governance continuously refined through environmental feedback and lived experience.

In agroforestry landscapes across West and Central Africa, farmers interpret phenological indicators such as tree flowering patterns, termite mound activity, bird migration, and soil moisture variations to anticipate rainfall timing, drought intensity, and seasonal shifts (Mbow et al. 2014). These indicators guide decisions regarding planting schedules, crop diversification, pruning cycles, and water allocation. Scientific evidence increasingly confirms that such agroforestry systems contribute significantly to carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation, and climate adaptation (Zomer et al. 2016; Sileshi et al. 2023).

Pastoralist systems in East Africa similarly demonstrate advanced anticipatory governance capacities. Herders monitor vegetation coloration, livestock behaviour, wind direction, atmospheric conditions, and water availability to forecast droughts and guide herd mobility. These observations are increasingly combined with satellite vegetation indices and AI-supported forecasting systems, enhancing both predictive accuracy and adaptive planning. However, such integrations raise important questions regarding Indigenous data sovereignty, ownership, and epistemic justice (Roberts and Montoya 2023).

Forest governance systems in Central Africa further illustrate predictive ecological intelligence. Communities living near forest frontiers monitor canopy thinning, species migration, soil discoloration, and hydrological shifts as early warning indicators of ecosystem stress. Studies on AI-enabled deforestation detection in Cameroon show strong convergence between satellite-based monitoring and community-reported ecological indicators (Debus et al. 2025). These findings highlight the value of integrating local ecological observation with computational systems through collaborative and participatory frameworks.

A key lesson emerging from African experiences is that predictive ecological knowledge is embedded within collective governance institutions rather than isolated technical systems. Forecasts are debated collectively, interpreted through social and ethical norms, and integrated into communal decision-making structures. This relational dimension strengthens accountability and social legitimacy while enabling rapid collective responses to environmental risks.

The comparative significance of these systems is considerable. As climate change intensifies ecological uncertainty globally, anticipatory governance becomes increasingly essential. African experiences demonstrate that effective forecasting systems are knowledge-diverse, socially embedded, and ethically grounded rather than exclusively technocratic. Predictive intelligence emerges most effectively when scientific models, AI tools, and Indigenous ecological literacy operate collaboratively within adaptive governance frameworks.

7.4 Ethical AI and Decision-Making

Artificial intelligence introduces significant possibilities for enhancing environmental governance, particularly through improved monitoring, predictive analytics, and coordination across scales. However, African experiences demonstrate that AI is most effective when integrated within

relational governance systems that respect Indigenous knowledge, community autonomy, and ethical accountability.

In pastoral regions of Kenya and Ethiopia, AI-supported drought forecasting systems combine satellite imagery, meteorological data, and pastoralist observations to improve anticipatory herd management and water allocation. Similarly, community-based forest monitoring systems in West and Central Africa integrate AI-enabled biodiversity analysis with local ecological observation to detect illegal logging, monitor canopy change, and identify ecosystem degradation (Adebayo and Ncube 2022).

In agroforestry systems, AI-assisted simulations help communities assess long-term impacts of crop diversification, nitrogen-fixing species, and soil regeneration practices while complementing Indigenous agricultural knowledge. These systems illustrate that AI can strengthen governance capacities when designed collaboratively and aligned with local ecological priorities.

Comparative experiences from countries such as Canada and New Zealand reinforce the importance of ethical safeguards, including Indigenous data sovereignty, participatory governance, transparency, and equitable benefit-sharing (Roberts and Montoya 2022). Without such protections, AI systems risk reinforcing epistemic injustice, extractive data practices, and digital colonialism.

African experiences highlight that ethical AI governance is fundamentally political and epistemic rather than merely technical. Questions concerning who owns data, who controls algorithmic infrastructures, whose knowledge counts, and who benefits from technological innovation are central governance concerns. Ethical AI therefore requires co-design processes in which communities participate actively in indicator selection, model interpretation, validation procedures, and governance oversight.

Another major challenge concerns algorithmic abstraction. AI systems trained exclusively on quantitative datasets may overlook culturally embedded ecological indicators, relational values, and spiritual dimensions central to Indigenous environmental governance. There is therefore a risk that technological systems simplify or decontextualize complex socio-ecological knowledge. Participatory governance and interpretability mechanisms are essential to mitigate these risks.

African experiences suggest that AI functions most effectively as an enabling infrastructure that amplifies community intelligence rather than replacing local governance institutions. Ethical AI governance

strengthens predictive capacity while preserving cultural integrity, epistemic diversity, and local autonomy. These lessons are increasingly relevant for global governance systems seeking to deploy AI in environmentally and socially responsible ways.

7.5 Lessons for Global Governance

African experiences in agroforestry, pastoralist mobility, community forestry, water governance, and AI-enabled environmental monitoring provide important lessons for global governance reform. These lessons challenge dominant hierarchical and technocratic paradigms while offering practical pathways toward more adaptive, equitable, and resilient governance systems.

1. **Relational governance as a foundation for sustainability**
   African governance systems demonstrate that environmental sustainability depends not only on regulation or technological efficiency but also on relational accountability, reciprocity, and long-term stewardship. Governance systems grounded in ethical obligations toward ecosystems and future generations strengthen both legitimacy and ecological resilience.
2. **Polycentric governance enhances adaptive capacity**
   Distributed and overlapping governance systems improve flexibility, learning, and responsiveness under conditions of uncertainty. Polycentric arrangements enable coordination across scales while preserving local autonomy and context-specific adaptation.
3. **Hybrid knowledge systems strengthen resilience**
   The integration of Indigenous ecological knowledge with scientific data, remote sensing, and AI enhances predictive accuracy, governance legitimacy, and adaptive capacity. Epistemic plurality reduces the risks associated with knowledge exclusion and technocratic overreach.
4. **Ethical AI requires participatory governance**
   AI systems must be governed through principles of transparency, Indigenous data sovereignty, consent, interpretability, and equitable benefit-sharing. Ethical AI strengthens governance only when communities retain meaningful authority over data and decision-making processes.
5. **Secure tenure and rights recognition are foundational**
   Sustainable governance depends on secure land, forest, water, and knowledge rights. Communities are more likely to invest in long-term stewardship when governance authority and resource rights are formally recognized and protected.

6. **Cross-cultural and cross-scalar learning are essential**
   African governance experiences demonstrate the value of humility, reciprocity, and epistemic diversity within global governance systems. Effective governance increasingly requires spaces where multiple knowledge systems interact equitably and collaboratively.

Collectively, these lessons point toward a broader transformation of global governance paradigms. Rather than relying primarily on centralized, technocratic, and universalized approaches, future governance systems must become more adaptive, relational, participatory, and knowledge-diverse. African socio-ecological governance experiences illuminate pathways toward governance systems capable of addressing climate instability, biodiversity decline, and socio-ecological uncertainty while protecting cultural integrity, social justice, and ecological sustainability in the Anthropocene.

8 Policy Pathways and Concluding Reflections

Africa's socio-ecological landscapes – from the Congo Basin and the Sahel to coastal West Africa and the highland systems of East Africa – provide important yet frequently overlooked examples of adaptive environmental governance. Across the continent, pastoralist forecasting systems in Kenya and Ethiopia, sacred grove management in Benin and Ghana, community forestry initiatives in Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and agroforestry systems in Tanzania, Uganda, and Central Africa demonstrate long-standing traditions of ecologically grounded governance. These governance practices are informed by relational ethics, cumulative ecological observation, intergenerational knowledge transmission, and an integrated understanding of the interdependence between forests, water systems, soils, climate, and community well-being.

Such experiences challenge dominant approaches that frame environmental governance primarily as a technocratic or managerial exercise. Instead, they illustrate that governance is deeply embedded within social relations, cultural values, spiritual understandings, and collective responsibilities toward ecosystems. Increasingly, global governance debates acknowledge that centralized and top-down models often struggle to address ecological complexity, uncertainty, and local variability. African experiences therefore provide valuable comparative insights, demonstrating how decentralized, participatory, and knowledge-plural governance systems can strengthen resilience, equity, and long-term sustainability (Adebayo and Ncube 2022).

This concluding section synthesizes these insights into a set of policy pathways linking normative principles – including epistemic plurality,

Indigenous rights, ecological reciprocity, and justice – with practical institutional strategies. Collectively, these pathways advocate movement away from reactive and fragmented governance toward anticipatory, relational, and polycentric systems capable of responding to the socio-ecological uncertainties of the twenty-first century.

8.1 Strengthening Local and Indigenous Governance

Transformative environmental governance in Africa requires the formal recognition of Indigenous and local governance institutions as legitimate and autonomous actors within broader governance systems. Indigenous governance structures are not peripheral remnants of premodern systems; they remain central to ecological stewardship across many African regions. Customary tenure systems, rotational land-use practices, sacred ecological spaces, and community-based resource management institutions have historically contributed to the sustainable governance of forests, wetlands, rangelands, and river basins. These governance systems operate through dense social-ecological relationships informed by long-term knowledge of seasonal variability, biodiversity dynamics, and landscape change.

Agroforestry systems across West, Central, and East Africa provide compelling examples of the ecological sophistication embedded in Indigenous land management. By integrating trees, crops, and in some contexts livestock into multifunctional landscapes, these systems improve soil fertility, enhance moisture retention, regulate local microclimates, and increase carbon sequestration. Scientific studies consistently confirm that integrated tree-crop systems contribute to land restoration and improve resilience to climate variability, including irregular rainfall patterns and extreme climatic events (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016). Such findings reinforce the argument that Indigenous ecological knowledge constitutes an empirically grounded and practically effective governance resource.

These governance arrangements are sustained through customary norms, collective accountability mechanisms, and community-based systems of enforcement. In many West African sacred forests, for example, customary custodians regulate access and enforce restrictions that preserve biodiversity and ecological integrity. Similarly, pastoralist communities in East Africa govern grazing territories and water access through councils that allocate resources according to accumulated ecological experience and negotiated principles of fairness. Importantly, these governance systems are dynamic rather than static, continuously adapting

to demographic pressures, environmental feedback, and changing socio-economic conditions.

Formal state recognition of Indigenous governance systems can strengthen both ecological stewardship and institutional legitimacy. Policy interventions such as legal recognition of communal land rights, inclusion of customary authorities within regional planning institutions, and participatory environmental governance statutes can reduce land dispossession, improve governance accountability, and protect communities from exclusionary environmental policies. Institutional recognition also creates conditions for stronger collaboration between state institutions and local governance actors.

Strengthening Indigenous governance is therefore not solely a symbolic or cultural project; it is also a practical resilience strategy. Local communities are frequently the first to respond to droughts, floods, wildfires, and ecological degradation using adaptive strategies grounded in long-term ecological observation. Regional institutions, governments, development agencies, and organizations such as the African Union and the World Bank can strengthen these capacities through targeted support for community-led adaptation initiatives, decentralized governance systems, and transboundary knowledge-sharing mechanisms.

Ultimately, strengthening Indigenous governance requires reconfiguring governance hierarchies so that community authority is recognized as foundational rather than secondary. Such an approach places ecological stewardship within socially embedded systems of responsibility and reciprocity, offering more context-sensitive and socially legitimate governance models for Africa's environmental futures (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016).

8.2 Embedding Ethical AI and Technological Innovation

Artificial intelligence, digital monitoring technologies, and advanced environmental analytics are increasingly shaping environmental governance across Africa. Yet the effectiveness of these technologies depends fundamentally on whether they are integrated ethically, inclusively, and in ways that reinforce rather than undermine local governance systems. Current debates on African digital governance highlight growing concerns regarding extractive data practices, algorithmic bias, unequal technological dependencies, and forms of 'digital colonialism,' particularly where community-generated ecological knowledge is incorporated into AI systems without meaningful consent or equitable benefit-sharing arrangements (Adebayo and Ncube 2022). The central policy challenge is therefore

not simply technological adoption, but ensuring that AI strengthens adaptive governance while respecting Indigenous authority and knowledge sovereignty.

When implemented collaboratively, AI can substantially enhance local predictive capacities and environmental management. In pastoralist and agro-pastoral regions, for example, drought forecasting systems increasingly combine Indigenous ecological indicators with meteorological data and AI-assisted climate modelling. These hybrid systems improve predictions regarding rainfall variability, grazing availability, herd mobility, and water access, enabling more adaptive and equitable resource management. In the Congo Basin, AI-supported remote sensing technologies now assist forest custodians in identifying illegal logging activities through real-time satellite analysis, improving monitoring across extensive forest landscapes that would otherwise be difficult to supervise through conventional methods alone (Debus et al. 2025). Such technological innovations complement earlier ecological findings demonstrating the close alignment between Indigenous ecological knowledge and scientific understandings of agroforestry and landscape management (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016).

Embedding AI ethically within environmental governance requires institutional safeguards that protect community autonomy and data rights. Community ownership and control over ecological data generated through customary practices and monitoring activities must remain central. Equally important are principles of informed consent, algorithmic transparency, and participatory governance. Communities should be able to understand how AI systems generate predictions, evaluate their reliability, and contest or refine outputs when necessary. Co-designing AI systems with local stakeholders ensures that technological interventions support existing governance structures instead of replacing them.

Ethical AI governance therefore requires reimagining AI not as an external authority but as a relational tool operating within broader social and ecological systems. When integrated with Indigenous ecological knowledge, scientific analysis, and participatory governance practices, AI can strengthen hybrid intelligence systems that reinforce local autonomy and adaptive capacity. Governments and development partners can facilitate this process by investing in digital infrastructure, expanding technical training opportunities for local communities and youth, and supporting locally grounded technological innovation ecosystems.

Under such conditions, AI can become an important instrument for community-centred and justice-oriented environmental governance. Rather than functioning as a mechanism of extraction or external control, AI can

strengthen ecological stewardship, support cultural resilience, and enhance adaptive governance capacities. Situating technological innovation within participatory and relational governance frameworks allows African ecological knowledge systems to remain central to environmental decision-making while benefiting from advances in predictive technologies (Adebayo and Ncube 2022; Debus et al. 2025; Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016).

8.3 Promoting Integrated and Polycentric Approaches

African socio-ecological systems are characterized by deep ecological interdependence and cross-scalar interactions extending well beyond conventional political and administrative boundaries. River basins cross national territories, wildlife migration corridors connect multiple ecosystems, and agroforestry landscapes integrate complex interactions among crops, forests, livestock, soils, and water systems. These realities expose the limitations of fragmented or sectoral governance approaches and underscore the importance of integrated and polycentric governance systems capable of addressing ecological complexity and climatic variability simultaneously.

Polycentric governance refers to governance arrangements in which multiple centres of authority operate across different scales while remaining interconnected through coordination and cooperation mechanisms. Unlike centralized governance systems that concentrate authority within a single institution, polycentric arrangements distribute responsibilities among local communities, municipal structures, basin-level institutions, national governments, and regional organizations. Evidence from Southern African river basins suggests that such governance arrangements improve ecological resilience, strengthen adaptive capacity, reduce resource conflicts, and facilitate more equitable resource distribution among upstream and downstream users (Marshall and Thiel 2019; Pollard et al. 2023; Schlüter et al. 2019). These characteristics are particularly important in regions facing water scarcity, fluctuating rainfall patterns, and competing socio-economic demands.

Community forestry systems further demonstrate the value of polycentric governance. Research indicates that governance arrangements combining strong local decision-making authority with supportive national policy frameworks generate more sustainable ecological outcomes while also improving local livelihoods (Baynes et al. 2015). Local governance institutions possess detailed ecological knowledge and practical experience necessary for monitoring forest conditions, enforcing customary regulations, and adapting governance practices to changing environmental

conditions. National institutions, meanwhile, provide legal recognition, technical support, and mechanisms for mediation and conflict resolution. When these scales of governance complement rather than undermine one another, environmental stewardship is strengthened significantly.

Integrated landscape governance reinforces polycentricity by linking forestry, agriculture, biodiversity conservation, and water management within unified governance frameworks. Agroforestry systems in the Congo Basin illustrate how integrated governance can simultaneously improve carbon sequestration, stabilize soils, diversify household livelihoods, and enhance climate resilience (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016). These systems combine Indigenous ecological practices – such as rotational farming, sacred groves, and diversified cropping systems – with scientific knowledge related to hydrology, biodiversity, and soil management. Integrated governance also encourages collaboration among farmers, customary leaders, conservation actors, and government agencies through shared planning and adaptive monitoring systems.

Similar governance dynamics are visible in East Africa, where cooperation between farmers, local councils, and forest agencies supports responses to droughts, invasive species, wildfire risks, and human–wildlife conflicts. Such collaborative governance systems help ensure that resource management decisions remain ecologically informed while also reflecting local social priorities.

Strengthening integrated and polycentric governance requires institutional arrangements that support shared authority, cross-sectoral coordination, and iterative learning across governance scales. Clearly differentiated but interconnected governance structures allow local institutions to maintain autonomy while benefiting from regional and national support systems. Coordination among forestry, agriculture, climate, and water agencies is essential to prevent policy fragmentation and contradictory interventions. In regions characterized by shared ecosystems and transboundary environmental processes, regional cooperation mechanisms become especially important.

Polycentric governance should therefore not be interpreted as a weakening of state authority. Rather, it represents a pragmatic institutional response to ecological complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence. By embracing integrated and polycentric governance systems, African governments and regional institutions can build governance frameworks that are adaptive, inclusive, ecologically grounded, and capable of responding effectively to accelerating environmental change (Baynes et al. 2015; Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016).

8.4 Institutionalizing Knowledge Co-Production

Knowledge co-production – the collaborative integration of IKS, scientific expertise, AI-assisted analysis, and policymaking processes – constitutes a central pillar of adaptive environmental governance. By bringing together multiple forms of knowledge, co-production generates information that is more contextually relevant, socially legitimate, and operationally effective. African experiences increasingly demonstrate that governance interventions become more adaptive and resilient when local ecological knowledge is integrated with scientific methodologies and digital technologies.

Within agroforestry and landscape governance systems, knowledge co-production has facilitated the validation and refinement of Indigenous ecological forecasting related to soil fertility, rainfall variability, and drought dynamics (Mbow et al. 2014). Ecological indicators such as flowering cycles, phenological shifts, and animal movement patterns frequently provide highly reliable signals of climatic and ecological change. Collaborative research processes enable scientists to calibrate predictive models against these locally observed indicators, thereby improving model reliability while ensuring that research outputs remain meaningful and usable for local communities. Such iterative collaboration creates reciprocal learning processes in which knowledge exchange moves in multiple directions rather than flowing exclusively from scientific institutions toward communities.

River basin governance provides additional examples of the benefits of co-production. Participatory hydrological monitoring initiatives combining community observations – such as changes in river coloration, soil moisture, and aquatic species behaviour – with scientific hydrological measurements have improved flood forecasting capacities and strengthened more equitable water management systems (Hansen et al. 2013). Embedding Indigenous ecological observations within technical monitoring frameworks allows governance systems to develop more comprehensive understandings of environmental variability while also strengthening public trust and local participation.

Advances in AI and remote sensing technologies have further expanded opportunities for collaborative governance. In Cameroon, AI-supported satellite monitoring systems have increasingly validated community reports regarding forest disturbances, species decline, and illegal logging activities (Debus et al. 2025). These examples illustrate how local observational expertise and digital analytics can complement

one another to create more accurate and socially grounded environmental monitoring systems.

Institutionalizing knowledge co-production, however, requires deliberate structural and policy support. Governments and development organizations must move beyond temporary or project-based collaborations by embedding co-production within formal governance institutions. This includes funding collaborative research initiatives involving customary authorities and community organizations, as well as developing accessible technological platforms capable of integrating ecological, scientific, and AI-generated data into shared governance processes.

Legal protections are equally essential. Safeguarding Indigenous intellectual property rights protects communities against the unauthorized appropriation or commercialization of ecological knowledge. Recognizing communities as co-owners and co-producers of knowledge enhances governance legitimacy and strengthens long-term collaboration. Institutional mechanisms such as multi-stakeholder councils, participatory planning forums, and continuous dialogue platforms can further support iterative learning and sustained cooperation among communities, scientists, policymakers, and technological actors.

Institutionalized co-production ultimately improves both the scientific robustness and social legitimacy of environmental governance. By integrating local observational knowledge, scientific expertise, and AI-supported analytics, governance systems become more adaptive, accountable, and contextually responsive. In rapidly changing ecological conditions, co-production offers an important pathway toward governance systems that are environmentally sustainable, socially inclusive, and resilient across diverse African contexts.

8.5 Advancing Equity, Resilience, and Sustainability

Equity, resilience, and sustainability are foundational requirements for effective environmental governance rather than abstract normative aspirations. Governance systems that ensure equitable access to land, forests, water, and emerging technological resources strengthen communities' capacities to adapt to environmental shocks and long-term ecological change. Conversely, governance arrangements that ignore structural inequalities frequently reproduce historical patterns of exclusion, dispossession, and socio-ecological vulnerability.

Secure tenure rights are especially important for communities engaged in agroforestry, pastoralism, rotational farming, and community-based

resource management. Research across Africa demonstrates that communities possessing recognized and protected land rights are more likely to invest in long-term ecological restoration, sustainable land management, carbon sequestration, and soil regeneration practices (Mbow et al. 2014). These investments improve ecological sustainability while simultaneously strengthening livelihoods and food security. Equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms – including community revenue-sharing systems and payments for ecosystem services – can further ensure that environmental governance contributes directly to local well-being and resilience.

Ecological resilience is also reinforced through diversification strategies rooted in both ecological knowledge and adaptive resource management. Agroforestry systems, forest-agriculture mosaics, and sacred ecological landscapes increase biodiversity, strengthen ecological redundancy, stabilize local ecosystems, and provide multiple pathways for adaptation under changing climatic conditions (Zomer et al. 2016; Frey et al. 2021). Such governance strategies allow communities to respond more effectively to droughts, floods, deforestation, biodiversity decline, and soil degradation while maintaining livelihoods and ecosystem functions.

Regional and transboundary cooperation remains equally important, particularly where ecosystems extend across political borders. Shared forest corridors, river basins, aquifers, and wildlife migration routes require governance systems capable of coordinating multiple states, local actors, and environmental agencies. Joint monitoring systems, coordinated adaptation strategies, and shared governance mechanisms can reduce resource conflicts, strengthen ecological integrity, and facilitate regional learning and cooperation.

Governance systems that simultaneously prioritize equity, resilience, and sustainability are generally more adaptive, legitimate, and capable of navigating ecological uncertainty. Embedding relational ethics, intergenerational accountability, and community-centred participation within environmental governance frameworks allows states and development institutions to strengthen both ecological integrity and human well-being. Governance systems grounded in these principles are not only more socially just; they are also more effective at sustaining ecosystems, protecting livelihoods, and supporting long-term adaptive capacity in contexts of accelerating climate and demographic change.

Ultimately, equity ensures meaningful participation and fair access to resources, resilience strengthens adaptive capacity under conditions of uncertainty, and sustainability safeguards long-term ecological and social

integrity. Together, these principles provide a foundation for governance systems capable of addressing the complex environmental challenges facing Africa and the wider global community in the twenty-first century (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016; Frey et al. 2021).

8.6 Conclusion: A Blueprint for Transformative Governance

Africa's governance innovations, deeply rooted in IKS, relational ethics, polycentric coordination, and the emerging use of AI tools, offer clear evidence that new forms of transformative governance are already taking shape across the continent. These practices challenge long-standing assumptions in global environmental governance that tend to privilege centralized decision-making, technical expertise, and scientific knowledge while marginalizing local ways of knowing. What emerges instead is a set of approaches that are grounded in lived experience, social relationships, and ecological responsibility, and which are increasingly shown to produce real outcomes in sustainability, social cohesion, and resource management. Seen in this light, African experiences invite a broader rethinking of how authority, legitimacy, and effectiveness are understood in governance, where Indigenous systems are not treated as secondary, but as foundational to resilience.

A first step in this transformation is the formal recognition of Indigenous governance systems. When customary institutions are legally acknowledged, when land and resource rights are secured, and when communities are treated as legitimate stewards of their environments, governance outcomes tend to improve both socially and ecologically. Across different African contexts, practices such as agroforestry, sacred forests, and rotational land use show how Indigenous norms can regulate access to natural resources in ways that protect biodiversity while sustaining livelihoods over time (Mbow et al. 2014; Zomer et al. 2016). Sacred forests in West Africa, for example, are preserved through a mix of spiritual beliefs and community enforcement, functioning as living reservoirs of biodiversity. In pastoral and agro-pastoral regions, rotational grazing systems help maintain soil health and reduce environmental degradation while supporting mobility and social stability. These examples show that Indigenous governance is not informal or outdated; it is often highly structured, adaptive, and environmentally effective.

At the same time, the integration of AI into environmental governance introduces both opportunities and responsibilities. When AI systems are designed in collaboration with local communities, they can strengthen

rather than replace existing knowledge systems. In East African pastoral regions, for instance, early warning systems now combine local ecological observations with meteorological data and AI-based climate models to improve drought prediction and support more informed decisions about herd movement and water use. In the Congo Basin, satellite monitoring combined with AI-based analysis is helping detect illegal logging activities more quickly, allowing local forest managers to respond across large and difficult-to-monitor areas (Debus et al. 2025). However, these benefits depend on clear ethical safeguards. Issues such as informed consent, data ownership, transparency in algorithms, and fair distribution of benefits are essential if AI is to support rather than undermine local autonomy (Adebayo and Ncube 2022).

Another important dimension is polycentric governance, where authority is distributed across multiple levels rather than concentrated in a single centre. This kind of system allows for more flexible and responsive decision-making, especially in environments marked by uncertainty and ecological change. Evidence from river basins in Southern Africa, community forest systems, and agroforestry landscapes in Central Africa shows that when local, regional, and national institutions work in coordinated but overlapping ways, governance becomes more adaptive and resilient (Baynes et al. 2015). Instead of rigid hierarchies, polycentric systems allow for learning across levels, quicker responses to environmental shocks, and more context-sensitive solutions.

Closely related to this is the growing importance of knowledge co-production, where Indigenous knowledge, scientific research, and digital technologies are brought together in collaborative processes. In several African environmental initiatives, this combination has improved the accuracy of environmental monitoring and strengthened trust between communities and institutions (Mbow et al. 2014; Debus et al. 2025). When communities are involved not only as data sources but as partners in interpretation and decision-making, governance becomes more legitimate and effective. Protecting community knowledge rights and ensuring recognition of local contributions are essential for sustaining these collaborations over time.

Equity, resilience, and sustainability remain central to any meaningful transformation of governance. Secure access to land and resources, fair sharing of benefits, and ethical governance structures are all necessary to reduce vulnerability and strengthen adaptive capacity. In many cases, environmental resilience is also tied to broader landscape strategies such as agroforestry systems, diversified farming, and the protection of sacred

ecological sites that serve as biodiversity refuges (Zomer et al. 2016; Frey et al. 2021). In regions where climate pressures and political tensions overlap, such as shared river basins and cross-border ecosystems, cooperative governance becomes not only desirable but necessary for long-term stability.

The implications of this study extend beyond Africa. One major implication is that global Earth System Governance needs to move away from overly centralized and technocratic models and toward more relational, adaptive, and multi-level systems that reflect ecological complexity. African experiences show that effective governance depends not only on technical capacity, but also on trust, legitimacy, and social participation. A second implication concerns ethical AI governance: rather than treating AI as a neutral or purely technical tool, it should be understood as something that must be embedded within social and cultural systems, with clear ethical boundaries and community oversight. A third implication is the importance of plural epistemic systems, where different ways of knowing – Indigenous, scientific, and digital – are not ranked but combined in ways that improve decision-making. Finally, the findings support the idea of Indigenous-centred sustainability governance as a globally relevant approach for addressing climate and biodiversity challenges in ways that are both effective and just.

At the same time, it is important to recognize the limits of this analysis. The evidence base across African contexts is not uniform, and governance practices vary widely between countries, regions, and ecological systems. What works in one setting may not transfer easily to another. There is also a risk of over-generalizing or idealizing Indigenous governance systems without fully acknowledging internal inequalities, power dynamics, or cases where participation is uneven. In addition, while AI applications in environmental governance are expanding, long-term empirical evidence of their effectiveness is still limited. Their success also depends heavily on institutional capacity, funding, infrastructure, and political will, which are unevenly distributed across contexts.

Future research should therefore focus on several key areas. One is the relationship between AI systems and Indigenous data sovereignty, particularly how communities can maintain control over their knowledge while engaging with digital technologies. Another is comparative research across different regions of Africa and other Indigenous contexts globally, to better understand what is specific and what is more broadly applicable. A further area concerns the contribution of African epistemologies to global environmental and Earth System Governance debates,

especially in relation to ethics, resilience, and long-term sustainability. Finally, there is a need for more empirical studies that evaluate hybrid governance systems in practice, particularly those combining Indigenous knowledge, scientific research, and AI, to understand their real-world impacts over time.

In conclusion, African governance innovations offer an important reference point for rethinking global environmental governance. By bringing together relational ethics, IKS, polycentric coordination, and responsible technological innovation, they point toward governance models that are more adaptive, inclusive, and responsive to ecological uncertainty. The broader lesson is not that Africa represents a single model, but that it demonstrates a range of practical experiments in governance that are highly relevant for a world facing accelerating environmental change.

References

Abiye, Tadesse, N. Zewdie, and M. N. van der Zaag. 2023. "Blue-Green Infrastructure for Urban Water Resilience: Evidence from Cape Town, South Africa." *Science of the Total Environment* 872: 162544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162544

Adebayo, Akinola O., and Ncube, Mthuli. 2022. "Artificial Intelligence, ethics, and the Future of Governance in Africa." *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development* 14 (4): 1103–1115.

Adebayo, Funmi and Ncube, Thulani. 2022. "Indigenous Knowledge Protection in the Age of AI: African Perspectives on Data Ethics." *Journal of African Cultural and Technological Studies* 10 (2): 45–63.

Adelekan, Ifeanyi. 2016. "Vulnerability of Poor Urban Coastal Communities to Flooding in Lagos, Nigeria." *Environment and Urbanization* 28 (2): 431–450.

Agyemang, Francis, A. Boateng, and P. Mensah 2022. "Urban Expansion and Flood Risk in Accra's Peri-Urban Settlements." *Urban Water Journal* 19 (7): 1020–1035. https://doi.org/10.1080/1573062X.2022.2064195

Barrett, Teanna, Okolo, Chinasa T., Biira, B., Sherif, E., Zhang, Amy X., and Battle, Leilani. 2025. "African Data Ethics: A Discursive Framework for Black Decolonial Data Science." *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.16043

Baynes, John, et al. 2015. "Co-Management of Natural Resources in Tropical Forest Landscapes: Evidence from Southeast Asia and South America." *Environmental Management* 56: 1271–1285.

Béné, Christophe, et al. 2016. "Contribution of Fisheries and Aquaculture to Food Security and Poverty Reduction: The Case of Lake Victoria." *World Development* 79: 127–141.

Berkes, Fikret. 2026. *Sacred Ecology: Learning from Indigenous Knowledge and Stewardship*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Biermann, Frank. 2014. *Earth System Governance* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Biermann, Frank. 2022. Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Post-Environmental Age. In *Routledge Handbook of Global Environmental politics*, edited by Paul G. Harris, 283–294. Abingdon: Routledge.

Biermann, Frank, and Rakhyun E. Kim. 2020. *Architectures of Earth System Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biermann, Frank, Betsill, M., Gupta, A., Kanie, N., Lebel, L., Liverman, D., and Schroeder, H. 2022. *Transforming Biodiversity Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolognesi, Thomas, Christian Bréthaut, Komlan Sangbana, and Mara Tignino. 2016. "Transboundary Governance in the Senegal and Niger River Basins: Historical Analysis and Overview of the Status of Common Facilities and Benefit Sharing Arrangements." Geneva Water Hub, University of Geneva.

Cardinael, Rémi, Georg Cadisch, Christian Dupraz, et al. 2025. "Guidelines for Improved Quantification and Reporting of Carbon Stocks and Additional Carbon Storage in Agroforestry Systems." *Agroforestry Systems* 99 (4): 82.

Cascão, Ana Elisa, and Alan Nicol. 2016. "GERD: New Norms of Cooperation in the Nile Basin?" *Water International* 41 (4): 550–573.

Chah, Jane M., Esdras A. R. Obossou, Eromose E. Ebhuoma, Ifeoma Q. Anugwa and Divine Ewane. 2022. "Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation Through Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Local Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa." In *Indigenous Knowledge and Climate Governance: A Sub-Saharan African Perspective*, 165–179. Cham: Springer.

Chanza, Nkosana, Mapira, Gilbert and Moyo, Tendai. 2022. "Indigenous Knowledge in Smallholder Water Management in Zimbabwe." *Sustainability* 14 (19): 12547.

Chilisa, Bagele. 2019. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Coeckelbergh, Mark. 2021. *Artificial Intelligence and Democratic Values*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corburn, Jason, and Alice Sverdlik. 2017. "Slum Upgrading and Health Equity." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 14 (4): 342.

Couldry, Nick, and Ulises A. Mejias. 2020. *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dasgupta, Partha. 2021. *The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review*. London: HM Treasury.

Debus, Amandine, Emilie Beauchamp, Justin Kamga, Astrid Verhegghen, Christiane Zébazé, and Emily R. Lines. 2025. "Evaluating Satellite Data and Deep Learning for Identifying Direct Deforestation Drivers in Cameroon." *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment* 39: 101653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsase.2025.101653

Dryzek, John S., and Jonathan Pickering. 2019. *The Politics of the Anthropocene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ebhuoma, Eromose E., and Llewellyn Leonard, eds. 2022. *Indigenous Knowledge and Climate Governance: A Sub-Saharan African Perspective*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Egonmwan, Y. I., Fabiyi, O. O., Akindele, O. S., and Aghayere, R. 2025. "Ground Biomass and Carbon Sequestration of Selected Sacred Groves in Edo State, Nigeria." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (IJAES)* 12 (3): 58–68.

European Commission. 2020. *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence: A European Approach to Excellence and Trust*.

Fioramonti, Lorenzo. 2019. *Wellbeing Economy: Success in a World Without Growth*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fischer, Harry W., Ashwini Chhatre, Apurva Duddu, Nabin Pradhan, and Arun Agrawal. 2023. "Community Forest Governance and Synergies among Carbon, Biodiversity and Livelihoods." *Nature Climate Change* 13: 1340–1347.

Floridi, Luciano. 2019. *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frey, Klaus, Ferreira R. Ramos, Alonso Paixão dos Anjos, et al. 2021. Polycentric Water Governance in the Urban Global South. In *Sustainability in Natural Resources Management and Land Planning*, 47–61. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Gray, Emma and Tsurumi, Erika. 2023. *Data Sovereignty and Indigenous Governance: Global Lessons and African Applications*. London: Routledge.

Gupta, Aarti, Ingrid Boas, and Peter Oosterveer. 2020. "Transparency in Global Sustainability Governance: To What Effect?" *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 22 (1): 84–97.

Gupta, Aarti, and Mason Michael. 2024. *Accountability in Global Environmental Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habiyaremye, Alexis. 2020. "Water Innovation in South Africa: Mapping Innovation Successes and Diffusion Constraints." *Environmental Science & Policy* 114: 217–229.

Hansen, Marisa C., et al. 2013. "Integrating Indigenous Knowledge and Scientific Data for Climate and Biodiversity Management." *Global Environmental Change* 23 (6): 1570–1581.

Hiernaux, Pierre, Didier C. L. Gerard and Fatoumata Moustapha. 2016. "Pastoralism and Drought Management in the Sahel." *Journal of Arid Environments* 132: 1–12.

Huitema, Dave, Andrew Jordan, Harro van Asselt, and James Patterson. 2019. "Polycentric Governance and Climate Change." In *Global Challenges, Governance, and Complexity: Applications and Frontiers*, edited by Victor Galaz, 124–146. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788115421.00017.

Hulme, Mike. 2023. *Climate Change Isn't Everything: Liberating Climate Politics from Alarmism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

IPBES, W. (2019). Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Summary for policy makers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany*.

Iye, Ali Moussa, and Augustin F. C. Holl. 2024. *Beyond Mimicry: The Potential of African Endogenous Governance Systems*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter

Jackson, Tim. 2017. *Prosperity Without Growth: Foundations for the Economy of Tomorrow*. London: Routledge.

Jobin, Anna, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. "The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines." *Nature Machine Intelligence* 1: 389–99.

Jordan, Andrew, Dave Huitema, M. Hildén, H. van Asselt, T. Rayner, J. Schoenefeld, and J. Tosun. 2018. *Polycentric Governance and Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, Nankyer Sarah and Amir Sa'ad. 2025. "Ethical AI in African Contexts: Data Sovereignty and Indigenous Knowledge Systems." *AUN International Conference* 3 (1).

Khor, Neil Jin Keong. 2022. *World Cities Report 2022: Envisaging the Future of Cities*. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat).

Kita, Stern Mwakalimi. 2026. "'It's Like These Scientists Own the Rains': Indigenous Knowledge, Disaster Warnings, and the Politics of Legitimacy in Malawi." *Disasters* 50 (1): e70028.

Kithiia, James 2017. "Urban Water Governance in Africa: Case Studies from Nairobi and Johannesburg." *Water Policy* 19 (S1): 47–63. https://doi.org/10.2166/wp.2017.009

Kohnert, Dirk 2024. *The impact of the industrialized nation's CO2 emissions on climate change in Sub-Saharan Africa: Case studies from South Africa, Nigeria and the DR Congo*. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-92329-4

Kokou, Kouami and colleagues. 2024. "Local Practices in Sacred Groves Management in Togo: A Comparative Study in Nawda, Ifè, and Ouatchi Lands." *European Scientific Journal* 20 (14): 40–56.

Leal Filho, Walter, et al. 2022. "Understanding Responses to Climate-Related Water Scarcity in Africa." *Science of the Total Environment* 806: 150420.

Letseka, Moeketsi. 2014. "Ubuntu and Justice as Fairness." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (9): 544–551.

Li, Wanru, Mekuanent Muluneh Finsa, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, Paul Houser, and Rupert Douglas-Bate. 2023. "Groundwater Level Prediction with Machine Learning to Support Sustainable Irrigation in Water Scarcity Regions." *Water* 15 (19): 3473. www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/15/19/3473

Majambu, Eliezer, Sylvia Kavira Muyisa, and Symphorien Ongolo. 2023. "Biodiversity Governance and Regional Insurgencies in the Democratic Republic of Congo." In *Power Dynamics in African Forests*, 156–168. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003363101-8

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2018. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maniatis, Danae, and Kathryn J. Jeffery. 2026. "Opportunities and Potential for Sustainable Development in the Congo Basin from an Environmental Sustainability Perspective." In *Resilience and Sustainability in the Congo Basin: Retracing the Past, Looking to the Future*, edited by Bila-Isia Inogwabini, Bonaventure Sonke, Lydie-Stella Koutika, and Lee JT White, 1–31. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-02023-9_23-1.

Maringa, Theo, Bawa, Emmanuel, and Kambale, Patrice. 2024. "Algorithmic Ethics and Community-Led Decision-Making in African Agroforestry." *African Journal of Environmental Technology* 15 (1): 78–95.

Marshall, Graham, and Andreas, Thiel. 2019. "Constituting Polycentric Governance." In *Governing Complexity: Analyzing and Applying Polycentricity*, edited by Andreas Thiel, William A. Blomquist, and Dustin E. Garrick, 195–255. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mbow, Cheikh, A. van Noordwijk, S. Luedeling, K. Neufeldt, P. Minang, and C. K. Kowero. 2014. "Agroforestry Solutions to Address Food Security and Climate Change Challenges in Africa." *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 6: 61–67.

Mehta, Lyla, Bill Derman, and Emmanuel Manzungu. 2017. *Flows and Practices: The Politics of Integrated Water Resources Management in Eastern and Southern Africa*. Harare: Weaver Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvh8r2qk

Metz, Thaddeus. 2017. *African Ethics: An Anthology of Comparative and Applied Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mignolo, Walter D., and Catherine E. Walsh. 2018. *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mkandawire, Thandika. 2015. "Neopatrimonialism and the Political Economy of Economic Performance in Africa: Critical Reflections." *World Politics* 67 (3): 563–612.

Moleka, Pitshou. 2025a. *Empowering Africa: Harnessing Inclusive Innovation for Sustainable Development*. Bruxelles: Peter Lang.

Moleka, Pitshou. 2025b. *The Meta-Intelligence Paradigm: Complexity, Innovationology, and the Future of Knowledge Systems*. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Social Transformations in Science*, edited by R. C. Brears and D. S. Abi Chedid, Innovation, and Education. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. *(forthcoming)*.

Moleka, Pitshou. 2025c. "Ubuntu and Sustainable Cities in Africa." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Ubuntu, Inequality and Sustainable Development*, edited by Ezra Chitando, Beatrice Okyere-Manu, Sophia Chirongoma, and Musa W. Dube, 355–370. Cham: Springer Natute Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69573-5_22

Moleka, Pitshou. 2026. "Adaptive Water Governance Under Climate Uncertainty." In *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Sustainable Resources and Ecosystem Resilience*, edited by Robert C. Brears, 1–10. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67776-3_87-1.

Muller, Benoit, Aline Chevalier, and Lars Nielsen. 2020. "AI for Participatory Environmental Governance." *Environmental Modelling and Software* 134: 104861.

Muller, Mike, Graeme Brent Simpson, Anthea van Niekerk, et al. 2020. *Artificial Intelligence for Climate Resilience in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges*. Pretoria: Water Research Commission.

Murithi, Timothy. 2017. *The African Union: Pan-Africanism, Peacebuilding and Development*. London: Routledge.

Mwalwimba, Isaac K., Mtafu Manda, and Cosmo Ngongondo. 2024. "The Role of Indigenous Knowledge in Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Chikwawa, Malawi." *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies* 16 (2): 1810.

Ndugwa, Robert Peter, and Clinton Kubondo Omusula. 2025. "Institutional Frameworks, Policies, and Land Data: Insights from Monitoring Land Governance and Tenure Security in the Context of Sustainable Development Goals in Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia." *Land* 14 (5): 960.

Norström, Anne V., C. Cvitanovic, M. F. Löf, S. West, C. Wyborn, P. Balvanera, et al. 2020. *Co-Production in Environmental Science and Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nowotny, Helga, Peter Scott, and Michael Gibbons. 2001. *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nyahunda, Louis. 2024. "Integration of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) into Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Endeavours: Milestones and Gaps in South Africa and Zimbabwe's Climate Policy Frameworks." *Climatic Change* 177: 162.

Nyamnjoh, Francis B. 2017. *Decolonising the University: New Directions*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Odora Hoppers, Catherine A. 2019. "Epistemic Plurality and Indigenous Knowledge Systems." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies* 14 (1): 7–25.

Okereke, Chukwumerije, Kennedy Mbeva, and Reuben Makomere. 2025. "Introduction to the Special Issue: The North–South Politics of Global Just Transitions." *Global Environmental Politics* 25 (4): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP.a.27.

Okunola, Olufemi H. 2025. "Beyond Institutional Silos: Rethinking Multilevel Disaster Risk Governance in Africa a Decade into the Sendai Framework Implementation." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* 16: 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-025-00412-3

Olorundami, Tokunbo. 2026. "Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Community-Led Innovations: Climate Resilience Practices in Sub-Saharan Africa." Paper Presented at the International Climate Resilience Conference, (iCARE), Munich, Germany, 26–29 October 2025.

Olsson, Per, Victor Galaz, and Wiebren J. Boonstra. 2014. "Sustainability Transformations: A Resilience Perspective." *Ecology and Society* 19 (4): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-06799-190401.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2021. *Water Governance in African Cities: Fit for the Future?* Paris: OECD Publishing. www.oecd.org/en/publications/2021/03/water-governance-in-african-cities_7280cf28.html

Östensson, Olle. 2018. "Local Content, Supply Chains, and Shared Infrastructure." In *Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development*, edited by Tony Addison and Alan Roe, 351–369. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198817369.003.0024

Ostling, Anna and Robin Craig. 2022. *Indigenous Peoples and Environmental Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, Elinor. 2017. "Polycentric Systems for Coping with Collective Action and Global Environmental Change." In *Global Justice*, edited by Christian Barry and Holly Lawford-Smith, 423–430. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315254210-18.

Pahl-Wostl, Claudia. 2007. "Transitions Towards Adaptive Management of Water Facing Climate and Global Change." *Water Resources Management* 21 (1): 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-006-9040-4

Pandey, Hari Prasad, Tek Narayan Maraseni, Armando Apan, et al. 2024. "Decoupling REDD+ Understanding of Local Stakeholders on the Onset of Materializing Carbon Credits from Forests in Nepal." *Forest Ecosystems* 11: 100239.

Pandit, Jyotsana, and Anish Kumar Sharma. 2023. "A Comprehensive Review of Climate Change's Imprint on Ecosystems." *Journal of Water and Climate Change* 24 (11): 4273–4284.

Pazola, Anna, Mohammad Shamsudduha, Jon French, Alan M. MacDonald, Tamiru Abiye, Ibrahim Baba Goni, and Richard G. Taylor 2024. "High–Resolution Long–Term Average Groundwater Recharge in Africa Estimated Using Random Forest Regression and Residual Interpolation." *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 28: 2949–2967.

Pollard, Sharon Rae, Edward Riddell, Derick R. du Toit, et al. 2023. "Toward Adaptive Water Governance: The Role of Systemic Feedbacks for Learning and Adaptation in the Eastern Transboundary Rivers of South Africa." *Ecology and Society* 28 (1): 47.

Ragragui, Hind, My Hachem Aouragh, Abdellah El-Hmaidi, Lamya Ouali, Jihane Saouita, Zineb Iallamen, Habiba Ousmana, Hajar Jaddi, and Anas El Ouali. 2024. "Mapping and Modeling Groundwater Potential Using Machine Learning, Deep Learning and Ensemble Learning Models in the Saïss Basin (Fez-Meknes reRgion, Morocco)." *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* 44: 101477. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352801X24002042

Rakotonarivo, O. Sarobidy, Mirindra Rakotoarisoa, H. Manoa Rajaonarivelo, Julia P. G. Jones, and Neal Hockley. 2023. "Resolving

Land Tenure Security Is Essential to Deliver Forest Restoration." *Communications Earth & Environment* 4: 179.

Raworth, Kate. 2017. *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. London: Random House.

Roberts, Jennafer Shae, and Laura N. Montoya. 2022. "Decolonisation, Global Data Law, and Indigenous Data Sovereignty." *arXiv preprint (cs.CY)*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.04700

Roberts, Jennafer Shae, and Laura N. Montoya. 2023. "In Consideration of Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Data Mining as a Colonial Practice." In *Proceedings of the Future Technologies Conference (FTC) 2023, Volume 2*, edited by Khaled A. A. Al-Khateeb, Amir H. Gandomi, and Aboul Ella Hassanien, 180–196. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47451-4_13.

Sánchez-Soriano, Marbella, Paola Miriam Arango-Ramírez, Elvira Iveth Pérez-López, and Iván Antonio García-Montalvo. 2024. "Inclusive Governance: Empowering Communities and Promoting Social Justice." *Frontiers in Political Science* 6: 1478126. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1478126

Sarfo Adu, Gordon K., Henry K. Kokofu, Mark A. Dadebo, Gladys Nkrumah, and David K. Galley 2022. "Management of Sacred Groves and Customary Practices in Pursuit of Sustainable Forest Management." *Journal of Environment and Ecology* 13 (1): 31–45.

Schlüter, Maja, et al. 2019. "Polycentric Governance in the Anthropocene." *Ambio* 48: 1055–1068.

Schreiner, Bruce. 2016. "Community Water Governance in the Okavango Delta, Botswana." *Water Alternatives* 9 (2): 401–422.

Scoones, Ian, Andrew Stirling, Dinesh Abrol, Joanes Atela, Lakshmi Charli-Joseph, Hallie Eakin, Adrian Ely, et al. 2020. *Transformations to Sustainability: Combining Structural, Systemic and Enabling Approaches*. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 42: 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.12.004.

Shandu, Irvin D., and Iqra Atif. 2023. "An Integration of Geospatial Modelling and Machine Learning Techniques for Mapping Groundwater Potential Zones in Nelson Mandela Bay, South Africa." *Water* 15 (19): 3447. www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/15/19/3447

Sileshi, Gudeta Weldesemayat, Jagdish Chander Dagar, Arun Jyoti Nath, et al. 2023. "Agroforestry as a Climate-Smart Agriculture: Strategic Interventions, Current Practices and Policies." In *Agroforestry for Sustainable Intensification of Agriculture in Asia and Africa*, edited by

Jagdish Chander Dagar, Arun Jyoti Nath, and Gudeta Weldesemayat Sileshi, 589–640. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Singh, Rajesh, Anita Gehlot, Shaik Vaseem Akram, Amit Kumar Thakur, Dharam Buddhi, and Prabin Kumar Das. 2022. "Forest 4.0: Digitalization of Forest Using the Internet of Things (IoT)." *Journal of King Saud University – Computer and Information Sciences* 34 (8): 5587–5601.

Sit, Muhammed, Bekir Zulfikar Demiray, Zhongrun Xiang, Gregory James Ewing, Yusuf, Sermet, and Ibrahim Demir. 2020. "A Comprehensive Review of Deep Learning Applications in Hydrology and Water Resources." *Water Science and Technology* 82 (12): 2635–2670. London: IWA Publishing. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2020.369

Sonwa, Denis J., et al. 2015. "Community-Based Forest Management in Central Africa: Lessons and Challenges." *Forests* 6 (6): 2123–2144.

Sow, Aissatou, and Mamadou Diop. 2025. "Relational Ethics for AI Governance in West African Indigenous Communities." *Ethics and Information Technology* 27 (3): 112–129.

Steffen, Will, Katherine Richardson, Johan Rockström, et al. 2015. "Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet." *Science* 347(6223): 1259855.

Tall, Arame, Jeanne Y. Coulibaly, and Moustapha Diop. 2018. "Do Climate Services Make a Difference? A Review of Evaluation Methodologies and Practices to Assess the Value of Climate Information Services for Farmers: Implications for Africa." *Climate Services* 11: 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2018.06.001

Taylor, Linnet, Luciano Floridi, and Bart van der Sloot. 2017. *Group Privacy: New Challenges of Data Technologies*. Cham: Springer.

Touré, Haoulata, Cyril D. Boateng, Solomon S. R. Gidigasu, David D. Wemegah, Vera Mensah, Jeffrey N. A. Aryee, Marian A. Osei, et al. 2024. "Review of Machine Learning Algorithms Used in Groundwater Availability Studies in Africa: Analysis of Geological and Climate Input Variables." *Discover Water* 4: 109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43832-024-00109-6

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2020. *African Adaptation Strategy and Integrated Climate Risk Management*.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2021. *State of the Environment and Policy Outlook for Africa*.

Verweijen, Judith, and Vicky Van Bockhaven. 2020. "Revisiting Colonial Legacies in Knowledge Production on Customary Authority in Central and East Africa." *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 14 (1): 1–23.

de Wasseige, Cedric, Marie Flynn, Sylvie Louppe, Patricia Hiol and Rosalie Mayaux, eds. 2014. *The Forests of the Congo Basin – State of the Forest 2013*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Zhang, Ting, Ran Zhang, Jianzhu Li, and Ping Feng. 2025. "Deep Learning of Flood Forecasting by Considering Interpretability and Physical Constraints." *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 29: 5955–5975. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-29-5955-2025

Zheng, Yanting, Jing He, Wenxiang Zhang, and Lv Aifeng. 2023. Assessing Water Security and Coupling Coordination in the Lancang–Mekong River Basin for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability* 15 (24): 16880.

Zomer, Robert J., Henry Neufeldt, Jianchu Xu, Antje Ahrends, Deborah A. Bossio, Antonio Trabucco, Meine van Noordwijk, and Mingcheng Wang. 2016. "Global Tree Cover and Biomass Carbon on Agricultural Land: The Contribution of Agroforestry to Climate-Change Mitigation." *Scientific Reports* 6: 29987.

About the Author

Pitshou Moleka
Eudoxia Research Centre

Dr. Pitshou Moleka is a scholar of governance, innovation, artificial intelligence, and sustainability. His interdisciplinary research integrates complexity science, Indigenous knowledge, Earth system governance, and innovationology to develop adaptive approaches to socio-ecological transformation, particularly within African contexts. He has authored numerous peer-reviewed publications and international research monographs.

Cambridge Elements

Earth System Governance

Frank Biermann

Utrecht University

Frank Biermann is Research Professor of Global Sustainability Governance with the Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, the Netherlands. He is the founding Chair of the Earth System Governance Project, a global transdisciplinary research network launched in 2009; and Editor-in-Chief of the new peer-reviewed journal *Earth System Governance* (Elsevier). In April 2018, he won a European Research Council Advanced Grant for a research program on the steering effects of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Aarti Gupta

Wageningen University

Aarti Gupta is Professor of Global Environmental Governance at Wageningen University, The Netherlands. She is Lead Faculty and a member of the Scientific Steering Committee of the Earth System Governance (ESG) Project and a Coordinating Lead Author of its 2018 Science and Implementation Plan. She is also principal investigator of the Dutch Research Council-funded TRANSGOV project on the Transformative Potential of Transparency in Climate Governance. She holds a PhD from Yale University in environmental studies.

Michael Mason

London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)

Michael Mason is Associate Professor in the Department of Geography and Environment at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). At LSE he is also Director of the Middle East Centre and an Associate of the Grantham Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. Alongside his academic research on environmental politics and governance, he has advised various governments and international organisations on environmental policy issues, including the European Commission, ICRC, NATO, the UK Government (FCDO), and UNDP.

About the Series

Linked with the Earth System Governance Project, this exciting new series will provide concise but authoritative studies of the governance of complex socio-ecological systems, written by world-leading scholars. Highly interdisciplinary in scope, the series will address governance processes and institutions at all levels of decision-making, from local to global, within a planetary perspective that seeks to align current institutions and governance systems with the fundamental 21st Century challenges of global environmental change and earth system transformations.

Elements in this series will present cutting edge scientific research, while also seeking to contribute innovative transformative ideas towards better governance. A key aim of the series is to present policy-relevant research that is of interest to both academics and policy-makers working on earth system governance.

More information about the Earth System Governance project can be found at:
www.earthsystemgovernance.org

Cambridge Elements

Earth System Governance

Elements in the Series

The Politics of Deep Time
Frederic Hanusch

Trade and the Environment: Drivers and Effects of Environmental Provisions in Trade Agreements
Clara Brandi and Jean-Frédéric Morin

Building Capabilities for Earth System Governance
Jochen Prantl, Ana Flávia Barros-Platiau, Cristina Yumie Aoki Inoue, Joana Castro Pereira, Thais Lemos Ribeiro and Eduardo Viola

Learning for Environmental Governance: Insights for a More Adaptive Future
Andrea K. Gerlak and Tanya Heikkila

Collaborative Ethnography of Global Environmental Governance: Concepts, Methods and Practices
Stefan C. Aykut, Max Braun and Simone Rödder

Institutionalising Multispecies Justice
Danielle Celermajer, Anthony Burke, Stefanie Fishel, Erin Fitz-Henry, Nicole Rogers, David Schlosberg and Christine Winter

Sustaining Development in Small Islands: Climate Change, Geopolitical Security, and the Permissive Liberal Order
Matthew Bishop, Rachid Bouhia, George Carter, Jack Corbett, Courtney Lindsay, Michelle Scobie and Emily Wilkinson

Transition Imaginaries: Contested Temporalities, Affective Politics, and Decolonial Technology
Benoit Dillet and Sophia Hatzisavvidou

Conservation Covenants and Easements: A Local Instrument Supporting Global Biodiversity Goals
Benjamin J. Richardson, Dominic Bilton, Afshin Akhtar-Khavari, Sarah Brugler, James A. Fitzsimons and Phillipa C. McCormack

Who Governs Deep-Sea Mining? A Battle Between Global Governance and National Governance
Lai-Ha Chan and Pak K. Lee

Planetary Health Law and Governance
Eric C. Ip

Transformative Governance for Complex Socio-Ecological Systems: Innovation, AI, and Indigenous Knowledge in Africa
Pitshou Moleka

A full series listing is available at: www.cambridge.org/EESG