Legitimacy, Fragmentation, and the Hidden Architecture of Governance

Why Good Institutions, Good Projects, and Good Intentions Still Fail to Cohere in Living Coastal Systems

By Robert Primmer

www.restoreeden.com

Executive Reflection

One of the most persistent misunderstandings I encounter in conservation and development practice is the assumption that fragmentation is primarily a coordination problem. If actors shared information more effectively, aligned their planning calendars, pooled their monitoring data, or simply sat at the same table more often, the system would begin to cohere. This diagnosis is intuitive. It is also, in most cases, wrong.

The lived reality in places like Samaná Bay tells a different story. Fragmentation in complex coastal systems is rarely caused by ignorance or unwillingness to cooperate. It is caused by legitimacy gaps — structural misalignments between authority, trust, incentives, and lived experience that make acting in parallel safer than acting together (Ostrom, 2009; Lockwood et al., 2010). When legitimacy is weak or unevenly distributed, fragmentation is a rational survival strategy, not a failure of goodwill.

Samaná Bay does not lack institutions, laws, science, or civil society energy. What it lacks is a shared space in which authority, credibility, and economic power can be aligned without triggering the resistance, capture, or collapse that premature integration risks producing. Understanding why requires moving past organisational charts and into how legitimacy actually functions in complex adaptive systems — and why its absence shapes behaviour in ways that conventional project design rarely accounts for.

Fragmentation Is a Symptom, Not the Disease

In most coastal governance diagnostics, fragmentation is described as an unfortunate side effect of multiple actors operating simultaneously without effective coordination. Ministries work in institutional silos. NGOs run parallel projects with overlapping geographies. Donors fund separate initiatives answerable to separate accountability chains. Communities are consulted without being empowered. Enforcement operates independently of the social contract that makes rules legitimate.

In Samaná, this description is accurate, but it misidentifies the cause. Fragmentation persists not because actors fail to see the whole system, but because no single actor can afford to act as if the whole exists. Each institution operates within political, financial, legal, and reputational constraints that make system-wide action genuinely risky (Andrews, Pritchett & Woolcock, 2017). The risk is not imagined. It is structural.

From the vantage point of a civil society organisation, aligning too closely with state authority risks losing the community trust that gives the organisation its credibility and its mandate. From the vantage point of a ministry, appearing too restrictive on development risks political backlash from economic interests that carry greater weight at the national level. From the

vantage point of fishing communities, collaboration without demonstrated fairness risks marginalisation — producing outcomes that benefit others while costs are borne locally. From the vantage point of international donors, funding coordination without robust safeguards risks reputational damage when capture or misuse of funds becomes visible.

Each of these calculations is rational. Each produces behaviour — caution, parallel action, selective engagement, strategic silence — that looks from the outside like a failure to cooperate. Internally, it is adaptive risk management in a system where legitimacy is contested and the consequences of misplaced trust are real (Holling, 2001; Levin et al., 2013). Treating fragmentation as a coordination failure leads to coordination interventions that miss the underlying problem entirely.

Legitimacy Is the Hidden Currency of Governance

Legitimacy is frequently treated in conservation practice as an abstract aspiration — something desirable in principle but secondary to the concrete requirements of legal authority, institutional capacity, and financial investment. This ordering gets the architecture backwards. In complex governance systems, legitimacy determines whether rules are followed, resisted, ignored, or selectively enforced. It is the load-bearing variable that everything else depends on.

Decades of empirical research in environmental governance confirm that compliance with rules depends far less on enforcement severity than on actors' perceptions of fairness, transparency, and inclusion in rule-making (Tyler, 1990; Ostrom, 1990). When people regard rules as legitimate — procedurally fair in how they were made, substantively fair in what they require, and consistently applied regardless of who is being regulated — they comply even when enforcement capacity is weak. When legitimacy is absent, even heavy enforcement produces only short-term, surface-level compliance. Behaviour shifts when enforcement is present and reverts when it is absent. The underlying relationships between people and rules do not change.

In Samaná Bay, legitimacy is distributed unevenly across actors and scales, and this unevenness is the structural condition that shapes everything else. Long-standing civil society organisations hold high moral and social legitimacy within coastal communities — people trust them, have worked with them across years, and regard their presence as evidence that local interests are being represented. These same organisations hold little formal authority; they cannot compel compliance, issue permits, or enforce sanctions. State institutions hold legal authority across relevant domains but operate under political pressure that communities observe and factor into their trust calculations. Economic actors — particularly those connected to large-scale development and high-volume tourism — hold significant de facto

power at the national level but carry limited social legitimacy among the communities most directly affected by their decisions.

The result is a governance system in which no single actor simultaneously holds legal legitimacy (the authority to decide), social legitimacy (the trust to lead), and practical legitimacy (the demonstrated capacity to deliver outcomes that match commitments). This tripartite fragmentation of legitimacy is the core structural condition in Samaná Bay (Lockwood et al., 2010; Berkes, 2009). It is what coordination efforts run into, repeatedly, regardless of the technical quality of the coordination design.

Why Parallel Action Becomes the Rational Choice

In a system where legitimacy is fragmented, acting in parallel is often genuinely safer than acting together. This is a finding that runs counter to most conservation programme design logic, which treats joint action as inherently preferable and fragmentation as a problem to be overcome through better facilitation or stronger incentives. The evidence from complex governance systems suggests a more uncomfortable conclusion: joint action without legitimacy foundations is often more dangerous than sustained parallel action, because it creates the appearance of alignment while the structural conditions for durable agreement are absent.

Joint processes expose actors to risk in ways that parallel operation does not. They require each participant to trust that others will not exploit openness. They require confidence that existing power asymmetries will not be amplified through the process — that the actor who enters the room with more resources, more political access, and more legal authority will not use the coordination forum to consolidate advantage rather than share it. They require assurance that participation in a process cannot later be used against those who participated: that raising concerns will not be treated as opposition, that acknowledging uncertainty will not be treated as incompetence, that naming tensions will not create permanent adversarial relationships.

Where these assurances are absent or insufficiently credible, actors default to what they can control. This pattern is documented consistently across complex governance systems — fisheries co-management, forest conservation, watershed governance, urban planning (Ostrom, 2009; Cinner et al., 2012; Folke, 2006). The actors are not being obstructive. They are being rational. Coordination without legitimacy is perceived as exposure, and exposure in a system with unresolved power asymmetries carries real costs.

What I have observed in Samaná is a landscape of strong, substantive, credible initiatives that were each designed in isolation and are each maintained in isolation — not primarily because actors don't understand the value of integration, but because the conditions for safe integration have not yet been created. Coordination has been attempted. It has produced meetings, agreements in principle, and shared statements of intent that have not translated into shared action. The repeated failure of these attempts has itself become a data point that actors carry into subsequent coordination opportunities, raising the perceived risk of engagement still further.

Informal Power Is Decisive, and Ignoring It Is a Design Error

A recurring assumption in governance design is that authority gaps are the primary source of failure — that if the right institutions had the right legal powers and the right resources, governance would function. In practice, many of the most consequential forces shaping outcomes in coastal systems operate entirely outside formal governance structures, and designing as if they do not exist is not a neutral choice. It is a choice to allow those forces to operate without constraint.

In Samaná, economic power — particularly from large-scale development and tourism interests with national-level political connections — exerts significant influence over decision-making processes even when formal local institutions are not directly engaged. Environmental impact assessments are conducted, reviewed, and approved through processes that communities often learn about after consequential decisions have already been made. Concession agreements are structured at levels of government that are formally beyond the reach of the governance forums that communities participate in. Infrastructure investment decisions that will shape the bay's trajectory for decades are driven by national development priorities that have their own political logic, their own financial logic, and their own accountability chains.

Political-economy research is consistent on this point: when informal power is not acknowledged and deliberately bounded within governance design, formal governance reforms consistently struggle to gain traction (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Andrews et al., 2017). The reforms are real. The legal frameworks are sound. The institutional mandates exist. The informal power continues to shape outcomes more decisively than any of these formal structures. Local actors understand this intuitively. They may not use the language of political economy, but their behaviour reflects an accurate reading of where consequential decisions actually get made.

What I have observed repeatedly is that silence, caution, and strategic non-participation are rational responses to this structural reality, not evidence of apathy or disengagement. Actors

who raise concerns through formal channels and see those concerns overridden by decisions made elsewhere draw reasonable conclusions about the value of formal engagement. Governance design that ignores this history does not overcome it. It repeats it, with diminishing returns on trust.

The Illusion of More Participation

Participation is consistently proposed as the remedy for legitimacy gaps in environmental governance. More consultations, more workshops, more stakeholder forums, more representation on committees. The logic is understandable — if the problem is that people do not feel heard, then creating more opportunities to be heard should help. The evidence suggests a more qualified conclusion: participation is necessary for legitimacy, but the form of participation matters enormously, and participation conducted under the wrong conditions can actively deepen mistrust rather than rebuilding it.

Tokenistic or premature participation — engagement that is structured around information-sharing rather than genuine influence over outcomes, or that proceeds before power asymmetries have been acknowledged and managed — becomes extractive. It asks communities and civil society actors to invest time and credibility in processes where the substantive decisions have already been made or will be made elsewhere. When those actors recognise this pattern, and they typically do, participation becomes a performance for external audiences rather than a genuine contribution to governance design (Reed, 2008).

Research on deliberative governance is clear on what legitimacy requires from participation: participants must believe that their voice meaningfully shapes outcomes, that the process protects them from harm or retaliation, that disagreement is genuinely possible without permanent adverse consequences, and that what is agreed in the room will be honoured outside it (Kenter et al., 2016). These are demanding conditions. They are rarely created by adding more meetings to an existing process.

In Samaná, many actors have participated in consultations, diagnostics, and coordination forums across many years without observing durable changes to the governance conditions they were asked to help improve. This history is not neutral. It has produced a form of participation fatigue — a reasonable reluctance to invest in processes that have not delivered, shaped by accurate observations about where decisions actually get made and who makes them. Rebuilding participatory legitimacy in this context requires changing the conditions under which engagement occurs, not repeating the same formats at greater frequency or with more sophisticated facilitation.

Safe Spaces Before Solutions

One of the most consistent findings across institutional reform literature is that transformation rarely begins with solutions. It begins with safe spaces — arenas where actors can speak honestly about constraints, tensions, and trade-offs without fear of political, economic, or reputational consequence (Andrews et al., 2017). This finding is counterintuitive in a project culture that is oriented toward outputs and timelines. It requires investing in process conditions that do not appear in logframes and are difficult to photograph for donor reports.

In complex systems, safe spaces are rare. Most governance forums are performative, transactional, or strategically constrained by the political context in which they operate. Actors say what is safe rather than what is true. Concerns are not raised because raising them creates risk. Tensions are not acknowledged because acknowledging them disrupts the consensus that the forum is designed to produce. The result is a set of agreements that everyone has formally endorsed and that few believe will hold, because the real constraints were never surfaced.

What I have found in Samaná — and in comparable systems in other regions — is that the absence of safe spaces explains why fragmentation persists even when problems are widely and accurately understood. The diagnosis is shared. The analysis converges. But without a place to surface the fears, incentive structures, and power dynamics that make acting on the shared diagnosis difficult, alignment remains theoretical. Actors return to their parallel tracks because the safe space required to move beyond them does not yet exist.

This is why early phases of successful governance reform consistently focus on permission rather than architecture. Permission to talk honestly. Permission to disagree without consequence. Permission to acknowledge uncertainty without being treated as incompetent. Permission to name tensions without being held responsible for them. These are the preconditions for the trust that durable governance requires. They take time to create and cannot be manufactured through a facilitation technique or a workshop agenda. They emerge through consistent, visible demonstration that the process is genuinely safe — which means they depend on who convenes the space, on what authority, and with what demonstrated commitment to protecting those who participate.

The Cost of Skipping Legitimacy

When legitimacy is not addressed as a primary design variable, systems compensate later through blunt instruments: heavy-handed regulation, centralised authority, exclusion of actors perceived as obstructive, or crisis-driven intervention that bypasses the deliberative processes that voluntary compliance depends on. These responses produce visible action. They can

demonstrate measurable outputs within a project cycle. They consistently erode the trust and social capital that long-term stewardship requires.

Comparative evidence from environmental governance systems is direct on this point: compliance achieved through coercion is more expensive to maintain, more brittle under pressure, and more likely to generate organised resistance over time than compliance grounded in perceived legitimacy (Lockwood et al., 2010; OECD, 2016). The enforcement cost of low-legitimacy rules rises continuously, because the underlying relationship between communities and governance institutions is one of managed adversarialism rather than shared stewardship. Every enforcement action reinforces the adversarial frame. Every exception granted to politically connected actors confirms that the rules are not equitably applied. The system becomes progressively harder to govern, even as the formal governance apparatus expands.

Samaná Bay remains in a preventive window. Ecological thresholds in the bay's key systems — whale-watching pressure, mangrove coverage, reef condition, watershed sediment load — have not yet been irreversibly crossed. Social trust, while strained by years of inconsistent governance and unmet commitments, is not broken. Institutional capacity exists across the relevant actors. The civil society organisations that hold community trust are still actively engaged. What the system currently lacks is a legitimate pathway for acting together — a shared institutional space with the procedural fairness, power balance, and demonstrated reliability that collective action requires.

Every month spent without creating that pathway narrows the window. Port infrastructure under active construction at Puerto Duarte and the Samaná Bayport is creating path dependencies. Economic momentum is accumulating around development models that will be difficult and politically costly to redirect once they are established. The governance window that currently exists is real, but it is not permanent. The cost of skipping legitimacy is paid later, at higher price, under worse conditions.

What Samaná Is Quietly Teaching

Samaná Bay reveals a pattern that extends far beyond the Dominican Republic and far beyond coastal conservation. Fragmentation is what cooperation looks like when legitimacy is missing. It is the adaptive response of rational actors to a system in which acting together is more dangerous than acting alone. Treating it as a coordination failure leads to coordination solutions that do not address the structural condition producing the fragmentation.

The way forward in Samaná is deliberate in its sequencing and patient in its pace. Premature integration — forcing actors into joint frameworks before the legitimacy conditions for durable joint action exist — creates the appearance of progress while deepening the underlying

mistrust. Centralising authority in the name of efficiency produces compliance without legitimacy and forfeits the social capital that effective long-term stewardship depends on.

What the evidence from complex governance systems supports — and what I have come to understand through sustained engagement in Samaná — is a different logic entirely. Legitimacy must be treated as a design variable, with the same rigour and intentionality applied to technical system components. The process conditions required for legitimate governance must be built before governance architecture is installed. The safe spaces required for honest dialogue must exist before the agreements that governance depends on can be made. The sequencing is not optional. It is load-bearing.

In Samaná, the actors needed for a functioning stewardship system are present. The ecological foundations that stewardship would protect are still largely intact. The economic case for conservation-compatible governance is strong and becoming stronger as development pressure increases. What remains to be built is the relational and institutional foundation that makes collective action rational rather than risky. That foundation is legitimacy. Building it is the first task.

Closing Reflection

The difficult truth about fragmentation in complex coastal systems is this: the actors involved are often doing exactly what the system's current conditions make rational. They are protecting their mandates, their relationships, their credibility, and their capacity to continue operating in a system where trust is scarce and the consequences of misplaced confidence are real. The fragmentation is not irrational. It is a precise reflection of the legitimacy conditions that currently exist.

Samaná does not need fewer projects or more forceful coordination. It needs the patient work of building a shared institutional space where the actors who are already committed, already capable, and already locally rooted can begin acting together on terms they recognise as fair. That is a governance design challenge, not a facilitation challenge. It requires treating legitimacy as the primary variable, sequencing interventions accordingly, and resisting the pressure to move faster than the relational foundations can support.

Legitimacy is slow to build and fast to lose. In living systems under accelerating pressure, that asymmetry is the central design constraint. Working within it is the only strategy with a credible track record.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty. Crown Business.

Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2017). Building State Capability: Evidence, Analysis, Action. Oxford University Press.

Berkes, F. (2009). Evolution of co-management: Role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. Journal of Environmental Management, 90(5), 1692–1702.

Cinner, J. E., et al. (2012). Comanagement of coral reef social–ecological systems. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(14), 5219–5222.

Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. Global Environmental Change, 16(3), 253–267.

Holling, C. S. (2001). Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems. Ecosystems, 4, 390–405.

Kenter, J. O., Reed, M. S., & Fazey, I. (2016). The deliberative value formation model. Ecosystem Services, 21, 194–207.

Levin, S. A., et al. (2013). Social–ecological systems as complex adaptive systems. Ecology and Society, 18(4).

Lockwood, M., Davidson, J., Curtis, A., Stratford, E., & Griffith, R. (2010). Governance principles for natural resource management. Society & Natural Resources, 23(10), 986–1001.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). Thinking in Systems: A Primer. Chelsea Green Publishing.

OECD (2016). Coastal Zone Management and Governance. OECD Publishing.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analysing sustainability of social–ecological systems. Science, 325(5939), 419–422.

Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management. Biological Conservation, 141(10), 2417–2431.

Tyler, T. R. (1990). Why People Obey the Law. Yale University Press.

Walker, B., & Salt, D. (2006). Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World. Island Press.