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Abstract

G7 nations have a significant opportunity to strengthen the social contract between their governments and citizens, reconciling their economies and societies in ways that foster greater social cohesion. Equipping citizens with the participatory tools to navigate through future periods of uncertainty – including the next set of economic and environmental transformations – should be a priority for G7 governments as they continue to strive towards open societies, democratic freedoms, and enhanced political participation. Achieving such objectives will require three actions. First, G7 governments must replace the inadequate social safety nets of the past with new robust and resilient welfare systems, tailored to the needs of economies and societies in the 21st century. We call these systems ‘Universal Social Protections’. Second, G7 countries must leverage the potential of digital democracy, recognising that data is a new form of capital which will be critical to the running of our economies and societies in the future. Redirecting the flow of benefits from the digital transition into the hands of citizens themselves is essential if we are to rebuilding trust and social cohesion throughout G7 and G20 countries, and the wider world. Third, G7 countries need to redefine prosperity to encompass social and environmental flourishing, and develop new metrics to measure progress against these goals.

Our recommendations in this Issue Paper thus reflect a ‘New Multilateralism’ for the 21st Century: the belief that many of the challenges facing us today are inherently global in nature, requiring collective participation and co-operation. This expanded notion of social cohesion will only be achieved through a series of interlocking actions and policies linking social resilience to economic transformation, digital citizenship and multilateral decision procedures. This will require new institutions and new forms of collaboration with citizens themselves.
Challenge

Social Cohesion, Economic Transformation and Open Societies

In light of the vanishing peace dividend and the partial unravelling of globalisation, as evidenced both by the COVID-19 pandemic and the invasion of Ukraine, we stand at a crossroads, facing starkly divergent pathways into the future. On the one hand, there is the prospect of a toxic Anthropocene, marked by deglobalisation, environmental collapse, the unravelling of global collective action, a retreat into nationalist politics, and the rising threat of large-scale conflict, including of a nuclear kind. On the other, there is the possibility that current crises will mobilise transnational efforts to develop collective social and economic capacities in the G7 and beyond to deliver climate action, increased aid for refugees, enhanced social protection and improved pandemic preparedness.

The invasion of Ukraine, like the COVID-19 pandemic, has highlighted the interconnected nature of the world we inhabit and the importance of multilateral co-operation. It is widely recognised, too, that the countries of the world have no alternative but to co-operate if they are to address the imminent global threats of zoonotic disease and climate change, and the pending global threats of biodiversity loss, financial instability, antimicrobial resistance, water and food insecurity, and digital manipulation. This puts centre stage for the G7, and the wider community of the G20, the question of how to develop a New Multilateralism appropriate for the times we live in, embedded in a set of policies and purposes that enhance the well-being of individuals, create thriving communities and a sustainable natural world.

A New Multilateralism will recognize both the worth and rights of individuals and nations, as well as their obligations to the common good. It will recognise the need to address collective challenges collaboratively and the pursuit of norms, values and institutions aimed at enhancing the ability of individuals, communities and nations to weather future social, economic and political challenges. It will be a multilateral spirit that recognises both our individual and our collective needs – a multilateral spirit that acknowledges that human well-being arises not just from access to resources and not just from the exercise of individual agency, but from a sense of belonging in a multiplicity of social groups. Our sense of meaning in life arises not just from our sense of individual achievement, but from our sense of place in a social ecosystem.1

The principles of a New Multilateralism may be well-known, but our current challenge is to apply them globally with respect to global problems, such as climate change. In short, these principles may be summarized as follows:

1. **Social cohesion**: Develop a sense of shared identity and purpose extending from the level of family and friends right up to a sense of belonging to the economy, humankind, and the natural world. As we already feel loyalty to millions of strangers who happen to be citizens of our nation, it should be possible to feel such loyalty to humanity and all living things with respect to global challenges. Nationalisms are helpful when dealing with national challenges (such as education), but these nationalisms must not get in the way of cosmopolitanism in the service of environmental sustainability, pandemic preparedness, and other global challenges.
(2) **Economic transformation**: Develop multilateral decision-making procedures to ensure that all countries affected by collective action are involved in decision-making processes. The outcomes of collective action must be measured and reported via metrics that move beyond GDP, accounting for social and environmental value, as well as the value of goods and services. Without moving beyond GDP, it will be difficult (near impossible) to assess the true value of climate action, pandemic preparedness, peace and shared prosperity. A reorientation of measurement and reporting will lead to better assessments of well-being and quality of life. Such measurements need to be developed in ways that take account of the diversity of communities and regions within countries, and to be part of broader efforts to build trust with citizens and residents through enhanced participation in processes of transformation.²

(3) **Multilateral decision procedures**: Once countries have entered into the decision-making process, their representatives must bear full responsibility for adhering to the rules that they co-created. National activities must be monitored, so that previously agreed sanctions for violations and rewards for compliance can be imposed. These sanctions and rewards are not to be the discretionary measures in response to a major violation of international law, but rather components of a well-functioning multilateral system for addressing global problems. In cases of disagreement, fast and fair conflict resolution mechanisms must be in place.

(4) **Open societies**: Most importantly, build responsibility for tackling global problems through nested tiers of governance, in which local, regional, national and multilateral agreements constitute a consistent system of policy-making, designed to promote the requisite degree of co-operation.³ According to these nested tiers of governance, sovereignty must not reside exclusively in the individual or the state, but should be distributed across different levels of collectivity corresponding to the collective challenges we face. Giving digital users control over data about themselves, individually and collectively, would be an essential step towards establishing nested tiers of governance in the world of data. Likewise, effective climate action calls for joint efforts at national and local levels, as well as the global level. We are capable of establishing a shared sense of identity and purpose at multiple levels, as we know from the many affiliations – family to nation etc. – that pervade our lives.

It is sufficient for a significant number of countries (rather than all countries) to adopt the principles of the New Multilateralism, much as they have done in the response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Just as the abolition of slavery spread from some countries to others, the resulting benefits could influence norms and stimulate imitation elsewhere. For example, experimentation and leadership are key components.

The evolutionary success of the human race is due largely to our capacities for co-operation in ever larger numbers. Admittedly, there have been grave setbacks – world wars, brutal dictatorships and much unnecessary suffering. In the present stage of human history, where the nuclear, climate and cyber threats are extreme, we cannot afford another grave setback.
It is not difficult for the citizens of the world to recognise the immense dangers of pursuing self-interest in the face of global problems. The time has come to respond to the need to create peace and sustainable prosperity in our fragile, beautiful, precious world.

**Proposals**

**Universal Social Protection**

Universal access to basic services for health and education has underpinned prosperity in G7 countries. Public services now need to be expanded for the 21st century, with protections that enhance people’s capacities, capabilities, and opportunities for economic and social participation, as well as, also supporting the climate and energy transitions and leveraging the full potential of digital democracy.⁴

- **G7 countries should commit to providing universal access to transport and digital services as part of the first steps in instituting a comprehensive set of protection services** that together enhance productivity, increase social cohesion, and safeguard citizens through the global energy transition.⁵ A new basket of public goods, expanded for the challenges of the 21st century, is needed.

- Conditionality should be eliminated or reduced, so that all tax paying contributors are also protected. This model of universal entitlement is necessary to establish the reciprocity required for the expansion of social protections.⁶

- Governments should add access to care, transport, food, and digital services to the 20th century basket of education, health, housing and legal services.⁷

- **G7 nations can lead and set an example for G20 nations by establishing universal access to seven basic social protections as automatic and reciprocal entitlements of citizenship:** shelter, food, education, health & care, transport, information, and legal services.⁸ These protections will not be needed or used by all citizens, but the assurance that they are accessible, in the event of need, will help to establish greater social cohesion.

With fiscal capacity depleted after the pandemic, the need to invest in an accelerated global energy transition whilst funding an expanded adult social care system as society ages will create competing demands on budgets in the coming decade. With levels of political mistrust and economic inequality growing, success on all fronts will require much stronger social cohesion. Both the access to the protections and the breadth of protections provided need to be widened⁹.

The **Social Cohesion, Economic Transformation and Open Societies** task force examined solutions to this difficult task. How can G7 countries meet all their obligations and prioritise the strengthening of their social cohesion in the current context? What role can the G7 play in setting out new pathways for prosperity for G7 countries, the G20 and beyond?
To sustain their economies, **advanced societies will need to establish a much broader social safety net**, as the platform through which productive potential can grow.

The accelerated global energy transition is forcing real-time cost recognition in G7 countries. That, in turn, forces an increase in the realised cost of living for their populations. The emergency response to the COVID-19 pandemic have absorbed much of any spare fiscal capacity, and exposed budgets to rises in interest rates on elevated levels of debt. This results in a combination of an urgent need to invest in adaptation and transition, at a time of reduced fiscal capacity, and in the face of rising insecurity caused by cost of living increases.

The immediate risk is that G7 countries will prioritise short term political demands to address the cost of living, and in so doing sacrifice their ability to make long term investments that will be necessary to control the cost of living in the future.

A foundational re-arrangement of advanced society economics is needed. The core economic performance of advanced societies can be sustained, but only with increased productivity from a much broader portion of their populations. The days of “trickle down” economics — elevation of the many by the outperformance of a few — is not possible now that exploitation of global commons and financialisation escape routes are blocked.

**Only a system of social protection which leverages fiscal action to enjoin social effort can be "affordable".**

There is not enough money in the world to financially compensate everyone for the coming adjustments. To make the available level of fiscal action effective to transition to the new, productivity maximising system, it must solicit social effort by empowering and giving agency to citizens. The highest ambition should be to move early and transition rapidly.

The affordability of transitions on different fronts should not be underestimated as it is enhanced by the economies of scope that connect the production of the various public goods. The cost of producing each global public good cover also part of the cost of obtaining other global goods. Decreasing the inequality in education, for instance, automatically increases disease prevention and therefore global health; pursuing global health, in turn, is a crucial contribution to social justice and equality. Investing resources in the production of a public good has a multiplicative effect on collective welfare as it tends to enhance the availability of other public goods.

**G7 countries will need to better align their tax systems with social protections to create the reciprocity necessary to support stronger social cohesion.**

A **combination of tax simplification and direct assignment of revenues from private taxes to universal protections**, creates a sustainable fiscal structure that enables stronger cohesion. Recent work has shown that it is possible for a G7 country to fund higher levels of universal social protection, and Net Zero commitments, without increasing the burden on ordinary workers, thereby providing a progressive policy tool to facilitate transition. When the revenues from increased taxes are assigned to universal basic service protections, they more than offset the lost income for the lower four fifths of the income distribution with an offsetting impact up to the 86th income percentile and provide a ‘social wage’ instead.
The cost of living pressures will be politically irresistible. The initial response will be to compensate in the immediate term, unless an alternative strategy is adopted. The narrow fiscal capacity will incentivise reductions in adaptation investments to pay for compensation, resulting in steeper cost increases in the future. Eventually, the incoherence between the compensation and the financial construct will be unreconcilable. This will be a moment of great political danger. The earlier a society, and its political system, see this impending crisis, and the faster they transition, the less disruptive the process will be.

Essentially, the adaptation is a reversion to the recognition of interdependence. No person has ever been an island. We evolved in community. Context, connection, and co-operation is our natural, and only real, state. We need to recognise that social value drives economic value, and not the other way around.

A post-transition state is, at once, eminently recognisable, and radically different. Recognisable because much of the existing structure remains in place: currencies, commodities, businesses, jobs, physical and social infrastructure services, transport, sewage treatment, trade, and a myriad other features of modern living remain. Radically different in premise: universally interdependent. The importance of the value contributed by every citizen, recognised as essential to the maintenance of the whole society. Every contribution understood as the marginal difference between sustainability and collapse. Every effort made by each individual as essential to maintaining the fiscal balance of social and private resources — a balance that allows opportunity to fill its equally vital role, alongside safety, because space is left for it.

In such a world, conditions are the essential foundation. Conditions which maximise the contributory and productive capacities and capabilities of every individual. This is “supply side” in the parlance of liberal economics, or “prosperity” in the language of social science. The establishment and maintenance of those conditions becomes the essential endeavour of society. The sum of those conditions is encapsulated in the concept of universal basic safety. A reconceptualisation of social protection from a defensive and compensatory mechanism, to a proactive foundation. This will require new frameworks and new measures, moving away from GDP and aggregate figures towards finer grained, real time, citizen-led metrics that link policy actions more directly to improved living conditions and quality of life.15

A more universal system of protections, with broader eligibility and more comprehensive coverage.16 A system that realises the synergies between protections, and leverages each to support the other. All of the conditions necessary to enable productivity and contribution, seen as a single and coherent set of conditions. Shelter, sustenance, transport and information held in equal regard to health, care, education and democracy.

Social protection needs an upgrade to reflect 21st century realities. Local public transport must become the alternative to private car ownership. Digital technologies, and data in particular, are vital to a 21st-century conception of the essential conditions for economic, environmental, and governance transitions. Data citizenship forms a critical part of the universal basket of public goods that underpin a transformed, peaceful, productive, and sustainable future society.17

This new basket of public goods must be tied to locally defined prosperity indices, pathways and plans that link environmental regeneration to improved livelihood opportunities.18 A rejuvenated localism will allow
direct engagement of residents or citizens in local sustainability and its foundation in social solidarity for shared prosperity and purpose.

A peaceful transition to a sustainable society, in the timeframe dictated by the Holocene’s boundaries, requires proactive adaptation to start now. The first step on that path is the transformation of social protection from compensatory welfare to universal basic services. That step is available, affordable, achievable, and directly aligned with the needed transformations of energy systems, global commons protection, balanced global economic relations, and the political imperative to provide secure livelihoods and a brighter future for ordinary people everywhere.

The future belongs to those societies that grasp the opportunity to maximise the productivity and innovation capacities and capabilities of the broadest swaths of their populations. Universal social protection, through expanded universal, basic, collectively provided, services, funded by equitable and modern tax systems, is the path to that future.19

We consider how the G7 nations can start their transition to universal social protection now, through the urgent expansion of universally accessible services designed to drive down the costs of living in an ordinary 21st century life, support livelihoods, and develop community and local resilience.

Empowering Digital Governance and Digital Citizenship

The maintenance of social cohesion in open societies calls for a new system of digital governance. In the aftermath of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the need for such a system has become more urgent than ever before. The present digital governance regimes are driven primarily by the digital service providers and digital information aggregators. Open societies require a governance system that gives digital citizens control, individually and collectively, of the data about themselves.20

However, this is only the first step in the changes needed to drive new forms of digital citizenship suitable for the 21st century. Open, trustworthy data ecosystems need to be built to facilitate the forms of social innovation which will drive new forms of productivity, value creation and markets.21 The UN SDGs cannot be achieved in any society in the world without further social, environmental and economic progress. The G7, in concert with the G20, needs to propel a new agenda for innovation based on using collaboration between data holders and users to tackle social, environmental and economic challenges, and to improve the capacities and capabilities of all citizens. In the 21st century, data is a new infrastructural form that is crucial both to future governance, and to social and environmental sustainability, and economic resilience.

A number of preliminary, but immediate steps are needed, including improving data flows between people, devices, organisations, businesses, intermediaries and countries in ways that bring stakeholders together to solve social, environmental and economic problems.22 This will require multilateral co-operation and new regulation, as well as a revision in our understanding of how data creates value and for whom.23

User consent for what is effectively ubiquitous commercial surveillance is inadequate, given power and information asymmetries between individuals and dominant technology platforms, and the paucity of service
available to those who ‘opt out’ means it is not a viable option for most. **Data protection as currently defined and enforced is unable to secure user control of data, or freedom from commercial and even political and social manipulation.**

The current market structure under-values the personal data that users must supply in order to receive most digital services, making individual control of personal data impossible. Personal data is vulnerable to cybersecurity threats, particularly those directed at the opaque networks of third parties with no relationship to the individuals whose data they exploit.

Although the digital revolution has unleashed a tidal wave of new opportunities, there is a **misalignment of interests between the users of digital services (on the one hand) and the digital service providers and the third-party funders of digital services (on the other).** An important feature of current digital governance systems is “third-party funded digital barter”: consumers of digital services get many digital services for free (or under-priced) and in return have personal information about themselves collected for free. In addition, the digital consumers receive advertising and other forms of influence from the third parties that fund the digital services.

The control of the planetary-scale advertising platforms that fund many Internet services is based around large quantities of personal data, much of it collected by data brokers with whom the consumer has no contractual or other relationship, which may be used to manipulate users’ preferences to influence purchasing, voting, and many other behaviours.

The misalignment between the digital consumers and the digital third-party funders is responsible for a wide variety of malfunctions, which ultimately threaten the continued functioning of our economic market systems; diminish the tax base; weaken mental health, expose users to far-ranging manipulation of attention, thought, feeling and behaviour; erode appreciation for objective notions of truth, undermine our democratic processes; and degrade the cohesion of our societies.

The benefits from the digital revolution are not immutably tied to the current digital governance regimes. The central challenge of digital governance regimes lies in finding ways of making these regimes humanistic without sacrificing the technological benefits.

**The current systemic weaknesses can be addressed by adjusting how we classify and treat data relating to people into three types:**

- **O-Data** – “official data” such as name and date of birth, requires authentication by the state or legally accepted sources for specified legal transactions.

- **P-Data** – “privy data” related to people, but which is not collective and does not require authentication. There are two kinds; “first-party P-Data” volunteered or generated by people (e.g. photos or location data from phones). “Second-party P-Data” is generated or inferred by others from existing data, e.g. profiles of people.

- **C-Data** – “collective data” which people agree to share within a well-defined group, for collective purposes that can be defined by voluntary agreements or through law.
On this basis, we propose the following four policy guidelines²⁹

- **Proposals 1: Control over O-Data**
  - Proposal 1a: O-Data must receive official (Generally Trusted Source) authentication, and this is to be the only legal source of this data.
  - Proposal 1b: Give individuals genuine control over use of their O-Data through easy-to-use technical tools and supporting institutions.

- **Proposals 2: Control over P-Data**
  - Proposal 2a: The data subject is to be the only legal source of first-party P-Data.
  - Proposal 2b: Give individuals genuine control over use of their first-party P-Data, through the aforementioned technical tools and supporting institutions.
  - Proposal 2c: Use second-party P-Data exclusively in the interests of the data subjects.

- **Proposals 3: Control over C-Data**
  - Proposal 3a: Create legal structures to support the establishment of ‘data commons’ for C-Data.
  - Proposal 3b: Ensure that C-Data are under the control of effective, trustworthy and competitive organisations that promote the benefits of data subjects and the broader society.
  - Proposal 3c: Ensure that the data commons are permitted to use data only for specified purposes and that its use, like that of P-Data, be transparent and accountable.

- **Proposals 4: Addressing Digital Power Asymmetries**
  - Proposal 4a: Provide effective rights of association for digital users.
  - Proposal 4b: Provide effective legal protection for vulnerable digital users.
  - Proposal 4c: Ensure that competition in the online world is analogous to that in the offline world.
  - Proposal 4d: Provide Generally Accepted Accounting Principles-like (GAAP-like) oversight to data traffickers with regard to protecting the data they hold.

**New Prosperity Measures**

The achievement of the above objectives – fostering social cohesion, equipping citizens to navigate through the next set of economic transformations and building open societies that enable democratic freedoms, enhanced participation and the voices of people to be heard – will require consistent measures of well-being.³⁰

Current measures of prosperity, namely the use of aggregate statistics such as GDP, economic growth and wealth are inherently top-down metrics that have failed to deliver secure livelihoods for all, exacerbated inequalities, increased social and economic exclusion leading to devastating impacts on biodiversity, climate change and ecosystems.
These outdated measures of prosperity are heavily based on the theory of “trickle-down” in the field of mainstream economics which has assumed growth would translate in the shape of higher wages, better job opportunities, improved public services and living standards. There is a widely acknowledged dissatisfaction with GDP as a measure of prosperity – as it fails to provide information on neither distribution nor environmental impacts. There is a growing number of metrics that seek to go beyond GDP which use different baskets of aggregate statistics.32

Centralised, top-down measures and approaches to prosperity inhibits the ability of communities to meaningfully participate fully in their society and economy, and instead compounds their experience of economic and social inequality with a growing sense of exclusion and discontent, limiting social solidarity and cohesion. Consequently, a new approach to our societies and economies is required, a new paradigm and framework for understanding the meanings of prosperity for the 21st century.

Many of the prominent challenges of the twenty-first century, including the current dissatisfaction of population groups who feel left behind by globalisation and technological advance, may be viewed in terms of a “decoupling” of economic prosperity from social prosperity. Two new indexes of well-being – solidarity (S) and agency (A) – need to be considered alongside the standard indexes of material gain (G) and environmental sustainability (E).33 The four indexes – SAGE – form a balanced dashboard for evaluating well-being, which is meant to provide an empirical basis for mobilising action in government, business and civil society to promote a recoupling of economic and social prosperity.34 This new framework can also be useful to analyse and evaluate the performance of different countries in their response in dealing with the current COVID-19 crisis. Compliance with containment measures, which is vital for combatting a global pandemic, will be high and relatively easy to implement if governments make sure that fundamental human needs are satisfied, in particular if solidarity within and between groups is high, and individuals are empowered and ready to help one another.

Independent reporting bodies and authorities should also seek to complement existing GDP and economic growth data with a basket of 10 headline statistics that reports on factors encompassing social, economic and environmental dimensions of prosperity, for example, including biodiversity, health, social capital, solidarity, agency, and good quality and decent employment to increase the visibility to citizens of how economies are actually performing.

Measuring prosperity entails asking the key question of what does prosperity comprise and embrace, for whom, when and where?35 Therefore, a conceptual definition of prosperity with specific content, one that is sensitive to context specific visions of prosperity derived from engagement with community members, is the next step for existing beyond GDP measures. Local perspectives are important to ascertain the subjective meaning of prosperity which is associated with the individual and collective ideas and aspirations that people have for the future, as well as the everyday structural constraints that shape quality of life, which are heavily influenced by, environmental and economic conditions, social and cultural values, policy frameworks and historical legacies. These novel citizen-led prosperity indices link quality of life (human and environmental) at the local, community and regional levels to national level macro-economic data for the first time. This provides solid groundwork for policies to be developed that take account of the specific assets,
resources and capabilities that localities can mobilise to develop targeted pathways to prosperity, sustainable livelihoods and planetary well-being.

**G7 nations can enhance social solidarity and cohesion through adopting more citizen-led approaches to measuring prosperity.** Such approaches would increase social participation, trust, legitimacy and enable the public to monitor progress in the matters that are priorities to them. While currently, many G7 economies have expressed their desire to move beyond GDP and have created their own official frameworks and novel dashboards, very few have developed frameworks that bring a cross-sector and multi-stakeholder approach between citizens, businesses, civil society, policy-makers and academia.

To that end, **G7 nations should also implement citizen-led prosperity indices and measures as a way to add value and manage their economies and societies.**

It is clear that with an enhanced welfare state through Universal Social Protections combined with empowering digital governance, and the introduction of new ways for measuring prosperity, G7 nations can set the path to more resilient and sustainable economies positively impacting the prosperity and quality of life of their citizens while also contributing significantly to a ‘New Multilateralism’ and thus, improve social cohesion, creating more socially just and open societies, and enabling innovative transitions in response to economic transformations.

**Implementations**

In conclusion, in order to promote global peace, defend liberal democracy, social participation, freedom of science and of the press, tackle disinformation, and promote digital order and digital progress the G7 states should take five action points:

i. **Step up their foundational responsibility to protect their citizens.** The commitment of G7 countries with the provision of universal access to a new basket of public goods such as transport and digital services as part of a comprehensive set of Universal Basic Services that, together, will enhance productivity, increase social cohesion, and protect citizens through the global energy transition and impacts of climate change.

ii. **Implement progressive fiscal policy** through reforming and simplifying taxation systems across the G7. Treating all sources of income (earned and unearned) equally and taxing at identical rates can increase reciprocity and social solidarity but also crucially provides the finance to fund universal social protections, public services and net zero requirements.

iii. **Take steps towards implementation of digital citizenship** include the following:

   a. Enable individuals to gain control over their O- and P-Data and enable social groups to gain control over their C-Data by using institution-building strategies, and a range of building on
some of the lessons of Personal Information Management Systems (PIMS), self-sovereign identity (SSI) and high scale data record query and resolution.

b. Address digital power asymmetries by extending competition law as well as laws to safeguard the right of association and protections for vulnerable groups.

c. Enable social groups to gain control over their C-Data through the establishment and support of data commons, using current projects to determine which additional legal and institutional supports are needed.

iv. Commit to driving forward the agenda for a new understanding of prosperity and implementing comprehensive measurement tools (on the macro-, meso- and micro-level), e.g., based on the SAGE framework (covering Solidarity, Agency, GDP and Environmental sustainability) and similar initiatives, as well as through citizen-led prosperity indices. The independent statistical authorities of the G7 nations should report on no more than 10 statistics alongside GDP figures on a quarterly basis. In this way, citizens are able to monitor forms of progress in significant areas related to environmental and social domains. To ensure that the contributions to and benefits from collective action are equitably distributed, national performance needs to be measured and reported more broadly than GDP.

v. Develop locally defined prosperity indices to be implemented through citizen-led measures of prosperity that links with a new basket of public goods as well as indicating the local needs and priorities of citizens.
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