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Human influence on the earth system is now so large, that a new geologic epoch (the Anthropocene) has begun. We now live in a “Full World”

Business as usual is not an option

To create a sustainable and desirable Anthropocene, we need to think and act differently
Vision
How the world is
How we would like it to be

Tools & Analysis
Systems thinking and Modelling

Sustainable and Desirable Future

Implementation
Including societal therapy
Empty World View

Economy

Environment = Nature

Society

Full World View

Nature = the whole system

Environment

Society

Economy

Nature = the rest of Nature
The world is a complex, non-linear, adaptive system, with thresholds, tipping points, and surprises.
PLANETARY BOUNDARIES: THERE ARE FUNDAMENTAL ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS


We need a third movie...
We need a **third** movie...

A sustainable and desirable economy-in-society-in-the rest of nature
The Sustainable and Desirable “doughnut” (after: K. Raworth. 2012. A safe and just space for humanity: can we live within the doughnut? Oxfam International)
Integrated Questions/Goals:
• Ecologically Sustainable Scale
• Socially Fair Distribution
• Economically Efficient Allocation
TRANSFORMING OUR WORLD: THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
Overarching Goal:
A prosperous, high quality of life that is equitably shared and sustainable

---

Sustainable Scale:
Staying within planetary boundaries

Natural Capital/Ecosystem Services

---

Fair Distribution:
Protecting capabilities for flourishing

Social Capital/Community (Surveys)

---

Efficient Allocation:
Building a living economy

Net Economic Contribution (GPI 2.0)

---

167 Targets, 300+ Indicators

The relationship of the 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to the framework of ecological economics and the overarching goal of a sustainable, equitable and prosperous system. (Costanza et al. 2016. Modelling and measuring sustainable wellbeing in connection with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Ecological Economics. 130:350–355.)
"Empty World" Vision of the Economy

Property rights
- Private
- Public

Capital (Built)
- Perfect Substitutability Between Factors
- Labor
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Economic Process
- GDP
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- Cultural Norms and Policy
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Investment

Educational Improvement
- Education, Training, Research

Building
“Full World” Vision of the Whole System

Solar Energy

Complex property rights regimes

Individual  |  Common  |  Public

Natural Capital

Human Capital

Social Capital

Built Capital

Limited Substitutability Between Capital Forms

Restoration, Conservation, Education, training, research, Institutional rules, norms, etc.

Economic Production Process

Ecological services/amenities

Well Being (Individual and Community)

Consumption (based on changing, adapting preferences)

Evolving Cultural Norms and Policy

Goods and Services

Investment (decisions about, taxes community spending, education, science and technology policy, etc., based on complex property rights regimes)

Wastes

GDP

Materially closed earth system

Waste heat
Quality of Life

Opportunities to meet human needs, now and in the future (Built, Human, Social, and Natural Capital and time)

How Needs are Met

Human Needs
- Subsistence
- Reproduction
- Security
- Affection
- Understanding
- Participation
- Leisure
- Spirituality
- Creativity
- Identity
- Freedom

How Need Fulfillment is Perceived

Subjective Well-Being (happiness, utility, welfare) for individuals and/or groups

Policy

Envisioning, evolving social norms

Built Capital

Human Capital

Natural Capital

Social Capital

Ecosystem Services

Interaction

Sustainable Human Well-Being

The value of the world’s ecosystem services and natural capital

Robert Costanza, Ralph d’ Arge, Rudolf de Groot, Stephen Farber, Monica Grasso, Bruce Hannon, Karin Limburg, Shahid Naeem, Robert V. O’Neill, Jose Paruelo, Robert G. Raskin, Paul Sutton & Marjan van den Belt

For the entire biosphere, the value (most of which is outside the market) is estimated to be in the range of US$16–54 trillion ($10^{12}$) per year, with an average of US$33 trillion per year.
...we estimated the loss of eco-services from 1997 to 2011 due to land use change at $4.3–20.2$ trillion/yr.
Economic Reasons for Conserving Wild Nature

**Costs** of expanding and maintaining the current global reserve network to one covering 15% of the terrestrial biosphere and 30% of the marine biosphere

= $US 45 Billion/yr

**Benefits** (Net value* of ecosystem services from the global reserve network)

= $US 4,400-5,200 Billion/yr

*Net value is the difference between the value of services in a “wild” state and the value in the most likely human-dominated alternative

**Benefit/Cost Ratio = 100:1**

STRANDED ASSETS: DIVEST, ENGAGE OR HEDGE?
Find out how you can respond to this challenge now

CLICK HERE TO WATCH >>

WHAT WE DO

Trucost has been helping companies, investors, governments, academics and thought leaders to understand the economic consequences of natural capital dependency for over 12 years.

Our world leading data and insight enables our clients to identify natural capital dependency across companies, products, supply chains and investments; manage risk from volatile commodity prices and increasing environmental costs; and ultimately build more sustainable business models and brands.

Key to our approach is that we not only quantify natural capital dependency, we also put a price on it, helping our clients understand environmental risk in business terms.

It isn’t “all about carbon”; it’s about water; land use; waste and pollutants. It’s about which raw materials are used and where they are sourced, from energy and water to metals, minerals and agricultural products. And it’s about how those materials are extracted, processed and distributed.

How can companies benefit from a new era of sustainability metrics?
Natural value

What is Natural Value?

Ecosystems are made up of billions of living plant, animal and microbe species interacting with each other and their environment (e.g. air, water, mineral soil). They’re important to humans because they:

- Provide food, fibre and fuel (such as from biomass);
- Regulate climate and rainfall;
- Purify water, control soil erosion and regulate natural hazards;
- Provide recreation, tourism and educational services; and
- Provide the conditions for photosynthesis, nutrient and water cycling and other processes.

All companies are dependent on ecosystem services, either through their supply chains, around their operating sites or via their customers. There is a growing global recognition of the importance of natural capital to the health and wellbeing of the economy.

Part of managing natural capital involves putting an economic value on ecosystem services and the natural environment. In other words, recognising the impacts and dependencies of biodiversity and ecosystem services and accounting for them within traditional business frameworks. In light of this growing recognition, we reviewed our Environmental Agenda in 2011 and added a third pillar, Natural Value - our term for considering the value of natural capital.
“Natural capital is not a footnote in a business plan, it is a core asset on the balance sheet. That’s true for an individual business; and it is true also for the nation.”
Fair distribution is essential to quality of life.

Health and Social Problems are Worse in More Unequal Countries

Index of:
- Life expectancy
- Math & Literacy
- Infant mortality
- Homicides
- Imprisonment
- Teenage births
- Trust
- Obesity
- Mental illness – incl. drug & alcohol addiction
- Social mobility

The Rich Get Richer and Poorer Together

Income shares of the top percentile in Western countries, 1903-2004

Source: Jesper Roine and Daniel Waldenstrom
OUT OF BALANCE

A Harvard business prof and a behavioral economist recently asked more than 5,000 Americans how they thought wealth is distributed in the United States. Most thought that it’s more balanced than it actually is. Asked to choose their ideal distribution of wealth, 92% picked one that was even more equitable.

Source: Michael I. Norton, Harvard Business School; Dan Ariely, Duke University
Our Broken Economy, in One Simple Chart

By DAVID LEONHARDT
AUG. 7, 2017

The poor and middle class used to see the largest income growth.

But now, the very affluent (the 99.999th percentile) see the largest income growth.

Note: Inflation-adjusted annual average growth using income after taxes, transfers and non-cash benefits.
Life Satisfaction and Per Capita GDP around the World

Source: Deaton, 2008.
WHAT WE NEED AT THIS STAGE IS TO INCREASE OUR CONSUMPTION.
a country’s gross domestic product (GDP) measures “everything except that which makes life worthwhile”.
### A range of goals for national accounting and their corresponding frameworks, measures, and valuation methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Marketed</th>
<th>Economic Income</th>
<th>Economic Welfare</th>
<th>Human Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 + non-marketed goods and services consumption</td>
<td>value of the welfare effects of income and other factors (including distribution, household work, loss of natural capital etc.)</td>
<td>assessment of the degree to which human needs are fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-environmentally adjusted measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 + preserve essential natural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP (Gross National Product)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (Gross Domestic Product)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNP (Net National Product)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmentally adjusted measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNP* (Net National Product including non-produced assets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENNP (Environmental Net National Product)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNI (Sustainable National Income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEA (System of Environmental Economic Accounts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEA (System of Environmental Economic Accounts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Valuation Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 + Willingness to Pay Based Values (see Table 2)</td>
<td>3 + Constructed Preferences</td>
<td>4 + Consensus Building Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 + Replacement Costs, + Production Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Time to leave GDP behind

Gross domestic product is a misleading measure of national success. Countries should act now to embrace new metrics, urge Robert Costanza and colleagues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Area coverage</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Personal Consumption Expenditures weighted by income distribution, with volunteer and household work added and environmental and social costs subtracted.</td>
<td>17 countries + regions</td>
<td>1950-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Savings</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level of saving after depreciation of produced capital; investments in human capital; depletion of minerals/energy/forests; and damages from air pollutants are accounted for</td>
<td>140 countries</td>
<td>1970-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Wealth</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asset wealth including, built, human, and natural resources</td>
<td>20 countries</td>
<td>1990-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Unity Well-Being Index</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Annual survey of various aspects of well-being and quality of life</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2001-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Values Survey</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>100’s</td>
<td>Periodic (5 so far) survey of a broad range of social, environmental, and economic variables</td>
<td>73 countries</td>
<td>1981-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Annual survey in six domains: live evaluation, physical health, emotional health, healthy behavior, work environment, and basic assets</td>
<td>50 states in US</td>
<td>2008-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross National Happiness</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>In-person survey in nine domains: psychological well-being, standard of living, governance, health, education, community vitality, cultural diversity, time use, ecological diversity</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index (HDI)</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Index of GDP/person, spending on health and education, and life expectancy</td>
<td>177 countries</td>
<td>1980-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Planet Index</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HPI = subjective well being * life expectancy / ecological footprint</td>
<td>153 countries</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Index of Well-Being</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Includes community vitality, democratic engagement, education, environment, population, leisure, living standards, and time use</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1994-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Well-Being Index</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>proxies for built, human, natural and social capital with weights based on regression with subjective well-being</td>
<td>56 countries</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Better Life Index</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Includes housing, income, jobs community education, environment, civic engagement, health, life satisfaction, safety, and work-life balance</td>
<td>36 OECD countries</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being of Nations</td>
<td>Index #</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63 indicators in 20 domains weighted and ranked</td>
<td>180 countries</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How’s life?

There is more to life than the cold numbers of GDP and economic statistics – This Index allows you to compare well-being across countries, based on 11 topics the OECD has identified as essential, in the areas of material living conditions and quality of life.
Figure 2.2: Ranking of Happiness 2014-2016 (Part 1)  Top 30

1. Norway (7.537)
2. Denmark (7.522)
3. Iceland (7.504)
4. Switzerland (7.494)
5. Finland (7.469)
6. Netherlands (7.377)
7. Canada (7.316)
8. New Zealand (7.314)
9. Australia (7.284)
10. Sweden (7.284)
11. Israel (7.213)
12. Costa Rica (7.079)
13. Austria (7.006)

- Explained by: GDP per capita
- Explained by: social support
- Explained by: healthy life expectancy
- Explained by: freedom to make life choices
- Explained by: generosity
- Explained by: perceptions of corruption
- Dystopia (1.85) + residual
- 95% confidence interval

25. Mexico (6.578)
26. Singapore (6.572)
27. Malta (6.527)
28. Uruguay (6.454)
29. Guatemala (6.454)
30. Panama (6.452)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>4.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Congo (Kinshasa)</td>
<td>4.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>4.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>4.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>4.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>4.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>4.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>4.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>4.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>3.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>3.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>3.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>3.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Explained by:** GDP per capita
- **Explained by:** social support
- **Explained by:** healthy life expectancy
- **Explained by:** freedom to make life choices
- **Explained by:** generosity
- **Explained by:** perceptions of corruption
- **Dystopia (1.85) + residual**
- **95% confidence interval**
Genuine Progress Indicator (or ISEW) by Component

Additions
- Personal Consumption Expenditure
  - Income Distribution
- Personal Consumption Adjusted for Income Inequality
- Services of Household Capital
- Services Highways and Street
- Value of Household Labor
- Value of Volunteer Work
- Cost of Consumer Durables
- Loss of Leisure Time
- Cost of Commuting
- Cost of Automobile Accidents
- Cost of Crime
- Cost of Family Breakdown
- Cost of Underemployment
- Cost of Household Pollution Abatement
- Cost of Water Pollution
- Cost of Air Pollution
- Cost of Noise Pollution
- Loss of Wetlands
- Lost of Farmland
- Depletion of Nonrenewable Resources
- Long-Term Environmental Damage
- Cost of Ozone Depletion
- Loss of Forest Cover
- Net Capital Investment
- Net Foreign Lending and Borrowing

Subtractions

- Built Capital
- Human Capital
- Social Capital
- Natural Capital
United States

Source:
GPI /capita for the 17 countries for which it has been estimated

Global GPI/capita & GDP/capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Categories</th>
<th>Environmental Categories</th>
<th>Social Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Budget Expenditures</td>
<td>Services from natural capital</td>
<td>Services from human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Expenditures</td>
<td>Depletion of natural capital</td>
<td>Services from social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Investments</td>
<td>Costs of pollution</td>
<td>Social costs of economic activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Provisioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services from built capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modelling and measuring sustainable wellbeing in connection with the UN Sustainable Development Goals
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ABSTRACT

The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer a detailed dashboard of goals, targets and indicators. In this paper we investigate alternative methods to relate the SDGs to overall measures of sustainable wellbeing that can motivate and guide the process of global societal change. We describe what a Sustainable Wellbeing Index (SWI) that connects with and complements the SDG dashboard might look like. We first investigate several options for how to construct such an index and then discuss what is needed to build consensus around it. Finally, we propose linking the SDGs and our SWI with a comprehensive systems dynamics model that can track stocks and flows and make projections into the future under different policy scenarios.
CLIMATE SUMMIT

WHAT IF IT'S A BIG HOAX AND WE CREATE A BETTER WORLD FOR NOTHING?

- ENERGY INDEPENDENCE
- PRESERVE RAINFORESTS
- SUSTAINABILITY
- GREEN JOBS
- LIVABLE CITIES
- RENEWABLES
- CLEAN WATER, AIR
- HEALTHY CHILDREN
- ETC. ETC.
To create a sustainable and desirable economy-in-society-in-the rest of nature requires:

• Breaking our *addiction* to the "growth at all costs" economic paradigm, to fossil fuels, and to over-consumption

• Envisioning a more sustainable and desirable future that focuses on quality of life
Overcoming societal addictions: What can we learn from individual therapies?
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 ABSTRACT

Societies, like individuals, can get trapped in patterns of behavior called social traps or “societal addictions” that provide short-term rewards but are detrimental and unsustainable in the long run. Examples include our societal addiction to inequitable over-consumption fueled by fossil energy and a “growth at all costs” economic model. This paper explores the potential to learn from successful therapies at the individual level. In particular, Motivational Interviewing (MI) is one of the most effective therapies. It is based on engaging addicts in a positive discussion of their goals, motives, and futures. We suggest that one analogy to MI at the societal level is a modified version of scenario planning (SP) that has been extended to engage the entire community (CSP) in thinking about goals and alternative futures via public opinion surveys and forums. Both MI and CSP are about exploring alternative futures in positive, non-confrontational ways and building commitment or consensus about preferred futures. We conclude that effective therapies for societal addictions may be possible, but, as we learn from MI, they will require a rebalancing of effort away from only pointing out the dire consequences of current behavior (without denying those consequences) and toward building a shared vision of a positive future and the means to get there.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
Motivational Interviewing (MI) is one of the most effective therapies for treatment of substance addictions based on engaging addicts in a positive discussion of their goals, motives, and futures.

MI suggests that there are four basic principles that underlie successful therapies.

In a societal context, these basic MI principles can be summarized as:

1. **Engaging**: building relationships with diverse stakeholders to enable change talk
2. **Focusing**: developing shared goals among those stakeholders
3. **Evoking**: helping stakeholders identify motivations for positive change
4. **Planning**: helping stakeholders move from goals to actual change
Creating a Sustainable and Desirable Future
Insights from 45 global thought leaders

The ever-pressing challenge for the current generation of mankind is to develop a shared vision that is both desirable to the vast majority of humanity and ecologically sustainable. Creating a Sustainable and Desirable Future offers a broad, critical discussion on what such a future should or can be, with global perspectives written by some of the world’s leading thinkers, namely Wendell Berry, Van Jones, Frances Moore Lappe, Peggy Liu, Hunter Lovins and Gus Speth.
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Australia: Our Future, Your Voice

STEP 1: Read about this survey

Australia is at a cross-roads about the future we want. This is evident in the ongoing political, social, and economic debates. Should we pursue an approach to our economy which continues to focus on economic growth, continuing to pursue opportunities in the mining, energy and agriculture sectors. Should we focus more on our environment and social well-being? Should we increase or decrease the role of government. Pursue a free market economy or a more managed economy where environmental, social, as well as economic factors are balanced? Should we focus on building a more equitable and socially cohesive culture, or a focus on greater freedom of for individuals? These are important questions, however, till now, no one has asked the Australian public what they want the future to look like. Where they want the priorities to be put.

The Australia: Our Future, Your Voice survey will allow participants to rank four possible future scenarios out to 2050 based on different priorities and trade-offs. The aim of the survey is to support a national discussion on what Australians want for their future and guide government, business and community leaders and help make policy decisions consistent with achieving this future. Although there have been many earlier scenario planning studies in countries around the world, Australia will be the first country to conduct a national public opinion survey where everyone is invited to take part in choosing their preferences for alternative futures for Australia in 2050.

The survey is open to all Australians, and everyone is encouraged to participate. The survey will be available to complete online between 31st March to 22nd April and the results will be released in June 2018. This is an important opportunity for every Australian to make their voice heard in what future they want for Australia. Taking part in this survey gives you the chance to shape Australia. It’s our shared future and we need to hear your voice.

To complete the survey first review the four scenario details by clicking on A, B, C, and D. Then click on the survey button below.

STEP 2: Review scenario details

A Free Enterprise
- The market knows best
- Inequality not addressed
- Limited government

B Strong Individualism
- Everyone for themselves
- Inequality not addressed
- Small government

C Community Well-being
- We are all in it together
- Inequality addressed
- Governance at many levels

D Coordinated Action
- Government knows best
- Inequality addressed
- Strong planning and government

STEP 3: Click Here to take the Survey

This project is run by researchers at The Australian National University. For more background information, click here.
A no-growth disaster

A better low/no-growth positive economy

12 things we need to change to create a better world

1. New meanings and measures of success
12 things we need to change to create a better world

2. Limits on materials, energy, wastes, and land use
12 things we need to **change** to create a better world

3. More meaningful prices
12 things we need to change to create a better world

4. More durable, repairable products
12 things we need to change to create a better world

5. Fewer status goods
12 things we need to change to create a better world

6. More informative advertising
12 things we need to change
to create a better world

7. Better screening of technology
12 things we need to change to create a better world

8. More efficient capital stock
12 things we need to change to create a better world

9. More local, less global
12 things we need to *change* to create a better world

10 Reduced inequality
12 things we need to change to create a better world

11 Less work, more leisure
12 things we need to change to create a better world

Education for life, not just work
Vision
How the world is
How we would like it to be

Sustainable and Desirable Future

Tools & Analysis
Systems thinking and Modelling

Implementation
Including societal therapy
Purpose

ASAP was created by several members of the International Expert Working Group (IEWG), convened by the King of Bhutan with the objective of designing a New Development Paradigm (NDP), to invite wider participation by a cross-section of society and facilitate the global movement to craft a sustainable future by

1. Bringing together parties interested in redefining the relationship between humans, economic life and nature, and

2. Serving as a collective forum for information, debate and exchange.

ASAP content will represent the best of the collective knowledge of its contributors, and will be disseminated in multiple fora and in various formats, for multiple audiences.

All submissions will be accepted provided they fulfill the General Guidelines, and ASAP’s steering committee, initially drawn from the IEWG, will evaluate and select submissions that add real value to the best practice information already on hand. Moderated debate will allow a productive exchange of views.
Online and Print; Hybrid peer-reviewed academic journal and popular magazine; Uses a more participatory and transdisciplinary review process; Focuses on seriously creative dialog to solve complex problems in an integrated way

Editors-in-Chief: Robert Costanza, Ida Kubiszewski, Lorenzo Fioramonti

Associate Editors: Jacqueline McGlade, David Orr

Thank You

Papers mentioned in this presentation can be downloaded from:

www.robertcostanza.com
1. Integrated, Dynamic Analysis and Modelling of Socio-Ecological Systems:
   How do we better understand, model, value and manage our complex, interdependent systems of humans and the rest of nature over multiple space and time scales?
   • the dynamics and spatial patterns of natural capital assets, ecosystem services, and ecosystem health in terrestrial and marine systems.
   • social and cultural capital (rules, norms, markets, institutions, etc.) and the complex interconnections and dynamics among the parts of the system.

2. Measuring Well-Being:
   How do we measure human and environmental well-being in a more integrated way, including built, human, social and natural capital assets and their interactions and services?
   • integrating knowledge from human psychology, economics, ecology, sociology, and other fields.
   • moving well beyond GDP as a measure of progress
   • build on the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals process.

3. The Future We Want:
   How do we engage the full range of stakeholders in envisioning and designing more sustainable and desirable futures?
   • behavioral economics experiments, stakeholder workshops, scenario planning exercises with subsequent public opinion surveys, integrated games, and other approaches.