



Environmental Philanthropy in Europe and Asia: Transforming Governance Models and Social Innovation Towards Inclusive Sustainable Development

Dianova Nurafifah¹ and Shobichatul Aminah²

¹ University of Indonesia

² University of Indonesia

dianova.nurafifah@ui.ac.id

Abstract. This study comparatively examines the dynamics of environmental philanthropy in five countries Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Japan, and South Korea to analyze how institutional and cultural frameworks influence the effectiveness and orientation of philanthropic practices. Using a qualitative comparative approach to secondary data from 2015 to 2023, the research focuses on five dimensions: regulatory frameworks, funding mechanisms, stakeholder collaboration, project orientation, and the sustainability of initiatives. In Germany, the Renewable Energy Sources Act (EEG) and the tax-exempt "Gemeinnützigkeit" status have channeled approximately €1.9 billion per year to R&D which is largely focused on technological innovation. In contrast, the Netherlands demonstrates flexibility through its "Green Deals" initiative, which promotes multi-stakeholder partnerships, such as the "Room for the River" flood management program. In Asia, Japan uses a culture-based approach through the Satoyama Initiative that involves more than 160 partners in 250 community-based conservation projects. Meanwhile, South Korea's digital philanthropy platforms, such as Kakao's micro-donation campaigns, have mobilized youth participation for urban restoration and climate education. The study concludes that successful environmental philanthropy requires a "hybrid governance" model that combines the institutional strengths of Europe with the participatory dynamics of Asia, which ultimately balances technological innovation with social justice and community empowerment.

Keywords: Environmental Philanthropy, Hybrid Governance, Cultural Theory.

1 Introduction

The accelerating climate crisis and widespread environmental degradation represent the defining challenges of the 21st century, requiring coordinated responses that transcend the authority of governments alone. In Europe, the severity of this crisis is visible: 81% of its natural habitats are degraded, while the 2022 heatwave caused an estimated 61,672 heat-related deaths. Moreover, economic losses from climate- and weather-related disasters in Europe have reached €738 billion from 1980 to 2023 (European Environment Agency, 2023). In Asia, challenges are equally pressing, with South Korea struggling with severe air pollution and Japan continuing to grapple with ecosystem resilience after the Fukushima disaster (Liu & Zhang, 2020).

© The Author(s) 2025

I. S. Fitritinitia et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Strategic and Global Studies 2025 (ICS GS 2025)*, Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 43,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-918-6_29

In response, environmental philanthropy has evolved from traditional charitable giving into a dynamic social movement mobilizing private capital, driving policy reform, fostering technological innovation, and empowering communities. Global climate philanthropy has nearly tripled since 2019, reaching US\$4.8 billion in 2023, although growth remains highly uneven. North America and Europe capture nearly 60% of the total funding, while low- and middle-income countries receive only about 14% (ClimateWorks Foundation, 2023; Dadzie & Viktoriia, 2023).

This inequality underscores critical questions regarding how governance structures and cultural contexts shape the equity and effectiveness of philanthropic interventions in global climate action. To address this, this study undertakes a comparative analysis of five countries: Germany, Sweden, and the Netherlands as models of Europe's institutionalized philanthropic frameworks, and Japan and South Korea as representatives of Asia's rapidly evolving, culturally rooted models (Anheier & Toepler, 2019; Barman et al., 2019). The analysis examines how institutional frameworks and cultural norms influence environmental philanthropy and explores pathways to integrate European top-down structures with Asian bottom-up practices to create a more inclusive and sustainable approach to green development.

2 Theoretical Framework

To comprehensively analyze environmental philanthropy, this paper employs several mutually reinforcing theoretical frameworks that explain how organizations and institutions adapt to external environments. Two central approaches—Institutional Isomorphism Theory and Neo-institutionalism—offer valuable insights into the dynamics of organizational change and legitimacy. When applied to philanthropy, these perspectives highlight how regulatory frameworks, cultural expectations, and professional norms shape the evolution of environmental organizations across regions. By synthesizing these frameworks, the study establishes a foundation for understanding how philanthropy operates in diverse institutional and cultural contexts while adapting to global challenges such as climate change.

Institutional Isomorphism Theory has long explained why organizations in the same sector tend to become increasingly similar over time as a result of external pressures (Lopez-Leyva & Martínez, 2024). Coercive isomorphism occurs when organizations are compelled to adopt structures and practices aligned with regulatory mandates or societal expectations. A case in point is Indonesia's *Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga* (PKK) movement, which was reshaped by state interventions such as Presidential Decree No. 28 of 1980 and Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 18 of 2018, embedding the organization into state bureaucratic systems. Mimetic isomorphism develops in conditions of uncertainty, when smaller or less established organizations imitate the practices of more reputable peers to reduce risks and enhance legitimacy. For instance, environmental NGOs often replicate proven community engagement or funding models pioneered by leading philanthropic organizations. Normative isomorphism reflects the increasing professionalization of the nonprofit

sector, where shared standards of reporting, accountability, and ethics improve transparency while simultaneously reinforcing legitimacy (Clemens, 2020; Greenwood et al., 2021). These mechanisms show that isomorphism is not merely about structural similarity, but also about achieving legitimacy within complex institutional environments.

Neo-institutionalism, developed most notably by Richard Scott (2014), deepens this analysis by emphasizing the role of three interconnected institutional pillars: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive. The regulative pillar refers to the formal rules and laws that constrain and incentivize behavior. In philanthropy, this is evident in Germany's *Gemeinnützigkeit* status and the Renewable Energy Sources Act, which institutionalize fiscal incentives to direct private funding toward environmental objectives (Kamal & Pramanik, 2022). The normative pillar highlights the power of professional norms, ethical standards, and shared values that guide philanthropic behavior. This is illustrated by the global push for standardized reporting frameworks and codes of conduct promoted by transnational philanthropic associations (Sabharwal & Berman, 2021; Barman et al., 2019). The cultural-cognitive pillar focuses on the symbolic systems, values, and taken-for-granted assumptions that shape how philanthropy is perceived and enacted. Historical traditions of community-based mutual aid in Asia, for example, continue to shape contemporary philanthropic practices, producing grassroots-oriented and participatory forms of environmental action (Liu & Zhang, 2020; Anheier & Toepler, 2019).

Recent studies further confirm that both isomorphic mechanisms and institutional pillars remain highly relevant in the global nonprofit sector. For example, institutional logics research shows how philanthropic organizations balance market-oriented practices with social accountability norms, often borrowing from both corporate governance and grassroots traditions (Meyer & Höllerer, 2019; Vyas & Vanapalli, 2022). Similarly, comparative research on Europe and Asia indicates that cultural-cognitive elements play a decisive role in shaping philanthropic engagement, explaining why European philanthropy tends to be more institutionalized and policy-oriented, while Asian philanthropy is often community-based and shaped by informal networks (Shin & Liu, 2023; Li & Xiang, 2022).

By integrating these perspectives, this study demonstrates that environmental philanthropy cannot be understood through a single theoretical lens. Instead, it is shaped by the interplay of coercive and regulative forces, the normative influence of professional standards, and the cultural-cognitive contexts that grant meaning and legitimacy to organizational practices. Together, Institutional Isomorphism Theory and Neo-institutionalism provide a comprehensive framework for examining why and how environmental philanthropy has developed along divergent paths in Europe and Asia, while also revealing common pressures that drive convergence in a globalized world. This multi-layered analysis highlights that environmental philanthropy is not only a response to ecological crises but also a dynamic field where institutions negotiate between formal regulations, social norms, and cultural traditions to maintain relevance and legitimacy in an era of manufactured risks.

3 Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative approach to examine the functioning of environmental philanthropy in Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Japan, and South Korea between 2015 and 2023. Data were collected from diverse secondary sources, including government and EU policy reports, annual reports of leading environmental foundations, peer-reviewed academic studies, and reputable media archives. The use of multiple secondary sources ensures breadth and depth, offering insights into both formal institutional structures and informal societal narratives that shape philanthropic practices (Lopez-Leyva & Martínez, 2024; He & Ma, 2021).

For the analysis, this research combines thematic coding, discourse analysis, and cross-country comparison to capture recurring patterns and contextual differences. Thematic coding allowed the identification of central issues across cases, while discourse analysis uncovered how philanthropic roles are framed in public and institutional narratives (Sabharwal & Berman, 2021). Cross-country comparison, in turn, facilitated systematic evaluation of similarities and differences between European and Asian models of environmental philanthropy, enhancing the explanatory power of the study (Yasir et al., 2020).

The evaluation was structured around five key dimensions: regulatory and policy frameworks, funding models and sources, levels of local community engagement, project orientation between technological and social priorities, and long-term sustainability of initiatives. These dimensions were selected as they capture the essential factors influencing philanthropic effectiveness and institutional adaptation (Kamal & Pramanik, 2022; Barman et al., 2019). By analyzing these areas in combination, the study develops a comprehensive framework for understanding the relationship between philanthropy, state policy, and society.

Triangulation across multiple secondary sources was applied to ensure methodological rigor and to mitigate bias, thereby enhancing the validity of the findings (Liu & Zhang, 2020). Despite these strengths, the study acknowledges two key limitations: its reliance on secondary data, which restricts access to primary stakeholder perspectives, and its narrow geographic scope focusing only on five countries. These limitations suggest that future research should expand the geographic coverage and incorporate primary methods, such as interviews or field-based ethnography, to gain richer insights into the evolving practices of environmental philanthropy (Anheier & Toepler, 2019).

A detailed analysis of the five countries reveals two distinct models of environmental philanthropy, each reflecting different institutional logics, regulatory contexts, and cultural orientations. The European model of environmental philanthropy can be described as institutionalized, governance-driven, and technology-oriented. It is characterized by mature legal frameworks and state-supported mechanisms that direct philanthropic resources into large-scale projects, particularly those related to renewable energy and climate mitigation. This approach demonstrates how coercive and regulative isomorphism operate in practice, as philanthropy adapts to governmental rules, policies, and fiscal incentives. While effective in mobilizing significant financial

resources, the European model is often critiqued for its top-down orientation, which limits grassroots participation and can create tensions with local communities.

In Germany, environmental philanthropy is strongly shaped by legal and fiscal instruments such as the Renewable Energy Sources Act (EEG) and the *Gemeinnützigkeit* (public benefit) status. The EEG has successfully encouraged large-scale investments in renewable electricity by offering feed-in tariffs, creating predictable markets and stimulating rapid technological progress. At the same time, the *Gemeinnützigkeit* status provides generous tax incentives for both individual and corporate donors, enabling the mobilization of approximately €1.9 billion annually for clean energy research and development. Despite these achievements, this philanthropic model tends to concentrate funding within industrial and research clusters, making it less effective at fostering grassroots engagement. A similar pattern can be observed in Sweden, where philanthropy is deeply connected to state policy through the 2018 Climate Act, which binds successive governments to climate targets. Although philanthropy in Sweden has involved major corporations such as IKEA, which donates up to €50 million annually, the majority of philanthropic funds remain oriented toward technological solutions, leaving grassroots and community-based initiatives underfunded. This imbalance has sometimes created friction, especially when large-scale projects disrupt traditional livelihoods, as seen in conflicts involving Indigenous Sámi communities.

The Netherlands, however, provides a slightly different variation of the European model through its Green Deals initiative, which emphasizes collaboration between government, NGOs, and private businesses. This networked approach has enabled innovative public-private partnerships and substantial resource mobilization for environmental restoration projects, such as the Room for the River flood management program, which raised up to €1.2 billion. The Dutch model further benefits from hybrid funding mechanisms, including government-issued green bonds that channel investments into renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable transportation. This hybridization demonstrates how philanthropy in the Netherlands is not only reliant on private giving but is also strongly embedded within structured public financing mechanisms, creating a more balanced model that combines state oversight with collaborative participation.

By contrast, the Asian model of environmental philanthropy is more oriented toward public participation, cultural traditions, and civic innovation. Rather than being primarily shaped by formal regulations and state incentives, philanthropy in Asia often emerges through mimetic and normative isomorphism, whereby organizations adopt socially embedded practices, drawing legitimacy from cultural values, local traditions, and collective action. This makes Asian philanthropy more inclusive and bottom-up in orientation, with stronger emphasis on community engagement, social capital, and participatory governance.

Japan illustrates this model vividly, particularly in the aftermath of the 2011 Fukushima disaster, which catalyzed a cultural shift in nonprofit and community involvement. Philanthropic efforts such as the Satoyama Initiative exemplify how environmental giving is embedded in cultural traditions of collectivism and harmony with nature. The Hotani Satoyama Project in Osaka, which seeks to restore local

ecosystems by replacing non-native bamboo forests with native tree species, demonstrates how philanthropy is integrated with community participation. The project not only restores biodiversity, including protecting the endangered Yamato salamander, but also builds social capital by involving residents, students, and volunteers in ecological restoration activities. This participatory orientation illustrates how philanthropy in Japan is conceptualized less as financial transfer and more as a socio-cultural process that fosters ownership and resilience.

South Korea provides another compelling case of the Asian model by combining strong state-led climate policies with grassroots and digitally mediated philanthropic practices. National frameworks such as the Renewable Energy 3020 Implementation Plan and the Emissions Trading Scheme provide overarching policy direction, while digital platforms like Kakao Together demonstrate how bottom-up micro-donation systems can mobilize widespread public engagement. Through gamified participation, where simple user actions such as commenting or completing online challenges trigger corporate donations, Kakao Together has successfully raised approximately ₩95.9 billion across more than 19,000 campaigns. This innovative approach not only mobilizes financial resources but also creates a participatory culture of environmental awareness, bridging the gap between state-led policy frameworks and civic activism.

Taken together, the European and Asian models illustrate contrasting yet complementary pathways in the evolution of environmental philanthropy. The European model excels in mobilizing large-scale financial and technological resources through state-institutionalized frameworks, but struggles to ensure inclusivity and grassroots legitimacy. Conversely, the Asian model emphasizes cultural traditions, civic participation, and innovative platforms, resulting in higher levels of community engagement, though often with fewer large-scale resources. These differences highlight the interplay between institutional structures, cultural values, and societal expectations, underscoring how philanthropy adapts to distinct regional contexts while facing shared global challenges of climate change and environmental sustainability.

4 Study Case

The debate over whether environmental philanthropy should prioritize technological innovation or community empowerment is a central issue. Institutional philanthropy in Europe tends to invest heavily in technological solutions, such as renewable energy and carbon capture. The argument is that radical technological advances are necessary to effectively address the climate crisis, and that philanthropy can take financial risks that governments or markets will not. However, this approach often leads to

top-down strategies that less involve the most vulnerable communities, which risks creating social friction and failure in the long term.³ This top-down approach is a direct result of

coercive pressures from government and a reliance on the regulative pillar of institutionalism. Philanthropic organizations, seeking to align with state goals and fiscal incentives, conform to these top-down agendas.

In contrast, philanthropic models in Asia such as the *Satoyama* initiative in Japan and the *Kakao Together* campaigns in South Korea show that philanthropy can be a driving force for profound behavioral and social change. Philanthropy that is driven by communities offers the perspective that expertise comes not only from scientists or engineers but also from the lived experience of communities most affected by environmental degradation. Initiatives like these focus on building social capital, inclusion, and empowerment, which are considered essential for the sustainability of environmental solutions. This approach is an example of

mimetic and normative isomorphism, where successful local models are emulated, and the professionalization of the field is driven by grassroots values (cultural-cognitive pillar).

No single approach is sufficient. European philanthropy succeeds in mobilizing capital and technology at the scale required for climate mitigation, but often overlooks participation, which can damage the legitimacy of projects. On the other hand, Asian philanthropy shows how to integrate local values and civic energy into environmental initiatives, creating a more just and sustainable development.

Table 1. Summary of Environmental Philanthropy Models: Comparative Analysis of Europe and Asia

Characteristic	Germany	Sweden	Netherlands	Japan	South Korea
Policy Framework	<i>Ge-meinnützigkeit</i> status, Renewable Energy Act (EEG)	2018 Climate Act, Individual tax credit, Carbon Tax	<i>Green Deals</i> , Government Green Bonds	Post-Fukushima NPO reform, Satoyama Initiative	<i>Renewable Energy 3020</i> , ETS, Digitalization Policy
Funding Mechanism	Strong tax incentives, large endowment donations, foundation funding	Large public-corporate funding, carbon tax, individual tax credit incentives	Government green bonds, lottery funds, collaborative funding schemes	Government grants for NPO, corporate funding, <i>crowdfunding</i>	Digital platforms (Kakao), <i>micro-donation</i> campaigns,

					government funding
Project Orientation	Highly technology-oriented: R&D in renewable energy, efficiency	Highly technology-oriented: 80% of funds for innovation, 10% for grass-roots	Flexible, public-private collaboration-oriented: infrastructure and nature restoration projects ²	Community participation-oriented: landscape conservation, local knowledge	Digital participation-oriented: online campaigns, climate education
Community Engagement Level	Limited, often <i>top-down</i>	Low, causes social friction	High, inclusive collaborative model	Very high, based on tradition and local ownership	Very high, driven by digital participation & youth activism

Source: Primary Data Processed by Author, 2025

Table 2. Application of Theories to Empirical Findings

Theory	Key Indicators	Empirical Findings (Example)	Theoretical Implications and Analysis
Institutional Isomorphism	Coercive Pressure from State	Germany's EEG and <i>Ge-meinnützigkeit</i> status mandate specific environmental actions through fiscal policy.	Philanthropic organizations conform to government regulations to receive tax benefits, leading to a top-down, technology-focused approach.

	Mimetic Behavior in Uncertainty	Japanese NPOs adopted models from successful organizations post-Fukushima crisis to address new social and environmental needs. ²	Organizations imitate perceived successful practices to reduce risk and gain legitimacy in a field with new challenges and ambiguities.
	Normative Pressure from Professionals	Professionalization of standards in philanthropy (e.g., accounting, governance) in Europe and Asia shapes organizational conduct.	Organizations adopt shared norms and standards to be perceived as legitimate and effective, moving away from informal, ad-hoc practices.
Neo-institutionalism	Regulative Pillar (Formal Rules)	Sweden's 2018 Climate Act and tax credits for individual donors directly influence philanthropic funding priorities toward national climate goals.	Formal legal and policy frameworks are a primary force dictating the direction and scope of philanthropic activity in highly coordinated economies.
	Cultural-Cognitive Pillar (Shared Beliefs)	Japan's <i>Satoyama Initiative</i> is driven by a shared cultural belief in preserving semi-natural landscapes, integrating traditional ecological knowledge.	Cultural values and beliefs provide a foundation for philanthropic action, leading to community-driven, culturally-embedded projects that would not be feasible in a purely top-down model.

Source: Primary Data Processed by Author, 2025

5 Conclusion

The comparative analysis of environmental philanthropy across Europe and Asia reveals that neither large-scale institutional funding nor grassroots engagement alone is

sufficient to achieve a just and sustainable green transition. This finding explicitly addresses the research objective by demonstrating that effective environmental philanthropy must adopt a "hybrid governance" approach that combines the institutional and technological strengths of Europe with the participatory and cultural dynamics of Asia.

The European model, shaped by coercive and regulative pressures, excels at mobilizing capital and technology under clear regulatory mandates but often leaves communities at the margins, which risks creating social friction and undermining long-term buy-in. Meanwhile, practices in Asia, influenced by

mimetic and normative isomorphism rooted in cultural-cognitive values, offer valuable lessons in integrating local values and civic energy into environmental initiatives.

Philanthropy in the future must be designed to balance high-tech investments with an equally strong commitment to community empowerment. This means creating funding mechanisms that allocate dedicated streams for community-driven projects and implementing participatory decision-making in grant schemes. By bridging

top-down policy frameworks with *bottom-up* civic engagement, nations can develop resilient philanthropic ecosystems that not only reduce emissions and advance clean technologies but also empower communities and uphold social justice in the long term.

References

1. Anheier, H.K., Toepler, S.: Comparative perspectives on philanthropy and social innovation. *Voluntas* 30(1), 1–10 (2019)
2. Anheier, H.K., Toepler, S.: Policy regimes, institutional logics, and patterns of philanthropy: Comparing Europe and Asia. *Nonprofit Policy Forum* 10(1), 1–21 (2019)
3. Barman, E., Henrique, I., Marshall, C.: The role of professionalization in philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 48(2), 440–459 (2019)
4. Barman, E., MacIndoe, H., Okten, C.: Norms and accountability in philanthropy and nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 48(4), 783–803 (2019)
5. Clemens, E.S.: Organizational fields, institutional logics, and nonprofit studies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 49(4), 738–756 (2020)
6. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T.B., Meyer, R.E.: *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. 2nd edn. SAGE, London (2021)
7. He, J., Ma, Z.: Philanthropy in the climate crisis: Emerging roles and practices. *Sustainability* 13(14), 7618 (2021)
8. Kamal, A., Pramanik, A.: Regulatory frameworks and the evolution of environmental philanthropy. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 24(6), 711–727 (2022)
9. Kamal, M.M., Pramanik, A.: Institutional pressures and adoption of sustainability practices in nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 370, 133473 (2022)
10. Li, Y., Xiang, X.: Philanthropy with Chinese characteristics: Cultural-cognitive foundations and institutional evolution. *Voluntas* 33(6), 1159–1175 (2022)
11. Liu, Y., Zhang, H.: Community-based philanthropy and environmental governance in Asia. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* 5(3), 237–254 (2020)

12. Liu, Y., Zhang, L.: Cultural-cognitive perspectives on nonprofit development in China: The role of traditions and societal values. *Voluntas* 31(6), 1259–1277 (2020)
13. Lopez-Leyva, S., Martínez, J.: Institutional isomorphism and nonprofit organizations: Reassessing legitimacy in contemporary contexts. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 34(2), 245–263 (2024)
14. Lopez-Leyva, S., Martínez, L.: Institutional isomorphism and environmental NGOs: Revisiting neo-institutional theory. *Nonprofit Policy Forum* 15(1), 25–46 (2024)
15. Meyer, R.E., Höllerer, M.A.: Meaning structures in a contested issue field: A topographic map of shareholder value in Austria. *Academy of Management Journal* 62(6), 1610–1642 (2019)
16. Sabharwal, M., Berman, E.: Public values, philanthropy, and institutional change. *Public Administration Review* 81(6), 1033–1045 (2021)
17. Sabharwal, M., Berman, E.M.: Normative institutions and nonprofit accountability: Lessons from global civil society. *Public Management Review* 23(5), 668–685 (2021)
18. Shin, H., Liu, C.: Comparing philanthropic cultures in East Asia: Institutional frameworks and cultural-cognitive drivers. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* 8(2), 144–160 (2023)
19. Vyas, S., Vanapalli, K.: Institutional logics and sustainability in nonprofit organizations: A multi-level perspective. *Sustainability* 14(18), 11426 (2022)
20. Yasir, M., Majid, A., Ahmad, M.: Cross-country comparison of nonprofit governance and sustainability. *Voluntas* 31(5), 975–990 (2020)
21. Johnson Center for Philanthropy: 11 trends in philanthropy for 2025, <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/11-trends-in-philanthropy-for-2025/>, last accessed 2025/09/24
22. Kakao Corp.: Kakao's Commitment and Responsibility (ESG Report 2020), https://www.kakaocorp.com/media/esg-resource/pdf/ESGReport2020_EN.pdf, last accessed 2025/09/24
23. Kakao Corp.: Kakao ESG Report 2024, https://www.kakaocorp.com/media/esg-resource/pdf/Kakao_ESGReport2024_EN.pdf, last accessed 2025/09/24
24. Wise Steps Consulting: 7 tantangan pembangunan pedesaan melalui pariwisata, <https://wisestepsconsulting.id/blog/7-tantangan-pembangunan-pedesaan>, last accessed 2025/09/24

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

