

## **Concept Note**

### **Experts Roundtable in Support of Our Common Agenda, 18 February 2022**

To: **United Nations University Centre for Policy Research (UNU/CPR)**  
Dr. Adam Day  
Dr. David Passarelli  
**Executive Office, UN Secretary General (EOSG)**  
Michèle Griffin  
Claire Inder

Re: **Experts Roundtable in support of Our Common Agenda, 18 February 2022**  
***Governance Innovations to Protect and Care for Our Planet.***  
In anticipation of the High-Level Advisory Board (HLAB) on the **Global Public Goods**

From: **Right Livelihood College Bangkok**  
14 February 2022 / Hans van Willenswaard, Advisor RLC Bangkok / the views expressed in this concept note are those of the author

### Concrete proposal:

Twin meetings: one in **Bangkok** and one in **The Hague** on *The Global Commons, Ecosystem Restoration and Earth Trusteeship* (draft title); tentatively in association with the “*Vanuatu initiative*” and campaign for an Advisory Opinion (AO) of the International Court of Justice, The Hague, on *Climate Justice* by the “Pacific Islands Students Fighting Climate Change” (PISFCC). Output: opiating and positively motivating *media product*, academic publication and advisory note on governance innovation inspired by this highly symbolic campaign. **Open coalition networking** towards “*Summit of the Future*” (expected in conjunction with the 78<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly, September 2023).

### Recommendations:

Considering, that “**innovation**” is generated by the interplay of disruptive as well as constructive considerations and actions the HLAB is recommended to intimate a combination of two complementary streams of action:

- **A platform for inter-disciplinary academic research and change agents’ strategy**, translating emerging innovations into situational correctness, evidence and within realistic assessment of feasibility. Resulting in a do-able program of actions within the mandate of the HLAB and its follow-up mechanisms.
- A creative, civil society and social enterprise-driven ‘**design**’-approach to **improvisation and experiment**

### Issues for both streams:

- Anticipating various options toward **re-purposing the Trusteeship Council**. Articulating various scenarios with consequent legal and decision-making pathways.
- Improvisation, cutting cross silo's, institutes, organisations, existing paradigms and movements toward *Eco-Peace* (or similar conceptualization of a common goal). Co-creating and “staging” a virtual **“Earth Trusteeship Council”**.
- Pathways to empowering **global citizenship** grounded in the appropriate interpretations of the UN Charter, The Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR) and, more specific, the UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration 2021 – 2030, implying new forms of bio-regional governance.
- Modelling *tripartite* polycentric collaboration in a framework of “the community of life” (Earth Charter). Experiments with *tripartite* consensus building of states, business sector and civil society (public, private, civil partnerships), applied to **Food as a Commons** and models for a “new economy”. Impact assessment of future scenarios beyond GDP.

## **Governance Innovations to Protect and Care for Our Planet**

### **Introduction**

‘Our Common Agenda’ is a *pivotal* document initially marking the emergence of a hopeful collaborative perspective towards Peace, economic transformation and ecosystem restoration. The **HLAB on the Global Public Goods** offers a unique opportunity to finding unconventional solutions for core challenges. Because seen from the unusual perspective of the Global Commons and Public Goods, the creative space for paradigmatic governance innovation, becomes articulate and inviting.

‘Our Common Agenda’ proposes *A renewed social contract*

- at national level and
- a *new deal* at the global level.

This represents an enormous ambition. That is why it is realistic, as our planet’s problems are of gigantic and fundamental order.

Conventional global commons are defined as *‘beyond national jurisdiction’*.

And global public goods *‘cannot be adequately provided by any one State acting alone as they concern the welfare of humanity as a whole’*.

### **Broad application of principles *beyond national jurisdiction***

Although it may not be directly within the mandate of the future HLAB and the Experts Roundtable, the 21<sup>st</sup> century governance principles that can be formulated from the perspective of the global commons and global public goods may be applicable to all good governance: including climate governance within national jurisdiction and to goods that are delivered for, in first instance, more specific interests than those shared by humanity as a whole – however, within a totally inter-connected world. It may be proof of their quality and strength if these principles are applicable to situations both within and without national jurisdiction. Climate is within both orders.

Often new modes of good governance aiming at addressing climate governance, are described as *guardianship* or *stewardship*. This resonates with the title of the Roundtable ‘protection of our Planet’. However, protection sounds rather defensive. We opt for a complementary, albeit near synonymous and partially overlapping, proactive concept: *trusteeship*. Therefor we propose here a longer title of the Roundtable – if appropriate – including: care.

## **Trusteeship**

Trusteeship – tentatively defined as *executing ownership rights and responsibilities for the benefit of others* – is not only a legal principle of private law, codified already to a satisfactory level by the Hague Conference of Private International Law (HCCH), it is also a principle of public international law, even enshrined in the UN Charter related to one of the core UN institutes: the Trusteeship Council. There might be defining similarities between the status of pre-independent nation-states, handed into the care of the post-World War II Trusteeship Council on their way to full independence (until 1994 when its task was accomplished), and the status *'beyond national jurisdiction'* of e.g. the high oceans. The global commons, and – in a similar spirit – global public goods, wait to be ushered into an appropriate 21<sup>st</sup> century governance regime.

## **Indo-Pacific strategies**

As long as the Indo-Pacific Ocean area (including the South China Sea) – a region in which Bangkok, capital of Thailand, is central (for that reason a good 'case study' for this contribution<sup>1</sup>) – constitutes a near *legal vacuum*, nation-states and corporations tend to “map” the political landscape in terms of 'national economic interests' to be protected, 'military power to guarantee the safety of national citizens', thus 'security' rather than 'Peace'. Actors justify this by evoking the value of freedom, i.e. the freedom to extract and exploit. This leads to tensions and considerable instability. Earlier nuclear states claimed the privilege of executing atom bomb tests by appropriating “nobody’s land” for their destructive purposes, ignoring the rights of people who for generations live there. Small Island communities, at this stage, have little other legal means than positioning themselves as nation-states and claiming their protection in terms of “climate justice”.

## **Earth trusteeship**

In a more positive scenario, all stakeholders could join in a collaborative mode of good governance based on mutual care. This would evoke a state of *“Eco-Peace”* in which human actors and Nature co-exist by reciprocate support. Taking and giving, and contributing to climate stability in the benefit of humanity – including future generations – and Earth.

This is what an *Earth trusteeship regime* would aim to enable.

## **Judge Weeramantry, International Court of Justice**

Beyond 'trusteeship' shaped in service of the purposes of the UN Trusteeship Council (which not seldom led to abuse according to his first-hand observation), Judge C.G. Weeramantry (1926 – 2017), Sri Lanka, former Vice President of the International Court of Justice, revitalized and re-shaped the notion of trusteeship in the framework of his opinion on legal dilemmas, and disputes among nation-states, weighing “environment vs development”<sup>2</sup>. His reference to trusteeship, as a governance mode reconciling various specific interests (and worldviews) with *common interests* – including these of future generations – was based on the way traditional farmers and landowners in Sri Lanka succeeded in managing integration of their needs for water in an, extremely sophisticated, irrigation system that worked out in the shared benefit of all – in a long-term perspective and covering vast areas. The collaboration not only was based on the understanding of the principle of *trusteeship*, but also on the living art of *consensus building*.

---

<sup>1</sup> In terms of a “search” for contemporary universal principles applicable to all *global commons* and *public goods* a challenging cultural platform.

<sup>2</sup> *Separate Opinion of Vice-President Weeramantry*, Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary/Slovakia), International Court of Justice, 25 September 1997.

## **International customary law**

Later Weeramantry broadened the scope of his views and demonstrated that world religions (and indigenous peoples) actually share this consensus regarding trusteeship, as a principle governing the relationship humanity – Nature. He even held, as an eminent expert on international law and Judge of the International Court of Justice, that *international customary law* could establish already this foundational legal framework of responsibilities and rights towards public goods – in that order: responsibilities first.

Subsequently, thanks to the efforts of Klaus Bosselmann, Professor of Environmental Law, University of Auckland, New Zealand, and partners, 10 December 2018 – at the occasion of “70 Years Universal Declaration of Human Rights” – the Hague Principles on Earth Trusteeship were adopted, at the Peace Palace in the Hague, the Netherlands<sup>3</sup>.

## **Earth Charter, June 2000**

Delivery of a remarkable *governance innovation process* that started from UNCED in 1992 (or, arguably, from the Stockholm conference on the Human Environment in 1972) was manifested in the adoption of the *Earth Charter* and its launching at the Peace Palace in The Hague, the Netherlands, June 2000.

Drafts of the *Earth Charter* had been circulated during the *1999 Hague Appeal for Peace* attended by world leaders and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, commemorating the *First Hague Peace Conference in 1899*, laying the foundations for the UN legal system.

Earth trusteeship builds on the Earth Charter, in particular the concept of the “*community of life*” in which humanity and the Earth are united.

Other declarations and conventions followed securing specifically the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In a parallel process, the climate conferences had started, initiating negotiations in terms of physical substances, among others in the atmosphere, and related indicators for a regulatory framework, with consequent money allocations.

## **Paris Agreement 2015 and Club des Juristes**

‘Our Common Agenda’ refers repeatedly to the Paris Agreement of 2015, considered a much-needed achievement in the series of climate negotiations. However, in the margin of the Paris Agreement, the *Club des Juristes*, the French lawyers’ association, warned that “Paris 2015” was *not enough*. **A binding, global, agreement between nation-states (and stakeholders) would be needed for truly effective climate governance.** Also, movements for the recognition of Rights of Nature and ecocide as a crime against humanity emerged. France proposed a binding *Global Pact for the Environment* and this was prioritized on the agenda of the UN.

## **“Stockholm+50”**

As a result, a “political statement” is planned to be concluded at the occasion of “Stockholm+50” in June 2022. No statement will be able to hide that the Global Pact for the Environment negotiations, organized by UNEP in Nairobi, remained almost fruitless. The efforts to transfer the “soft law” of the Earth Charter into “hard law” of a binding agreement remained unsuccessful at this stage. A major obstacle in achieving consensus was the position of a number of countries who insisted they are held to a strict interpretation of “sovereignty” as conceived during the **Treaty**

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.earthtrusteeship.world/the-hague-principles-for-a-universal-declaration-on-human-responsibilities-and-earth-trusteeship/>

of Westphalia in 1648, and in a modern context enshrined in the UN Charter. Consensus in its reductionist manifestation is ruled by *veto* and/or *unanimity*. This (mis-)understanding is one of the major “spoilers” of innovation.

However, from an optimistic point of view, like promoted by civil society organization Common Home of Humanity, Portugal, and partners, an unavoidable learning process is underway. “Stockholm+50” in June 2022 will probably be a peak in this learning curve.

In particular, reflections and innovations addressing *good governance challenges induced by the Global Commons and Public Goods* may open new avenues to forging a much-needed breakthrough. As a civil society contribution to the process, **Earth trusteeship was proposed as an overarching principle for the Global Compact for the Environment**. An important step into this direction is the recent recognition by the Human Right Commission of the right to a healthy environment.

### **Discussion: sovereign people or sovereign nation-states?**

As one of the co-drafters of the Hague Principles on Earth Trusteeship, I would like to emphasize here that, given the history of trusteeship as a rather patriarchic connotation, *Earth* trusteeship, to be fruitful for innovation of effective climate governance, should be promoted not only completely in accordance with the UDHR – as the Hague Principles explicitly do – but also as a building block of a ‘basic democracy’ which *recognizes the sovereignty of the people*, rather than the power of sovereign states, even if these nation-states are legitimized by representative democracies. Earth trusteeship, this is my strong opinion, like all attempts to “innovate governance to protect and care for our planet” and “climate governance” should be grounded in **global citizenship**. After all, “climate governance” is “global governance” (or: “Earth governance”). Climate governance can only become adequate if we recognize “global citizenship”. In this line of consideration “Earth Trusteeship” could be defined as:

**“All global citizens are equal trustees of the Earth –  
for the benefit of the ‘community of life’, and future generations.”**

Acceptance and active promotion of “global citizenship” is a challenge for all nation-states, irrespective their systems or ideologies; but, in particular for authoritarian governments, whether under economic, political or religious regimes. Global citizenship – including Earth trusteeship – is not granted by nation-states, it is a “birth right”.

### **Tripartite model for climate governance: culture, law, economy**

Growing awareness, acceptance and active application of rights and responsibilities are major impulses driving *governance innovation*. They not exclusively emerge from the interface of political and economic interests, but at least in equal proportion, from cultural dynamics generating **meaning**, attributed to *human interrelationships* as well as to the *relations between humanity and Nature*. Therefor **tripartite collaboration**, in ‘Our Common Agenda’ indicated as ‘public, civic and private’ should be given philosophical and legal foundation to secure a dynamic balance of power, maybe initially shaped as *experiment(s) toward re-purposing the Trusteeship Council*. An **Earth Trusteeship Council** could function as an advisory “Second Chamber”, complementary to the General Assembly which is governed exclusively by nation-states, under strong pressure of economic interests.

The civic sector, or *civil society*, the primary bearer of *culture*, should be given equal governance agency, firmly embedded in well protected legal freedom, independent from *private* or *business*

*interests* as well as from *political, public, power*. ‘Private’ and ‘public’ mandates should be clearly defined within boundaries. Tripartite consensus-building in a “threefold” context of *inter-dependent* dynamics of **culture** (civil society / freedom), **law** (governments / justice) and **economy** (private sector / livelihoods) towards the common goal *protection of and care for Earth; health and prosperity for all* (= the “community of life”). This tripartite dynamics, embedded in a foundation of Earth trusteeship governing the global commons and public goods, within an overall framework of inter-dependence, would guarantee world Peace.

### **The “commons” movement**

The model of *tripartite* or *tri-sector governance innovation*, with an equal role of civil society interacting with the public government sector and the private business complexity, is probably what Elinor Ostrom articulated as **polycentric governance**. Nobel Prize winning economist Elinor Ostrom marked a – until today: growing – social innovation movement “reclaiming the commons”. In contrast with the *global commons “beyond sovereignty”*, seen as “nobody’s land”, commons as social organism within jurisdiction of states are extremely governance intensive. However, governance innovation emerging from the “commons movement” is not based on governance “out-there”, but on **self-organisation**. These inter-human “commons”, and the global “commons movement”, operate in a realm “**beyond Markets and States**”, as Elinor Ostrom captured it<sup>4</sup>. The recent **Routledge Handbook of Food as a Commons**, with among its editors Olivier de Schutter, former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, and Ugo Mattei, well-known Italian philosopher who emphasizes the systemic impact of the commons movement, this handbook illustrates how important the “commons movement” is for governance innovation related to *Public Goods of which food is a vital one*.

If at a conceptual level the challenges of the ‘conventional commons beyond national jurisdiction’, could be synthesized with the growing civil-society-driven “reclaiming the commons movement” – pioneering a new economy –, if these two dimensions of global (and local) governance (including climate governance) can be synthesized, a new 21<sup>st</sup> century global governance regime may appear at the horizon.

### **Ecosystem restoration and bioregional governance**

In addition to national and global levels of governance (in the “Common Agenda” refined by governance at city-, regional, inter-governmental levels) we have to recognize **ecosystems**, *including Earth as an ecosystem*, as relatively new governance modi demanding appropriate governance agency. A new term to articulate this is “bio-regions”. A “federation of bioregional micro governance bodies” is proposed<sup>5</sup>. The slight technology- and urban bias of ‘Our Common Agenda’ demands to be balanced with inclusion of **villages and rural communities**.

In this realm climate-neutral and even regenerative agriculture, agroecology, and **eco-system restoration** merge to one bio-diversity-based system (inclusive cultural diversity!), not only adapting to climate change, but re-establishing climate balance. Cities, industry, technology and infra-structure will have to, and can adapt to “*Eco-Peace governance*”.

Climate governance is conventionally mainly defined by ‘*hard science*’ mechanisms and modelling, while humanity’s relation to Earth as the carrying system of ‘the community of life’, with humanity its integral part, should be primarily defined by (cultural) **worldviews, future vision** and

---

<sup>4</sup> Ostrom, Elinor *Beyond Markets and States. Polycentric governance of complex economic systems*. American Economic Review, 100(3): 641-672, 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Wahl, Daniel Christian *Designing Regenerative Cultures*, 2016.

**ethics.** The ‘community of life’ is determined by a norm of *mutual care* between humanity and Earth.

It is thought to be essential that the results of the UNFSS Food Summit and the **UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration** (2021 – 2030) are integrated. This requires a new governance approach to land and natural resources. The appropriate governance innovation can be tentatively defined as Earth trusteeship.

New indicators “beyond GDP” (see **Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Report 2008**) should be agreed on to assess future scenarios based on new governance principles.

### **Four returns model**

Within the complexity of business transition, with B Corp as the leading example, one single *business model* should be mentioned illustrating the future interface between governance of public goods (ecosystems, landscapes) and (social) entrepreneurship. **Commonland**<sup>6</sup> is an initiator, catalyst and enabler of large-scale and long-term restoration initiatives. Its mission is to transform degraded landscapes into thriving ecosystems and communities based on sound business cases, aligned with international policies and guidelines.

Commonland is driven by a “four returns model”: **inspirational, social, natural and financial returns.**

## **1. Understanding past and current efforts at climate governance**

### **From Human Security to *Eco-Peace***

In Thailand the concept of **Human Security** drew much interest as a binding issue and common goal. Involvement of the late *Surin Pitsuwan*, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and ASEAN Secretary General (in the then UN Commission on Human Security co-chaired by Madame Ogata, Japan, and Amartya Sen, India) placed Human Security at the heart of *new Millennium* political and academic future planning. Although interest faded out since then, the recent report *New Threats to Human Security in the Anthropocene*, presented by UNDP Administrator Achim Steiner, 8 February 2022, is recommended to be taken into account by the Roundtable and future HLAB.

Among young people in Asia and Europe the concept of ***Eco-Peace*** expresses a shift from human centrality and “security” to “the community of life” (Earth Charter) of which humanity is part; and to Peace rather than security.

### **Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)**

Although **ASEAN** until now fails in dealing with the one-year crisis in Myanmar (with a long history) and growing authoritarianism in general, its position vis-à-vis dynamics around the **Indo-Pacific strategy**, the **South China Sea**, the **Mekong River** (like most rivers in Asia finding its sources at the Tibetan Plateau, China) and its history of shaping contemporary consensus building as well as an active Human Security policy, offers opportunities for *think-tank like studies* on governance of the Global Commons and Public Goods. **The Mekong River Commission based in Vientiane, Laos**, offers a lively challenge to find ways towards bio-regional governance. Close

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.commonland.com/4-returns/>

collaboration between Thailand and Bhutan also offers a window of opportunity to reflect on bio-regional governance in the **Himalayas** (the “Third Pole”). Bangkok is home to a great diversity of UN bodies as well as centres of academic excellence like the ASEAN Studies Centre, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies and the Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS) at Chulalongkorn University (CU); as well as the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) in Bangkok. Although local political support for NGOs is at a low point, Bangkok is still a regional focal point of civil society activity and social innovation.

In addition, the CU Social Research Institute (CUSRI), as well as Chiang Mai University, maintain lively connections with **indigenous peoples** in Southeast Asia in their struggle to innovate governance modes appropriate for forest management, in the spirit of the global commons rather than semi-military National Park regimes, serving the protection of bio-diversity as well as cultural diversity.

**ASEAN**, with headquarters in Jakarta, together with **New Zealand**, also offers a promising window to the **Pacific Small Island states** and their *climate justice* concerns.

## **2. The future of climate governance**

### **Regional “think-tanks”: Thailand and New Zealand**

The HLAB exercise can result in a follow-up mechanism where regional “think-tanks” feed the Secretariat in Tokyo-New York with updates on actual innovations as well as anticipation of future opportunities for dialogue on new governance concepts.

We propose **Thailand-New Zealand** as an Asia-Pacific tandem, while similar partnerships could be shaped in Latin America, Africa and Europe.

In Europe, we recommend to forge a partnership **Sweden-the Netherlands**.

An important element being that both Sweden and the Netherlands maintain longtime friendship and diplomatic relationships with Thailand.

### **Historic perspectives supporting paradigm change**

A supporting historic perspective for reflection on existing paradigms includes for Thailand and the Netherlands the active involvement of Siam, as one of the few non-western countries, in the First Hague Peace Conference, 1899, which ultimately led to the location of the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

The First Hague Peace conference 1899 is one of the foundation stones of the UN. In 2024 it will be 125 years ago that the conference was held. In addition the 400 years diplomatic relations between Thailand and the Netherlands (and the innovating role of Dutch law expert Grotius plaid towards the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648) may help to set the stage for reflection, considerations and ultimately innovation, in an appropriate, long-term time frame.

The adoption of the Hague Principles on Earth Trusteeship, 10 December 2018, in the Peace Palace, at the occasion of 70 years Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adds an inspiring, *future oriented*, dimension to this supporting historic perspective.

### **Paradigms to be reflected on**



At stake are two extremely vital paradigms determining current and future climate governance: **sovereignty** (*UN Charter*) and **property** (*Art. 17 of the UDHR*). As they are so vital, it is very controversial, but unavoidable, to place them on agendas of official dialogue.

Earth trusteeship, as tentatively understood, offers a new, “commons-inspired” foundation for both paradigms, **while respecting their ongoing importance for future global governance**.

A third factor needing decisive debate is **the centrality of GDP in governance and planning**.

Careful deliberations on these three issues: sovereignty, property and “measuring growth”, will inform governance innovation for the “conventional commons” outside, and “public goods”, as well as systemic impact of the “commons movement” *within* current national jurisdictions will co-create new *governance space* “beyond Markets and States”, addressing all dimensions of global governance. This resonates with ‘Our Common Agenda’ where it says:

“This vision recognizes that States remain central to our collective ability to meet global challenges and have unique responsibilities in the multilateral system, while also acknowledging that solutions increasingly depend on the private sector and non-state actors, who should therefore be part of the deliberations and accountable for their commitments.” (par. 106)

The central role of States in this perspective should, according to Olivier de Schutter and Tom Dedeurwaerdere<sup>7</sup>, be: **enablers of social innovations**.

### **Ecosystem Restoration and Food as a Commons**

With reference to the UN Food System Summit (UNFSS), September 2021 in New York, Thailand, and our own network included, maintains deeply grounded collaborative connections with **partners in China**. This is true for both the corporate approach to “agri-business” as well as small-scale networks as our own, emphasizing rural reconstruction<sup>8</sup> *food as a commons* rather than food as a commodity.

### **Food and Health Promotion**

In Thailand this new approach to *food systems* is subject of the Food Program of the *Thailand Health Promotion Foundation* (ThaiHealth). Food Policy Design takes into consideration reflection on the four dimensions of health as defined by WHO: *physical health, mental health, social health* and, due to special attention from Thailand (a country with near-universal health care): *spiritual health*. Food as an important factor in health promotion can be considered a balancing influence towards the tendency to expect protection in the first place from technological progress, while the long-term social risks of *over-medication* of the population (e.g. AMR = antimicrobial resistance) are under-estimated.

Food as a Commons also gradually emerges as an appropriate approach to the governance innovations regarding fisheries, both in territorial as well as in extra-territorial areas where economic interests have to be balanced out by protection of and care for the environment.

### **Private sector and technology**

---

<sup>7</sup> Olivier de Schutter and Tom Dedeurwaerdere *Social Innovation in the Service of Social and Ecological Transformation*, 2022.

<sup>8</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New\\_Rural\\_Reconstruction\\_Movement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Rural_Reconstruction_Movement)

In conclusion of this overview of aspects of past and current efforts at climate governance from the perspective of Southeast Asia and the Pacific – and the potential *pivotal position for governance innovation* of a partnership based in Thailand in collaboration with New Zealand – it should be mentioned that Thailand, in addition to a Food Program pioneer, Thailand is advanced in e.g. satellite application, energy transition to solar power and (social) entrepreneurship in communication technology and design, manifested in a proactive National Innovation Association (NIA). This may enable partnerships with technology-based public goods.

### **Fears for a “Global Government”**

One persistent obstacle for progress on climate governance is a general fear for a centralized, anonymous, particular interest-driven, authoritarian ‘global government’. Whether a critical reception is rational or irrational, governance innovators have to avoid by all means that global governance will be perceived automatically as centralized governance beyond democracy. This demands human-to-human driven communication and participation strategies, implying time and resources investments and thus constraints.

Given the complexity and sensitivity of the subject, it would be naïve to expect quick results. A long-term development path requires in-depth investment.

### **Right Livelihood**

In the framework of the UN Charter sovereignty is allocated to nation-states. **The future paradigm may be that sovereignty is an intrinsic nature of global citizenship determined by birth.** Institutions arise from interactions between nation-states representing citizens; enterprises inclusive all stakeholders; and cultural institutions based on self-organisation. **Property rights-and-responsibilities, including public, private / corporate as well as common property are situational specific but equally rooted in Earth trusteeship.** The common goal binding *new citizenship* and *trusteeship-grounded property frameworks*, is protection of and care for the community of life and the wellbeing of future generations.

This requires deepening of understanding of SDG 3 “Good Health and Wellbeing” and translating this understanding to SDG 16 and 17: Peace, justice and strong institutions as well as Partnership for the goals.

Protection and care as common goals can be realized by means of decent jobs and rewards for all, including a dynamic balance of *protectors*, *care-takers* and *change-makers*. This results in a productive state of *Right Livelihood*.

*Right Livelihood*, in the specific context of Southeast Asian culture, can be seen as an equivalent of *Buen Vivir* in Latin America and *Ubuntu* in Africa. These are culturally deep-rooted movements who, if supported in appropriate ways, can provide strength to the integrity of governance innovations.

## **Right Livelihood College global network**

<https://rightlivelihood.org/what-we-do/education/the-right-livelihood-college/campuses/>

**RLC Bangkok** – School for Wellbeing Studies and Research; Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI), Thailand

**RLC Bonn** – Center for Development Research (ZEF), University of Bonn, Germany

**RLC Córdoba** – Facultad de Psicología, National University of Córdoba, Argentina

**RLC Lund** – Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies (LUCSUS), University of Lund, Sweden

**RLC Mumbai** – Centre for Livelihoods and Social Innovation, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, India

**RLC Port Harcourt** – Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**RLC Santa Cruz** – Institute for Social Transformation, University of California Santa Cruz, USA

**RLC Valdivia** – Universidad Austral de Chile

**The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies** – Geneva, Switzerland

**Right Livelihood Centre Zurich** – University of Zurich, Switzerland

**Rights of the Child Project** – Global Campus of Human Rights, Venice, Italy

**Secretariat Right Livelihood College Bangkok** Innovation Network International, Nonthaburi, Thailand

[hans.creativespace@gmail.com](mailto:hans.creativespace@gmail.com)

<https://schoolforwellbeing.org/>

### **Project partners RLC Bangkok:**

School for Wellbeing Studies and Research

Towards Organic Asia (TOA)

CURLS (Chulalongkorn University Right Livelihood Summerschool)

ETWG (Earth Trusteeship Working Group)

### **Earth Trusteeship Working Group**

Membership:

**Alyn Ware**, New Zealand, (Right Livelihood Award 2009) – *Coordinating Right Livelihood Award Laureate*; The Peace Foundation; Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament; World Future Council

**Neshan Gunasekera**, Sri Lanka, *Working Group Co-Chair*, legacy holder **Judge C.G.**

**Weeramantry**, Sri Lanka, (RLA 2007), former Vice President, International Court of Justice, The Hague; World Future Council

**Dasho Karma Ura, Bhutan**, *Working Group Co-Chair*, President, Centre for Bhutan & GNH Studies, Thimphu, Bhutan; former Member, Constitution Drafting Committee

**Klaus Bosselmann**, New Zealand, *Academic Supervisor of the Working Group*; with **Prue Taylor**, New Zealand, University of Auckland, New Zealand Centre for Environmental Law; New Zealand Centre of Global Studies Programme (NZCGS) (**in process** of formation: Right Livelihood College campus Auckland)

**Paulo Magalhães**, Portugal, General Director, Common Home of Humanity

**Narumon Arunotai**, Thailand, Director, CU Social Research Institute (CUSRI), Chulalongkorn University (CU), Bangkok, Thailand

**Mike Hayes**, Thailand / Australia, Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies / **Global Campus of Human Rights**, Asia-Pacific branch, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

**Justin Sobion**, Trinidad & Tobago, PhD candidate, Faculty of Law, University of Auckland, *Working Group Coordinator*

**Alexander Repenning**, Germany / Switzerland, Education Manager, Right Livelihood Foundation, office Geneva, Switzerland

**Hans & Wallapa van Willenswaard**, Thailand / the Netherlands, *Founders/Advisors*, School for Wellbeing Studies and Research, Right Livelihood College, campus Bangkok Thailand