GL-03 Polycentric governance of climate and the commons at planetary scale

1. Theoretical Foundations: From Micro-Commons to the Planetary Atmosphere

The intellectual genealogy of polycentric governance spans six decades of institutional analysis, originating in mid-twentieth-century urban public administration and culminating in contemporary Earth system science. The analytical concept was formulated by Vincent Ostrom, Charles Tiebout, and Robert Warren (1961) in their foundational examination of metropolitan governance, *The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas*[1]. They defined a polycentric system as one comprising many centers of decision-making that are formally independent of one another, yet take each other into account in competitive and cooperative relationships, entering into contractual arrangements or resorting to central mechanisms to resolve conflicts[2]. This theoretical breakthrough challenged the prevailing public administration orthodoxy that fragmented municipal jurisdictions were inherently inefficient, duplicative, and chaotic, demonstrating instead that overlapping polycentric structures could enhance public service efficiency, match diverse citizen preferences, and encourage jurisdictional innovation[1].

Elinor Ostrom subsequently transposed this logic to natural resource management in her seminal monograph, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (1990)[3]. Drawing upon empirical fieldwork across common-pool resources (CPRs)—including high-altitude Swiss pastures, Spanish and Philippine gravity-flow irrigation canals, and Turkish coastal fisheries—Ostrom challenged Garrett Hardin's (1968) *Tragedy of the Commons* and Mancur Olson's (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action*, which had asserted that resource users were trapped in inexorable Prisoner's Dilemmas solvable only through coercive state intervention or private property enclosure[5]. Ostrom codified eight design principles characterizing long-surviving, self-organized CPR institutions:

1. Clearly defined boundaries regarding the physical resource and legitimate users[7].
2. Congruence between appropriation and provision rules and local environmental conditions[7].
3. Collective-choice arrangements ensuring that the individuals affected by the operational rules can participate in modifying them[7].
4. Active monitoring of resource conditions and user behavior by monitors accountable to the appropriators[7].
5. Graduated sanctions for rule infractions, assessed by other appropriators or their accountable officials[7].
6. Rapid, low-cost, local conflict-resolution mechanisms[7].

7. Minimal recognition of the appropriators' right to self-organize by external governmental authorities.
8. Nested enterprises, wherein appropriation, provision, monitoring, enforcement, and conflict resolution are organized across multiple, interdependent jurisdictional layers.

In the final decade of her career, Elinor Ostrom extended this framework to global environmental dilemmas. In *Polycentric Systems for Coping with Collective Action and Global Environmental Change* (2010) and her 2009 World Bank policy paper *A Polycentric Approach for Coping with Climate Change*, Ostrom argued that relying exclusively on an elusive, top-down global climate treaty within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was an inherently fragile strategy prone to delay and institutional deadlock[9]. Ostrom posited that polycentric architectures facilitate parallel mitigation and adaptation across nested scales—from municipal retrofits and regional carbon pricing to transnational civic networks[9]. The primary mechanism driving this decentralized collective action is the capture of local "co-benefits"[9]. Actors reduce fossil fuel consumption not solely out of altruism for the planetary atmosphere, but because local investments generate immediate, excludable welfare gains: reduced urban particulate pollution, lower energy expenditures, modern transit infrastructure, and local economic resilience[13]. Through distributed experimentation, mutual adjustment, and inter-jurisdictional learning, these local actions aggregate into systemic global mitigation[9].

Daniel H. Cole (2011, 2015) formalized Ostrom's climate framework, asserting in *From Global to Polycentric Climate Governance* that polycentricity is not merely a normative recommendation, but the actual structural reality of contemporary international climate governance[12]. Cole argued that because sovereign nation-states operate in an anarchic geopolitical system without a global sovereign, climate governance inevitably evolves as an emergent regime complex of national policies, municipal initiatives, regional cap-and-trade systems, and court adjudications[1].

The empirical foundation of Ostrom's climate thesis was systematically audited by Andrew Jordan, Dave Huitema, Harro van Asselt, and Johanna Forster in their landmark volume, *Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?* (2018)[12]. Jordan and colleagues codified polycentric governance theory into five foundational analytical propositions:

1. *Local Action*: Governance initiatives self-organize at local levels to capture immediate co-benefits, circumventing higher-level collective-action inertia[12].
2. *Mutual Adjustment*: Constituent governing units spontaneously develop collaborations, linkages, and information-sharing networks, leading to systemic coherence without central orchestration[12].
3. *Experimentation*: Polycentric diversity fosters policy innovation, rapid institutional learning, and the diffusion of best practices across jurisdictions[12].
4. *Trust*: Trust builds more rapidly through direct, nested, decentralized interactions and participatory monitoring than through distant bureaucratic edicts[12].
5. *Overarching Rules*: Polycentric systems function most effectively when anchored by an overarching framework that defines collective objectives, ensures accountability, and

provides conflict-resolution mechanisms[12].

Jordan et al. (2018) assembled international empirical evidence across subnational, corporate, and transnational climate arenas to test these propositions[15]. Their findings revealed substantial structural friction between theoretical expectations and observable outcomes. The table below synthesizes this confrontation between polycentric theory and real-world empirical realities:

Theoretical Proposition	Theorized Polycentric Mechanism	Empirical Findings (Jordan et al. 2018; Inogov Project)	Replicated Empirical Outcome
Local Action	Spontaneous emergence driven by local co-benefits and subsidiarity[12].	Extensive emergence of local climate targets, but heavily skewed toward wealthy, resourced jurisdictions; highly variable execution[1].	Confirmed emergence; disconfirmed uniformity of implementation across resource-poor regions.
Mutual Adjustment	Autonomous units harmonize standards and close regulatory loopholes via horizontal peer review[12].	Infrequent spontaneous harmonization; widespread regulatory arbitrage, jurisdictional competition, and duplication[12].	Disconfirmed; fragmentation, forum shopping, and competitive gaming dominate absent hierarchy.
Experimentation	Quasi-scientific policy trials generating systematic learning and institutional diffusion[12].	Proliferation of uncoordinated "pilot projects" lacking rigorous evaluation, monitoring, or negative result reporting[12].	Disconfirmed; experimentation is predominantly symbolic and rarely subjected to rigorous testing.
Trust	Dense horizontal interactions foster	Local trust does not aggregate upward	Confirmed locally; disconfirmed

	social capital and curb free-riding[12].	across borders; high-trust local units remain suspicious of external jurisdictions[12].	transnationally.
Overarching Rules	Meta-rules establish boundaries, verify compliance, and enforce dispute settlement[12].	Overarching planetary rules (e.g., Paris Agreement) lack binding sanction mechanisms, weakening compliance[18].	Disconfirmed; global meta-rules lack coercive enforcement capacity.

The fundamental disconnect identified by Jordan et al. stems from a biophysical and game-theoretic scale mismatch. Local common-pool resources (irrigation canals, alpine pastures, community woodlots) are subtractable, spatially bounded, and populated by appropriators who interact repeatedly, observe direct ecological feedback, and can identify and sanction violators at minimal cost[5]. The planetary atmosphere, by contrast, is a perfectly mixed, non-excludable global sink[5]. Greenhouse gases emitted anywhere disperse globally, while local abatement produces non-excludable benefits that accrue overwhelmingly to external actors[13]. Consequently, individual local mitigation generates dispersed positive externalities while imposing localized concentrated costs, recreating the classic Prisoner's Dilemma at the macro scale[5]. As Paul C. Stern (2011) and Eduardo Araral (2014) demonstrate, Ostrom's eight design principles cannot scale linearly to global commons characterized by billions of heterogeneous actors, extensive temporal lag times, and radical spatial separation between resource exploiters and victims of degradation[5].

2. Institutional Frameworks and Empirical Test Cases

Arrangement 1: Transnational Municipal Networks (C40 Cities and the EU Covenant of Mayors)

Transnational municipal networks represent the premier contemporary manifestation of non-state, bottom-up polycentric climate governance. The C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, initiated in London in 2005 by Mayor Ken Livingstone and expanded under Michael Bloomberg, encompasses 96 major metropolitan areas, representing over 800 million urban residents and one-quarter of global economic output[14]. Parallel to this, the European Commission established the Covenant of Mayors (CoM) in 2008, which subsequently merged with the Compact of Mayors in 2016 to form the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy (GCoM), encompassing over 11,500 local and regional authorities across 142 countries[20].

These networks operate on principles of voluntary accession, horizontal benchmarking, peer-to-peer technical learning, and standardized carbon accounting frameworks. Participating municipalities formally adopt greenhouse gas reduction targets, pledging to meet or exceed regional benchmarks—such as the European Union's initial target of a 20% GHG reduction by 2020, amended to 40% by 2030 and net-zero by 2050[18]. Municipal signatories commit to drafting Sustainable Energy and Climate Action Plans (SEAPs/SECAPs), establishing baseline emissions inventories, and undergoing biennial progress monitoring[20].

The empirical record of transnational municipal networks reveals sharp structural discrepancies between public pronouncements and verified mitigation. In an exhaustive empirical audit evaluating the Covenant of Mayors 2020 commitments, Palermo et al. (2021) examined 5,054 participating European municipalities[20]. They documented a systemic reporting collapse: only 1,643 municipalities (32.5%) tracked and submitted monitoring reports on their emissions progress, while 3,411 municipalities (67.5%) completely defaulted on their monitoring obligations, leaving the actual physical impact of their action plans unobservable[20].

Angel Hsu et al. (2019, 2020) analyzed over 1,000 subnational and municipal climate commitments, finding that while active municipal adopters achieved an average annual per capita emissions reduction of 1.2% to 2.1%, these commitments were dominated by selection bias[22]. Cities joining voluntary networks are disproportionately wealthy, tertiary-service-dominated metropolises with pre-existing decarbonization trajectories driven primarily by national grid transformations[1].

Furthermore, Lukas Hakelberg (2014) performed statistical regressions across 124 European cities, demonstrating that transnational network membership had a statistically negligible independent effect on local climate policy adoption when controlling for national regulatory mandates and domestic fiscal subsidies. Transnational municipal networks serve largely as horizontal peer-validation platforms for progressive municipal elites rather than autonomous drivers of structural emissions abatement[18].

Scale Ledger: Transnational Municipal Networks

- **Household (4 to 10 people)**: *Never tried directly.* Transnational networks maintain no direct interface with domestic household decisions, engaging households solely as passive consumers through municipal building codes and waste collection schedules.
- **Hamlet or Band (30 to 50 people)**: *Never tried.* The administrative overhead of network criteria and GHG auditing excludes unincorporated rural settlements.
- **Village (150 to 500 people)**: *Failed.* Small rural settlements lack the bureaucratic staff, technical expertise, and fiscal baseline to draft compliant emissions inventories; over 85% of small rural signatories in Southern and Eastern Europe failed to submit follow-up monitoring reports[20].
- **Parish or District (1,500 to 5,000 people)**: *Failed.* Exhibited a >70% attrition rate in monitoring compliance under the Covenant of Mayors due to the absence of dedicated environmental administrative units[20].
- **Town or Watershed (15,000 to 50,000 people)**: *Mixed.* Marginal operational efficacy achieved only when regional provincial governments act as administrative intermediaries (e.g., provincial aggregation programs in Italy and Spain).

- **Region or Bioregion (0.5 to 5 million people)**: *Worked.* Optimal operational rung; metropolitan regional authorities possess administrative capacity, technical staff, and fiscal capital to execute public transit overhauls and district heating retrofits[14].
- **Nation or Continent (50 to 500 million people)**: *Failed as an autonomous governing entity.* Municipal networks cannot govern across national or continental territories independently; they remain structurally dependent on national grid decarbonization, federal interstate infrastructure, and national legislative mandates[1].
- **Planet (8 billion people)**: *Failed.* Global coverage represents less than 15% of aggregate planetary emissions; the voluntary model completely lacks legal jurisdiction or economic leverage over industrial production basins in authoritarian, petrostate, or developing economies.

Capture Test: Dark-Triad Exploitation Vectors

1. *Narcissistic Prestige Harvesting*: Political executives exploit network summits, international press conferences, and high-visibility pledges to construct personal progressive brands. Because target horizons (2030, 2050) extend far beyond electoral cycles, mayors harvest immediate reputational capital while shifting compliance and financial liabilities to future administrations[20].
2. *Scope Arbitrage and Greenwashing*: Municipal regimes claim localized "carbon neutrality" by outsourcing emissions-intensive manufacturing, waste processing, and power generation outside municipal administrative borders. By shifting from territorial to narrow operational accounting, an administration projects ecological virtue while driving net emissions increases in adjacent rural or peri-urban districts.
3. *Consultancy Extraction*: Technocratic and bureaucratic factions create private consulting ecosystems that absorb municipal sustainability budgets to produce standardized, formulaic SECAP documentation that is never implemented.

- *Structural Countermeasures*: Mandatory performance-bonding mechanisms, where municipal authorities deposit capital into third-party escrow accounts that are automatically forfeited upon failure to deliver verified physical emissions cuts; replacing self-reported inventories with independent, real-time multispectral satellite monitoring; establishing strict consumption-based emissions accounting that attributes full supply-chain footprints to importing cities.

Arrangement 2: Subnational and Transnational Carbon Offsets and Emissions Trading

Market-based polycentric architectures, most notably the Western Climate Initiative (linking California and Quebec) and the United Nations Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, were engineered to equalize marginal abatement costs across jurisdictional boundaries[24]. Under these systems, capped industrial entities purchase compliance offset credits from unregulated sectors—such as forestry, agricultural soil conservation, and industrial gas destruction in peripheral or developing regions—theoretically lowering the overall cost of global decarbonization while transferring capital to ecologically restorative projects[24].

The empirical literature demonstrates that these polycentric market flexibilities are structurally

vulnerable to adverse selection, baseline manipulation, and non-additionality. Grayson Badgley et al. (2022) conducted a comprehensive computational audit of California's forest carbon offsets program, which accounts for over 80% of all credits issued under the California Air Resources Board (CARB) compliance market[24]. Analyzing 4 million acres of enrolled forest projects and comparing them against the US Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) database, Badgley et al. demonstrated that CARB's coarse regional averaging enabled project developers to engage in systematic adverse selection[24].

Forest managers preferentially enrolled timber stands that naturally possessed higher carbon stocking densities than broad regional baselines ("supersections"), securing upfront credits for conservation actions that were entirely business-as-usual[24]. Badgley et al. quantified that California's program generated between 29% and 39 million metric tons of phantom carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO_2e) credits—representing an economic windfall of over $410 million (90% CI: $280–528 million)—which industrial polluters utilized to justify genuine point-source fossil combustion[24].

Furthermore, Badgley, Chay et al. (2022) conducted an actuarial analysis of California's forest buffer pool, a self-insurance mechanism holding 8.7% to 19.2% of project credits to guarantee 100-year carbon permanence against unintentional reversals such as wildfires, pests, and disease[28]. They demonstrated that the wildfire allocation of the buffer pool was fully depleted within a single decade by six major fire events, leaving the system severely undercapitalized and incapable of guaranteeing ecological permanence[28].

This dynamic mirrors the Clean Development Mechanism's HFC-23 destruction scandal analyzed by Michael Wara (2007) in *Nature*[26]. HFC-23 is an industrial waste gas with a 100-year global warming potential 11,700 to 14,800 times greater than CO_2, generated during the synthesis of the refrigerant HCFC-22[26]. Under the CDM, European industrial plants paid chemical facilities in China, India, and South Korea to install thermal oxidizers costing under $100,000 to destroy HFC-23[29]. Because the carbon market price for the resulting Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) vastly exceeded the actual cost of destruction, the value of the offset credits dwarfed the commercial value of the underlying refrigerant[29].

Chemical plant operators responded to this price signal by deliberately expanding HCFC-22 production and intentionally operating inefficient plants to maximize the generation of HFC-23 byproducts, harvesting hundreds of millions of dollars in offset revenues[29]. This predatory arbitrage consumed over one-third of all CDM credits issued prior to 2012, accelerating the manufacture of ozone-depleting and climate-heating chemical compounds until the European Union banned industrial gas offsets from the EU ETS in 2013[26].

Scale Ledger: Subnational Carbon Markets and Offsets

- **Household (4 to 10 people)**: *Never tried directly.* Micro-scale actors cannot absorb verification, registration, and legal fees.
- **Hamlet or Band (30 to 50 people)**: *Never tried.* Administrative transaction costs surpass total possible credit revenue.
- **Village (150 to 500 people)**: *Failed.* When community-managed forests are integrated into international offset schemes (e.g., REDD+), elite capture occurs rapidly; village

leaders monopolize cash flows while traditional agrarian foraging is criminalized.

- **Parish or District (1,500 to 5,000 people)**: *Failed.* Administrative intermediaries, legal registrars, and carbon auditors capture between 40% and 60% of gross capital inflows.
- **Town or Watershed (15,000 to 50,000 people)**: *Mixed.* Operates functionally only as an extraction zone for corporate timber monocultures, not as a participative commons regime[24].
- **Region or Bioregion (0.5 to 5 million people)**: *Worked administratively, failed ecologically.* Systems such as California cap-and-trade process financial trades efficiently at this scale, yet the structural offset mechanisms yield paper compliance while aggregate emissions remain unchanged or leak outward[24].
- **Nation or Continent (50 to 500 million people)**: *Worked administratively.* The EU ETS functions effectively across Europe, but only because it completely banned international offsets and enforced a rigid, declining physical cap backed by punitive fines[31].
- **Planet (8 billion people)**: *Failed catastrophically.* Global voluntary and flexible offset markets collapsed into baseline gaming, non-additionality, and structural carbon leakage[24].

Capture Test: Dark-Triad Exploitation Vectors

1. *Machiavellian Regulatory Engineering*: Industrial emitters, forest management corporations, and carbon brokers form lobbying coalitions that design convoluted baseline estimation methodologies based on unprovable counterfactuals (e.g., claiming a forest would have been clear-cut in the absence of offset revenues), turning non-action into tradable financial paper[24].
2. *Perverse Production Incentives*: Rational predators deliberately increase environmentally hazardous primary production (e.g., running refrigerant synthesis inefficiently to generate high-GWP waste gases) solely to capture lucrative destruction subsidies[29].
3. *Privatized Gain, Socialized Liability*: Offset project operators monetize upfront carbon credits immediately while externalizing the catastrophic risks of long-term reversal (wildfire, disease, drought) onto a collective, undercapitalized buffer pool[28].

- *Structural Countermeasures*: Complete statutory elimination of out-of-boundary offset mechanisms; restricting compliance exclusively to direct, physical point-source emissions reductions; establishing strict liability where emitters remain legally and financially responsible for 100-year physical reversals.

Arrangement 3: The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Adopted in 1987, the Montreal Protocol is universally cited as the most successful multilateral environmental agreement, having successfully phased out over 98% of global production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances (ODSs) while inadvertently averting an estimated 0.5°C to 1.0°C of global warming[33]. While early polycentric theorists referenced Montreal as proof that multi-layered polycentric treaties can solve planetary commons dilemmas, rigorous institutional analysis demonstrates that Montreal succeeded precisely because its structural architecture rejected voluntary, bottom-up polycentric arrangements[33].

As political economist Scott Barrett (2003) demonstrated in *Environment and Statecraft: The Strategy of Environmental Treaty-Making*, the Montreal Protocol did not rely on spontaneous local action, decentralized trust-building, or non-binding pledges[33]. Its enduring structural efficacy rested on three coercive, top-down mechanisms:

1. *Article 4 Trade Restrictions*: The protocol prohibited parties from importing controlled substances from non-parties, and banned non-parties from exporting controlled substances to parties[35]. As the coalition of ratifying states grew, non-participating nations faced total commercial exclusion from global chemical supply chains. This converted an open-access Prisoner's Dilemma into a self-enforcing tipping game: the economic penalty of remaining outside the treaty rapidly became higher than the cost of joining and complying[33].
2. *Article 10 Multilateral Fund*: Established under the 1990 London Amendment, the Multilateral Fund eliminated free-riding incentives across the Global South by financing the "agreed incremental costs" incurred by developing nations (Article 5 countries) to phase out ODSs[35]. Capitalized with over $4 billion since its inception, the fund neutralized distributional resistance by directly financing industrial plant conversions across China, India, and Latin America.
3. *Industrial Concentration and Chemical Substitution*: Global CFC production was concentrated within a tight corporate oligopoly dominated by DuPont, Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI), and AlliedSignal. Once DuPont successfully synthesized commercial chemical substitutes (HCFCs and HFCs) and secured protective patents, the firm broke ranks with industrial opposition, aggressively lobbying the US government to mandate a complete global phaseout of CFCs to lock in a captive global market for its patented alternatives.

Scale Ledger: The Montreal Model

- **Household (4 to 10 people)**: *Never tried directly.* Touched only downstream as passive consumers purchasing compliant cooling appliances.
- **Hamlet or Band (30 to 50 people)**: *Never tried.* Sub-municipal units possess no jurisdiction or technical capacity over fluorinated chemicals.
- **Village (150 to 500 people)**: *Never tried.* Non-applicable.
- **Parish or District (1,500 to 5,000 people)**: *Never tried.* Non-applicable.
- **Town or Watershed (15,000 to 50,000 people)**: *Never tried.* Municipalities lack legal authority over transnational trade borders.
- **Region or Bioregion (0.5 to 5 million people)**: *Never tried independently.* Execution was channeled strictly through national customs and environmental agencies.
- **Nation or Continent (50 to 500 million people)**: *Worked exceptionally.* National customs agencies enforced strict border bans, while federal regulations mandated technological phaseouts[33].
- **Planet (8 billion people)**: *Worked exceptionally.* Universal ratification (198 parties) achieved through game-theoretic economic coercion and targeted capital subsidization[33].

Capture Test: Dark-Triad Exploitation Vectors

1. *Monopolistic Intellectual Enclosure*: Chemical conglomerates use multilateral regulatory bans to eliminate unpatented generic competition, transforming environmental protection into an intellectual property rent-extraction machine.
2. *Black-Market Arbitrage and Smuggling*: Rogue operators and criminal syndicates mislabel virgin CFC cylinders as recycled compounds or unregulated solvents, exploiting vast price differentials in developing markets.
3. *Regrettable Substitution Cycling*: Chemical manufacturers engineer an endless cycle of chemical substitution—moving the global market from CFCs to ozone-damaging HCFCs, then to climate-forcing HFCs, and finally to proprietary hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs)—locking in continuous royalty flows while ignoring systemic ecological disruptions[26].

- *Structural Countermeasures*: The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP), an independent scientific body evaluating substitutes on strict thermodynamic and chemical criteria; a global atmospheric sampling network (e.g., AGAGE) capable of detecting illicit emissions spikes, which triggered direct diplomatic pressure and administrative crackdowns when illicit CFC-11 production was detected in eastern China in 2018–2019.

Arrangement 4: Traditional Bioregional Common-Pool Resource Precedents

To rigorously assess polycentricity at higher scales, one must examine the empirical foundations upon which Elinor Ostrom built her institutional theory: localized, self-organizing commons that endured across centuries without top-down bureaucratic control.

The Alpine Pastoral Commons: Törbel, Switzerland

Documented by anthropologist Robert McC. Netting in his classic study *Balancing on an Alp: Ecological Change and Continuity in a Swiss Mountain Community* (1981), the alpine village of Törbel, situated in the Vispertal of Valais canton, has governed its communal mountain pastures and irrigation channels (*suonen*) continuously since at least 1224[37]. The community maintained an unbroken demographic equilibrium, fluctuating between 400 and 600 inhabitants across five centuries[6].

Törbel resolved the tragedy of the commons through a structural rule codified in 1517: the "winter cow rule" (*Winterung*)[38]. No villager was permitted to send more cattle to graze on the communal alp in the summer than they could feed through the winter with hay harvested from their own privately owned meadow plots[38].

This institutional rule coupled private land ownership directly to common pasture access: the physical carrying capacity of private winter plots acted as an absolute ceiling against overgrazing the shared mountain pastures[6]. Village statutes were enacted by an alp association (*Alpgenossenschaft*) composed of all cattle-owning citizens[38]. An elected alp manager (*Alpvogt*) directed seasonal operations, while infractions were detected through mutual peer surveillance and penalized through strictly graduated fines, split evenly between the informant and the communal treasury[38].

The Huerta Irrigation Commons: Tribunal de las Aguas of Valencia

Described by Thomas F. Glick in *Irrigation and Society in Medieval Valencia* (1970) and analyzed by Arthur Maass and Raymond L. Anderson (1978) and Elinor Ostrom (1990), the *Tribunal de las Aguas* (Water Court) of the Plain of Valencia, Spain, is Europe's oldest continuously functioning democratic institution, tracing its origins to the 10th-century Umayyad caliphate[38]. The system coordinates gravity-flow water distribution from the Turia River across approximately 17,000 hectares of arid farmland supporting between 11,000 and 23,000 irrigators organized across eight (later nine) main irrigation canals (*acequias madres*)[38].

Each canal community forms an autonomous association of landowners (*hereters*) who elect an executive known as a *syndic* (*síndic*) every two to three years[38]. The syndic must be an active, working farmer who owns and tills land irrigated by that specific canal, ensuring immediate alignment of interest between administrator and users[38].

Water is allocated not through volumetric pricing, but via a strict rotational sequence (*tanda*): during droughts, the syndics enforce proportional rationing, running water through canals in an unyielding spatial sequence where irrigators take turns based on the surface area of their holdings[38].

Every Thursday at noon, the eight syndics assemble outside the Apostles' Gate of the Valencia Cathedral to constitute the *Tribunal de las Aguas*[43]. Conducting all proceedings entirely orally, in the Valencian language, without written records, attorneys, or administrative fees, the court resolves disputes between irrigators, hears challenges to syndics' rulings, and prosecutes illegal water theft[38]. Judgments are rendered immediately on the cathedral steps, enforcing graduated financial penalties, water forfeiture, and community restitution[38].

The Riverine Commons: Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (CCNR)

Established by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (CCNR) is the world's oldest surviving international organization[44]. Headquartered successively in Mainz, Mannheim (1860), and Strasbourg (1920), the CCNR governs navigation, safety standards, and physical infrastructure across Europe's primary industrial river corridor, binding five riparian states: France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Belgium[45].

The institutional breakthrough of the CCNR was the Mannheim Convention of 1868 (revising the 1831 Convention of Mainz), which established absolute freedom of navigation for all vessels on the Rhine, abolished transit tolls, mandated coordinated dredging and channel maintenance, and established independent Rhine Navigation Courts (*Rheinschifffahrtsgerichte*)[44].

The CCNR does not operate as a top-down supranational sovereign, but as a polycentric intergovernmental body[44]. While regulatory decisions require unanimous consent among member states, once enacted, regulations governing vessel engineering, pilot licensing, and hazardous cargo safety become directly binding within the domestic legal orders of all riparian nations[44]. The independent Rhine Navigation Courts allow commercial shippers and boatmen to appeal municipal or state customs decisions directly to the central commission, effectively insulating transnational commerce from local protectionist capture[44].

3. Constitutionalizing the Biosphere: Earth System

Governance, Planetary Boundaries, and the Doughnut

The persistent failure of decentralized, polycentric initiatives to halt aggregate planetary degradation prompted Earth system scientists and institutional theorists to formulate constitutional frameworks for the biosphere[48].

The Planetary Boundaries Framework: Physical Ceilings

First proposed by Johan Rockström et al. (2009) and updated by Will Steffen et al. (2015) and Katherine Richardson et al. (2023) in *Science Advances*, the Planetary Boundaries framework delineates nine critical biophysical Earth system processes that regulate the stability and resilience of the entire planet[50]. The foundational scientific premise is that the Holocene geological epoch (spanning the last 11,700 years)—characterized by stable temperature ranges, predictable hydrological cycles, and intact biomes—represents the only environmental state known empirically to support complex human agricultural and urban civilization[50].

The framework establishes quantified boundaries within which humanity can safely operate. The 2023 assessment by Katherine Richardson et al. revealed that humanity has transgressed six of the nine planetary boundaries, pushing the Earth system well outside its safe operating space[34]:

Earth System Boundary	Control Variable(s)	Pre-Industrial Base Value	Safe Boundary Threshold	Current Status (Richardson et al. 2023)	Transgression State
Climate Change	Atmospheric CO_2 concentration; Radiative forcing at top-of-atmosphere[52].	$280\ \text{ppm}$; $0\ \text{W/m}^2$ [53].	$350\ \text{ppm}$; $+1.0\ \text{W/m}^2$ [54].	$423\ \text{ppm}$; $+2.97\ \text{W/m}^2$ [54].	**Transgressed (High Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]
Biosphere Integrity	Extinction rate (E/MSY); Human Appropriation of Net Primary Production	$<$; $<$.	$<$; $<$ [52].	$>$; 30% HANP [54].	**Transgressed (High Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]

	(HANPP)[52].				
Novel Entities	Annual release of synthetic chemicals, plastics, pesticides, radioactive materials without safety evaluation[52].	Zero synthetic introductions[52].	Zero unassessed releases[52].	Over 350,000 synthetic compounds produced; 8.3B tons plastics; widespread bioaccumulation[52].	**Transgressed (High Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]
Biogeochemical Flows	Industrial/biological Nitrogen fixation; Phosphorus flow into aquatic systems[52].	0 Tg N/yr; 0 Mt P/yr[53].	62 Tg N/yr; 6.2 Tg P/yr[54].	165 Tg N/y; 18.2 Tg P/[54].	**Transgressed (High Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]
Land-System Change	Area of remaining global forest cover compared to original pre-agricultural extent[52].	100% original forest cover[53].	75% global forest area[53].	59% global forest area remaining[54].	**Transgressed (Increasing Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]
Freshwater Change	% of land area with human-induced deviations in streamflow (blue water)	9.4% Blue; 9.8% Green[53].	12.9% Blue; 12.4% Gree[54].	22.6% Blue; 22.0% Gree[54].	**Transgressed (High Risk)** [cite: 50, 54]

	and soil moisture (green water)[52].				
Ocean Acidification	Aragonite saturation state (Ω_{arag}) in surface seawater[52].	$3.57\ \Omega_{arag}$ [54].	$2.86\ \Omega_{arag}$ (80% of pre-ind.)[54].	$2.84\ \Omega_{arag}$ (breaching boundary across 40% of surface oceans)[54].	**Transgressed / Approaching Critical Threshold** [cite: 50, 54]
Atmospheric Aerosol Loading	Inter-hemispheric aerosol optical depth difference (AOD)[34].	Zero anthropogenic loading.	0.1 AOD difference.	Highly variable regionally; severe Asian and African overshoot, stable globally[50].	**Within Boundary (Locally Transgressed)** [cite: 50]
Stratospheric Ozone Depletion	Total stratospheric ozone concentration in Dobson Units (DU)[34].	$290\ \text{DU}$.	$275\ \text{DU}$ ($>$ of pre-ind.).	Stabilized above boundary (~ $285\ \text{DU}$) via Montreal Protocol enforcement[34].	**Safe Operating Space** [cite: 34, 50]

The Social Foundation: Raworth's Doughnut Economics

In *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist* (2017), Kate Raworth integrated the biophysical Planetary Boundaries ceiling with a socio-economic foundation derived from the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The resulting framework identifies a "safe and just space for humanity": the inner boundary represents the social foundation below which human privation occurs (shortfalls in food, clean water, healthcare, education, shelter, and political voice), while the outer boundary represents the biophysical ceiling above which industrial throughput drives ecospheric breakdown. When translated into an urban governance strategy—most visibly by the City of Amsterdam in

April 2020 during the COVID-19 crisis—the Doughnut was intended to transform municipal policymaking from GDP growth to circular regenerative systems. However, empirical and ethnographic evaluations of the Amsterdam implementation (e.g., 2022–2023) expose significant structural constraints[55]. Municipal bureaucracies routinely diluted the Doughnut's systemic redistributive mandates into standard neoliberal procurement tools, carbon-accounting protocols, and housing construction regulations[55].

The fundamental conflict between economic growth and biophysical limits was systematically avoided: the city advanced circular architectural pilot projects while municipal port terminals continued processing millions of tons of imported coal, oil, and consumer freight. Lacking sovereign authority to regulate transnational commodity chains or mandate regional wealth redistribution, the municipal "Doughnut" operated as a progressive branding framework layered atop an unchanged industrial metabolic flow[55].

Biermann's Earth System Governance and the Centralized Critique

Frank Biermann and the international Earth System Governance (ESG) Project (Biermann et al. 2009, 2012, 2014) articulated the primary theoretical critique against treating polycentricity as an adequate architecture for biosphere preservation[2]. Biermann argues that the biophysical reality of the Anthropocene is defined by non-linear planetary tipping points, cascading feedback loops, and unprecedented speed—dynamics that make the incremental, trial-and-error mutual adjustment of polycentric systems fundamentally obsolete[48].

Biermann contends that polycentric governance theory romanticizes fragmentation, confusing the *empirical observation* of decentralized institutional proliferation with *normative governance effectiveness*[2]. In *Transforming Governance and Institutions for Global Sustainability* (2012) and *Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Anthropocene* (2014), Biermann et al. advocate for centralized institutional steering mechanisms, including[49]:

1. Upgrading the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) into a specialized, authoritative World Environment Organization with binding regulatory capacity.
2. Replacing the weak UN High-Level Political Forum with a powerful United Nations Sustainable Development Council, placed directly under the UN General Assembly and operating with qualified majority voting rather than consensus paralysis[49].
3. Establishing an international "Earth Trusteeship Council" empowered to act as the legal fiduciary representative of the biosphere, holding sovereign nation-states and corporations legally accountable for violations of the Planetary Boundaries[49].

4. The Critical Counter-Case: The Pathology of Polycentricity at Planetary Scale

The academic critique of planetary-scale polycentricity is robust, supported by institutional scholars including Frank Biermann, Paul C. Stern, Eduardo Araral, David Victor, Robert Keohane, Danny Cullenward, and Nobel laureate William Nordhaus[5]. The core argument against polycentric climate governance is structured around four interlocking structural pathologies:

1. Structural Fragmentation and Institutional Paralysis

In *The Regime Complex for Climate Change* (2011), Robert Keohane and David Victor

demonstrate that the proliferation of overlapping, non-hierarchical governance arrangements produces a fragmented "regime complex"[12]. Rather than generating beneficial institutional diversity and adaptive experimentation (as predicted by Ostrom and Cole), structural fragmentation allows cynical actors to engage in "forum shopping"[12].

Sovereign states and multinational corporations exploit jurisdictional ambiguities by diverting regulatory oversight into toothless, voluntary fora (such as corporate sustainability roundtables or non-binding municipal networks) to preempt binding national mandates or trade-sanctioned international treaties[12]. Transaction costs explode across hundreds of uncoordinated secretariats, expert panels, and monitoring frameworks, paralyzing capital allocation while aggregate global emissions continue their upward trajectory[12].

2. Regulatory Arbitrage, Free-Riding, and Carbon Leakage

William Nordhaus (2015) formalized the fundamental free-riding crisis inherent to voluntary polycentric climate arrangements in *Climate Clubs: Overcoming Free-riding in International Climate Policy*[36]. Nordhaus proves mathematically that because emissions abatement generates a non-excludable global public good, non-participating jurisdictions systematically free-ride on the costly mitigation expenditures of proactive jurisdictions[36].

In the absence of coercive border penalties, aggressive subnational or national decarbonization policies induce "carbon leakage": energy-intensive industries simply relocate their physical production assets across administrative boundaries into jurisdictions with lax environmental rules[28]. The net atmospheric result is zero or negative abatement, accompanied by the economic impoverishment of the cooperating jurisdiction and the enrichment of the defecting free-rider[36]. Nordhaus demonstrates that voluntary polycentric networks are mathematically unstable; without external penalty tariffs levied on non-participants, voluntary agreements degrade to negligible abatement levels[36].

3. Systemic Greenwashing and Symbolic Compliance

As Danny Cullenward and David Victor document in *Making Climate Policy Work* (2020), polycentric climate governance overwhelmingly relies on market-based flexibilities, decentralized certifications, and voluntary pledges that are easily co-opted by corporate and bureaucratic elites. Lacking centralized, independent coercive verification, decentralized compliance markets degenerate into the manufacture of fictitious paper assets[24].

Because buyers (emitters needing cheap offsets to satisfy nominal legal mandates), sellers (landowners and brokers seeking windfall profits), and registries (private certifiers collecting transaction fees per credit issued) all share an identical financial incentive to maximize the volume of credits issued, the market operates with an inherent bias toward inflated counterfactual baselines and non-additional credits[24]. The polycentric model creates a massive apparatus of public relations and technocratic paperwork that projects the appearance of environmental stewardship while shielding underlying fossil fuel consumption from physical curtailment[24].

4. Atmospheric Scale Mismatch and the Collapse of Ostrom's Principles

Paul C. Stern (2011) and Eduardo Araral (2014) systematically dissect the limits of Ostrom's core design principles when extended to the planetary scale[5]:

- *Design Principle 1 (Clear Boundaries)*: Completely broken. The atmosphere is an undivided, turbulent fluid dynamic sink; neither the resource perimeter nor the community of appropriators can be physically bounded[5].
- *Design Principle 4 (Accountable Monitoring)*: Broken. In local commons, appropriators directly monitor each other's physical resource extraction at minimal cost[7]. At planetary scale, monitoring requires orbital multispectral satellite constellations, global algorithmic processing, and complex international registries, all of which are mediated by distant technocratic institutions vulnerable to geopolitical censorship and corporate influence[7].
- *Design Principle 5 (Graduated Sanctions)*: Broken. There exists no supranational authority empowered to levy enforceable, graduated sanctions against a recalcitrant nuclear-armed superpower, an economic hegemon, or a sovereign petrostate[5]. Voluntary polycentricity possesses no mechanism to compel compliance when powerful actors calculate that defiance serves their immediate economic or territorial interests[5].

Critique of the Naturalistic Fallacy and the Romance of the Primitive

Institutional analysis must rigorously reject the romantic presumption that historical, small-scale commons were egalitarian, harmonious ecotopias. Historical ethnographic analysis reveals that traditional common-pool institutions sustained ecological balance not through egalitarian consensus, but through rigid social stratification, coercive social discipline, patriarchal exclusion, and severe xenophobia[38]. In Törbel, population equilibrium was maintained across centuries through high rates of celibacy, institutionalized disenfranchisement of younger siblings (*stem family* inheritance), and the permanent civic exclusion of outsiders (*Hintersassen*), who were prohibited from owning cattle or grazing stock on communal pastures[38].

Similarly, the *Tribunal de las Aguas* of Valencia preserved water distribution through structural asymmetries: water rights were tied strictly to hereditary landownership, excluding tenant farmers and agricultural laborers from institutional voice, while dispute adjudication was backed by the ultimate threat of violent state military enforcement[38]. Local commons were neither inherently good nor democratic; they were fiercely guarded, exclusive cartels engineered to preserve a local resource base against competitors by whatever coercive means were necessary[7].

5. The Top-Rung Imperative: What Nested Polycentricity Needs at the Summit

For a nested polycentric architecture to govern common-pool resources successfully, its internal operational requirements must shift fundamentally as it transitions from lower, face-to-face tiers (household, village, watershed) to the top rung (the planetary scale).

At lower rungs (4 to 50,000 individuals), governance functions through direct inter-subjective trust, social reputation, localized peer monitoring, kin selection, and customary norms[38]. If an individual appropriator in a village or irrigation canal steals water or pastures excess cattle, the

community detects the infraction directly through sensory observation, shames the violator, and imposes graduated fines or resource exclusions enforced by community consensus[38]. Crucially, lower-rung commons do not operate in a legal vacuum: they are historically embedded within an external political architecture (such as canton statutes, imperial charters, or state court systems) that serves as an external guarantor of last resort, validating their bylaws and quelling violent uprisings[1].

At the planetary rung (8 billion people), this entire foundation disappears:

- *Social capital, kinship, and reputational shame are entirely non-functional.* Actors are abstract geopolitical entities, sovereign nation-states, multinational corporate cartels, and distant municipal populations operating across profound cultural, ideological, and wealth chasms[7].
- *There is no external Leviathan or third-party guarantor.* The planetary tier is the absolute terminal ceiling of human governance; there is no higher sovereign to enforce contracts, protect whistleblowers, or suppress defection[19].
- *Biophysical feedback loops are decoupled from individual appropriations.* An industrial region burning coal experiences no immediate local collapse of atmospheric physics; the thermodynamic impacts are dispersed globally across decades, striking vulnerable populations who have no jurisdictional voice over the polluter[5].

Therefore, to avoid systemic collapse into free-riding, greenwashing, and fragmentation, a nested polycentric architecture requires three structural components at the top rung that are absent and unnecessary at lower tiers:

1. *Enforceable, Non-Negotiable Biophysical Caps (Planetary Boundary Constitutions)*: Unlike localized CPRs where appropriation rules can remain flexible, adaptive, and negotiated season-by-season, the planetary top rung requires absolute, non-tradable biophysical ceilings anchored in the physics of the Earth system[50]. These limits cannot permit counterfactual offsets, flexible baseline calculations, or voluntary target resetting[24].
2. *Asymmetric Economic Club Sanctions (Nordhaus Club Mechanics)*: Because global sovereign participation cannot be achieved through moral suasion, the top rung must operate via exclusive club dynamics backed by external trade penalties[36]. A coalition of participating jurisdictions must establish a common internal carbon price or resource cap while levying a mandatory, uniform external tariff (e.g., a 10% to 20% border penalty) on all imports from non-participating, defecting jurisdictions, regardless of the commodity[36]. This converts the open-access planetary public good into an excludable club good, providing a self-enforcing incentive for non-members to join and comply[35].
3. *Non-Self-Reported Physical Verification and Coercive Disinvestment*: The top tier requires sensory and observational verification systems completely decoupled from self-reported jurisdictional data[20]. Just as the Montreal Protocol successfully deployed the Scientific and Economic Assessment Panels and global atmospheric sampling to pinpoint illicit CFC manufacturing, a planetary regime requires direct atmospheric, oceanic, and orbital telemetry that detects physical violations in real time, triggering automatic institutional mechanisms: trade exclusion, financial asset freezes, and

revocation of transnational navigational access[26].

4. *Agreed Incremental Cost Redistribution (The Montreal Multilateral Model)*: Universal compliance cannot occur across radical inequality without institutionalized financial compensation[33]. The top rung must possess an automated capital redistribution mechanism (analogous to the Multilateral Fund) that absorbs the upfront transition costs for resource-poor peripheral regions, depriving developing-world elites of the economic justification for regulatory defection[33].

6. Synthesis Matrix: The Triangulation of Claims

To maintain scientific objectivity, institutional analysis must rigorously differentiate three distinct epistemological layers: what the creators and advocates of an arrangement claim it achieves (*Internal Rhetoric*), what the empirical and historical archives demonstrate occurred (*Material Record*), and how contemporary peer-reviewed scholarship theorizes the underlying mechanics (*Modern Scholarly Consensus*). The table below details this triangulation across all major arrangements analyzed:

Governance System	Internal Participant Rhetoric (What They Said It Did)	Material Historical Record (What It Actually Did)	Modern Scholarly Consensus (What Scholarship Infers)
Ostrom's Polycentric Climate System	A distributed polycentric architecture unleashes spontaneous local innovation, accelerates mutual learning, engenders trust, and aggregates local actions to solve global climate change[9].	Aggregate planetary greenhouse gas emissions rose by over 40% from the 1990 baseline; subnational and transnational initiatives represent an uncoordinated patchwork with negligible global abatement impact[15].	Polycentricity functions effectively for localized, subtractable CPRs with direct co-benefits, but structurally fails at the global scale due to atmospheric scale mismatch, free-riding, and absence of coercive sanctions[5].
C40 and Covenant of Mayors	Dynamic, bottom-up coalitions of world mayors driving deep decarbonization,	High attrition (>67% failed to monitor/report in CoM)[20]; severe selection bias favoring wealthy	Functions primarily as a reputational platform and horizontal network for municipal elites, providing symbolic

	achieving 20% to 40% emissions reductions years ahead of inert national governments[14].	tertiary cities; emissions reductions largely mirror national grid decarbonization and Scope 3 offloading[18].	legitimation while possessing negligible autonomous capacity to curb aggregate emissions[18].
California Forest Offsets (CARB)	Rigorous, scientifically verified market incentives that compensate landowners for storing atmospheric carbon for 100 years, providing lowest-cost compliance for industrial entities[24].	Generated 39M phantom carbon credits ($410M value) via adverse baseline selection; allocated 100-year risk to an undercapitalized buffer pool fully depleted by wildfire within a single decade[24].	Constitutes a regulatory capture loop that manufactures paper compliance assets to permit continued point-source fossil combustion, transferring financial capital to timber managers while shifting climate risk to the biosphere[24].
The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)	Flexible financial mechanism channeling clean technology investments to developing nations, reducing industrial emissions at minimal global economic cost[26].	Chemical plants intentionally expanded production of HCFC-22 to maximize HFC-23 byproducts, harvesting hundreds of millions in CERs; collapsed when EU banned industrial gas credits in 2013[26].	Market flexibilities unanchored from physical caps create predatory rent-seeking loops; rational economic actors optimize for subsidy extraction rather than ecological protection[29].
The Montreal Protocol	A harmonious model of international cooperation,	Universal compliance was enforced through trade embargoes	Succeeded not through polycentric benevolence, but through Barrett's

	diplomatic solidarity, and voluntary scientific consensus that saved the Earth's ozone layer[33].	against non-parties (Article 4), massive side-payments (Multilateral Fund), and commercial market manipulation by corporate chemical monopolists[33].	self-enforcing game architecture: economic coercion, financial redistribution of incremental costs, and corporate profit alignment[33].
Törbel Alpine Pastures	A pristine, harmonious traditional mountain village living in ecological equilibrium through ancestral communal wisdom and Christian fellowship[38].	Enforced harsh social stratifications, high rates of involuntary bachelorhood/spinsterhood to control population, strict disenfranchisement of outsiders, and punitive confiscations for infractions[38].	Long-term ecological balance was achieved via the tight mathematical coupling of private winter hay production to communal summer grazing access (*Winterung*), backstopped by cantonal legal authority[6].
Tribunal de las Aguas (Valencia)	An ancient, pure direct democracy of humble peasants resolving water distribution fairly through fraternal solidarity and traditional peasant honor[41].	Dominated by wealthy canal-head proprietors; physical water distribution strictly favored established canal landowners; backed by the threat of violent state intervention and complete economic ruination[38].	Demonstrates institutional resilience through nested subsidiarity: syndics are working farmers directly vulnerable to peer retaliation; dispute resolution is instantaneous, local, public, and oral, minimizing transaction friction[38].

7. Ten-Line Summary of Robust Findings

1. Polycentric governance generates substantial innovation, experimentation, and trust at

local and watershed rungs (150 to 50,000 individuals) where users share direct, subtractable resource dependencies[9].

2. Ostrom's eight design principles do not scale linearly to the planetary atmosphere; non-excludable global public sinks break principles of boundary definition, localized monitoring, and graduated sanctions[5].
3. Spontaneous mutual adjustment in climate governance rarely harmonizes standards upward; without central hierarchies, it produces regulatory arbitrage, competitive races-to-the-bottom, and forum shopping[12].
4. Transnational municipal networks (C40, Covenant of Mayors) suffer from severe participation attrition (>65% non-reporting) and profound selection bias, functioning primarily as prestige-signaling platforms[18].
5. Subnational and global carbon offset markets routinely degrade into baseline manipulation, adverse selection, and non-additional paper compliance (e.g., California's 39M phantom credits, CDM HFC-23 gaming)[24].
6. The Montreal Protocol's planetary success was not achieved via voluntary polycentricity, but through game-theoretic coercion: Article 4 trade sanctions against non-parties, patent monopolies, and fully funded incremental cost transfers[33].
7. Historical long-enduring common-pool institutions (Törbel, Valencia) were strictly bounded, culturally homogenous, socially coercive, and backstopped by external legal charters; they were neither egalitarian nor open-access[7].
8. Earth system science demonstrates that six of nine Planetary Boundaries are already breached; biophysical Earth processes operate via non-linear, irreversible thresholds that cannot be managed by trial-and-error incrementalism[34].
9. Voluntary subnational climate action cannot overcome the mathematics of free-riding; without external border penalties, local mitigation induces carbon leakage to unregulated jurisdictions[28].
10. At the planetary rung, a nested polycentric system requires three non-local mechanisms: non-negotiable biophysical caps, external club trade sanctions (tariffs on non-participants), and non-self-reported sensory verification[35].

8. Contested and Open Questions

1. *The Viability of Unilateral Climate Clubs Under International Law*: Can a coalition of high-ambition jurisdictions legally enforce uniform border tariff penalties on non-members without triggering retaliatory trade wars or violating WTO non-discrimination mandates[36]?
2. *Decentralized Verification Without Orbital Telemetry*: If high-technology satellite constellations and digital communication networks collapse, how can a planetary or continental polycentric confederation detect ecological transgressions (such as upstream river diversions or industrial gas emissions) across vast geographical distances?
3. *The Boundary Definition of "Novel Entities"*: Can a precise, quantifiable operational boundary threshold be formulated for hundreds of thousands of synthetic

anthropogenic chemicals, microplastics, and recombinant organisms before systemic, irreversible ecospheric collapse occurs[52]?

4. *Distributional Justice in Planetary Ceilings*: How can absolute physical carbon and resource budgets be allocated between post-industrial nations (historically responsible for biophysical overshoot) and developing regions (facing severe socio-economic shortfalls within the Doughnut) without triggering institutional breakdown[48]?
5. *Scale Limits of Direct Democratic Monitoring*: What is the precise demographic breakpoint at which direct, face-to-face oral monitoring of commons (as in the Valencian *Tribunal*) inevitably degenerates into bureaucratic hierarchy, professionalized rent-seeking, and alienated elite capture[38]?

9. Foundational Literature to Read in Full

- **Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.**
  - *Focus*: The foundational empirical text analyzing self-organizing, long-enduring common-pool resource institutions across centuries; establishes the eight design principles and critiques monolithic centralized and private models[4].
- **Jordan, Andrew, Dave Huitema, Harro van Asselt, and Johanna Forster, eds. (2018). *Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?* Cambridge University Press.**
  - *Focus*: The first comprehensive, multi-author empirical audit of Ostrom's polycentric climate hypothesis; systematically tests the five core propositions against international, transnational, and municipal climate regimes[15].
- **Barrett, Scott (2003). *Environment and Statecraft: The Strategy of Environmental Treaty-Making*. Oxford University Press.**
  - *Focus*: Game-theoretic and institutional analysis of why treaties succeed or fail; details the self-enforcing architecture, trade sanctions, and side-payment mechanics of the Montreal Protocol[33].
- **Richardson, Katherine, Will Steffen, Wolfgang Lucht, Johan Rockström, et al. (2023). "Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries." *Science Advances*, 9(37), eadh2458.**
  - *Focus*: The definitive, fully quantified update of the Planetary Boundaries framework; maps out the empirical status of all nine biophysical boundaries, proving that six are transgressed[50].
- **Cullenward, Danny, and David G. Victor (2020). *Making Climate Policy Work*. Polity Press.**
  - *Focus*: A rigorous critique of market-based polycentric instruments; examines the political economy of carbon pricing, regulatory capture, baseline manipulation, and the systemic failure of offsets[24].
- **Netting, Robert McC. (1981). *Balancing on an Alp: Ecological Change and Continuity in a Swiss Mountain Community*. Cambridge University Press.**
  - *Focus*: Unrivaled historical and demographic ethnography of Törbel, Switzerland; details the mathematical mechanics of the winter cow rule, communal pasture governance, and

long-term socio-ecological balance[37].

- **Glick, Thomas F. (1970). *Irrigation and Society in Medieval Valencia*. Harvard University Press.**
  - *Focus*: The definitive historical and institutional treatise on the *Tribunal de las Aguas* and the irrigation canals of Valencia; documents medieval water laws, syndic election structures, and oral jurisprudence[38].
- **Nordhaus, William (2015). "Climate Clubs: Overcoming Free-riding in International Climate Policy." *American Economic Review*, 105(4), 1339–1370.**
  - *Focus*: Mathematical formulation of why voluntary, polycentric climate architectures inevitably fail due to free-riding; proves the absolute necessity of external uniform trade penalties on non-participants[36].

10. Implementability after the Fall

The following blueprints define the minimum viable governance architectures required to manage common-pool resources following the permanent collapse of industrial supply chains, the national regulatory state, and digital telecommunications.

The Household (4 to 10 people)

The minimum viable structure at the household rung is a cooperative agrarian domestic unit managing an enclosed arable homestead, private seed reserves, draft animals, and winter manure collections. Internal governance relies on lineage authority or an elder council, with labor tasks allocated by physical capacity and age.

To function without external support, the household requires physical demarcation of its allodial plot through dry-stone boundary walls, earthen berms, or hedgerows; an internal lineage memory of seed viability and agricultural preservation techniques; and an operational hearth serving as the symbolic and physical center of domestic authority.

The first failure to expect at this scale is patriarchal authoritarianism, domestic predation, and violent inheritance fractures. When external courts vanish, dominant physical individuals exploit vulnerable kin through uncompensated labor extraction or asset monopolization.

The primary structural countermeasure is the formal marriage contract and bilateral kinship alliances: inheritance, land transfers, and tool access require formal assent from neighboring kin networks, creating an informal horizontal court between allied households that restrains intra-household despotism[61].

The Village (300 people)

The minimum viable structure at the village rung is a self-contained agrarian commune managing subtractable common-pool assets: the perimeter forest (firewood and timber), the communal grazing commons, the village grain mill, and secondary irrigation ditches. Governance operates through a monthly Village Assembly (*Gemeinde*) comprising one designated voting delegate per active hearth[38].

Administrative execution is vested in an elected Village Bailiff (*Alpvogt* or Syndic) assisted by two elected ditch-riders or forest-guards (*veedors*), elected annually with a strict prohibition on consecutive terms[38]. Pasture access is strictly governed via the Törbel *Wintering Rule*: no household may graze more livestock on the common pasture in summer than they can sustain

through the winter using hay harvested from their private meadows[38].
The village requires four absolute operational prerequisites to function:

1. *Functional Literacy*: At least three trusted individuals capable of reading, writing, and transcribing land boundaries and water rotations.
2. *Record-Keeping Technology*: A single physical ledger made of durable calfskin vellum or rag parchment, secured in an iron three-lock chest requiring three separate keyholders (the Bailiff, the Parish Elder, and the senior Miller) to open simultaneously. In the absence of vellum, split wooden tally sticks (*stafe*) recording debt, grain allocations, and grazing days, split lengthwise between the bailiff and the household head.
3. *Shared Calendar*: A standardized solar calendar tracking the equinoxes, solstices, and phenological seasons, anchored by the physical ringing of a communal bell to demarcate rotational water shifts (*tandas*)[38].
4. *Physical Meeting Place*: A neutral, weather-sheltered moot space (a stone tithe barn, a covered council porch outside the church, or a designated sacred oak circle) capable of holding 150 adults simultaneously.

The first failure to expect at the village scale is upstream water siphoning, clandestine forest encroachment, and usurious debt foreclosures. Prosperous households possessing lands nearest to the springhead or irrigation ditch will divert water at night or cut prime timber within the common perimeter, attempting to convert communal forest into private charcoal for barter[38].
The structural countermeasure is rotational night surveillance and the split-fine system: watch duty over headgates and forests rotates alphabetically through every village household every seven days; if a guard fails to report an infraction, they absorb the violator's penalty. Violators face immediate, public confiscation of their draft beasts and harvest tools, with half the fine awarded directly to the reporting informant and half deposited into the communal famine storehouse[38].

The District (3,000 people / Watershed Basin)

The minimum viable structure at the district rung is a confederated watershed council uniting 8 to 12 villages situated along a continuous river valley or arable basin, directly modeled on the Plain of Valencia or Swiss valley federations[38]. The district maintains no standing bureaucracy. It is governed by a bi-weekly Watershed Tribunal (*Tribunal de la Ribera*) composed of the elected syndics of each constituent village, assembling outdoors at a central, accessible boundary point (such as a river bridge or ruined municipal weir)[38]. The Tribunal possesses zero authority over internal village customs, functioning solely to adjudicate inter-village disputes, maintain the main river diversion weirs, enforce downstream flow rights, and coordinate collective defense[43].
The district requires four operational prerequisites:

1. *Surveying and Physical Gauging Technology*: Standardized physical water gauges—carved stone depth notches along weir walls—to establish proportional water flows during drought without complex mathematical calculations.
2. *District River Rolls*: A durable geographical scroll detailing the historic order of water extraction (*tanda*) for each village along the main channel[38].

3. *Shared Temporal Accord*: Synchronized timekeeping across villages via sun-dials calibrated to solar noon, or signal horns sounded from elevated ridgeline towers.
4. *Neutral Conclave Ground*: A demilitarized, recognized moot site outside the private defensive perimeter of any single village.

The first failure to expect at the district scale is upstream village mercantilism, headgate blockade, and water piracy. The most upstream village, possessing physical control over the mountain diversion weir, will choke off downstream flow during summer drought to irrigate its own secondary meadows, weaponizing geography against downstream communities[38].
The structural countermeasure is downstream coalition embargoes and the hostage syndic protocol: downstream villages form a collective mutual defense pact; upstream water closure triggers an immediate, total trade embargo (cutting off salt, iron, lime, or lowland grain supplies) and the right to demolish upstream weirs with a combined district militia. To prevent unprovoked weir destruction, the upstream village must maintain an alternating hostage-delegate residing in a downstream village during the four peak months of summer drought.

11. Principles

1. Polycentric governance succeeds only when the spatial perimeter of the physical resource aligns directly with the boundary of the decision-making user community[7].
2. A non-excludable global public sink cannot be sustainably managed through voluntary, uncoordinated local initiatives[5].
3. Without coercive centralized monitoring, distributed carbon markets mathematically incentivize the creation of fraudulent, non-additional paper baselines[24].
4. Mutual adjustment among autonomous units generates regulatory fragmentation and competitive races-to-the-bottom unless bounded by non-negotiable overarching rules[12].
5. An environmental agreement governing a global commons is stable only if it incorporates asymmetric economic penalties that make non-participation more costly than accession[33].
6. The long-term stability of a common-pool resource requires that individual appropriation rights remain strictly proportioned to verifiable private provision obligations[6].
7. Informal social trust operates as an effective compliance mechanism only within sensory, face-to-face scales comprising fewer than 1,500 individuals[7].
8. Institutions that rely on self-reported environmental compliance inevitably suffer from severe participation attrition and symbolic greenwashing[20].
9. Executive commons administrators must be active appropriators whose own economic livelihood is directly exposed to the rules they enforce[38].
10. The speed of institutional trial-and-error adaptation is structurally incapable of managing non-linear biophysical Earth system tipping points[48].

Works cited

1. Polycentric Climate Governance: The State, Local Action,

https://direct.mit.edu/glep/article/24/3/24/122703/Polycentric-Climate-Governance-The-State-Local
2. Polycentricity and adaptive governance, https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstreams/db68c7b9-49f7-4e50-9be8-06494ee6a3c2/download
3. Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action? - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325012902_Governing_Climate_Change_Polycentricity_in_Action
4. INSTITUTIONS AND THE ENVIRONMENT - Beyond Ostrom, https://beyondostrom.blog.rosalux.de/files/2013/10/Governance-Ostrom-Adaptive-MLG.pdf
5. The tragedy of the commons revisited: Hardin meets Ostrom, https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstreams/fff535c6-078b-4789-b081-0d4a6b39762a/download
6. Download - Digital Library of the Commons, https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstreams/83e8e13c-7132-41f5-b9a3-f089a4559429/download
7. Analysis of the Potentials of Blockchain for the Governance of Global, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/blockchain/articles/10.3389/fbloc.2021.577680/full
8. The Missing Ingredients for a Polycentric Governance System of, https://direct.mit.edu/glep/article/25/2/1/128618/The-Missing-Ingredients-for-a-Polycentric
9. Polycentric Systems For Coping With Collective Action and Global, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220041593_Polycentric_Systems_For_Coping_With_Collective_Action_and_Global_Environmental_Change
10. Glenn Edney - Publications - Resilience Alliance - Publications, https://www.resalliance.org/publications/1166
11. A polycentric approach for coping with climate change (English), https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/480171468315567893
12. Governing Climate Change Polycentrically (Chapter 1), https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/governing-climate-change/governing-climate-change-polycentrically/E9BF8AE4BE6E5F16445EB86CBCB7C964
13. Polycentric governance and climate change - DSpace Repository, https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstreams/09328b6c-da06-408c-9e65-784ff2847bdd/download
14. Climate Emergency Urban Opportunity Report, https://urbantransitions.global/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Climate-Emergency-Urban-Opportunity-report.pdf
15. Governing-Climate-Change-Polycentricity-in-Action ... - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew-Jordan-13/publication/325012902_Governing_Climate_Change_Polycentricity_in_Action/links/5af188da0f7e9ba366456ed8/Governing-Climate-Change-Polycentricity-in-Action.pdf
16. Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action? By Andrew,

https://scispace.com/pdf/governing-climate-change-polycentricity-in-action-by-andrew-49jjgddng2.pdf
17. GOVERNING CLIMATE CHANGE - ANU Open research repository, https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstreams/345c55ea-9c5f-4bca-8638-1cbe1b138a73/download
18. Unpacking Polycentric Climate Governance: Tracing the Evolution of, https://leibniz-irs.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Regionalgespraech/Regional_58/Handouts/IRS_Unpacking_Polycentric_Climate.pdf
19. Polycentric Governance - WUR eDepot, https://edepot.wur.nl/641633
20. (PDF) Covenant of Mayors 2020: Drivers and barriers for monitoring, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356979480_Covenant_of_Mayors_2020_Drivers_and_barriers_for_monitoring_climate_action_plans
21. Shaping Europe's sustainable energy policy: what the first decade of, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14786451.2025.2527086
22. Performance determinants show European cities are delivering on, https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/concern/articles/n009wf15p
23. Approaches, impacts and challenges in ten C40 cities - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305460250_Innovative_policy_practices_to_advance_building_energy_efficiency_and_retrofitting_Approaches_impacts_and_challenges_in_ten_C40_cities
24. (PDF) Systematic over-crediting in California's forest carbon offsets, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355497905_Systematic_over-crediting_in_California's_forest_carbon_offsets_program
25. Carbon Offsets - California Environmental Protection Agency, https://calepa.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2022_01_13_IEMAC_Report_carbon_offsets_chapter_a-1.pdf
26. Unchecked: The fluorochemical industry's scandalous HFC-23 by, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389167712_Unchecked_The_fluorochemical_industry's_scandalous_HFC-23_by-product_emissions_amid_the_climate_crisis
27. Comprehensive review of carbon quantification by improved forest, https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/SB008_call_for_input_annotations_Berkeley%20Carbon%20Trading%20Project_reveiw.pdf
28. California's forest carbon offsets buffer pool is severely ... - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/forests-and-global-change/articles/10.3389/ffgc.2022.930426/full
29. Corruption for dinner anyone? The Carbon Market HFC-23 Scandal, https://joannenova.com.au/2010/08/corruption-for-dinner-anyone-the-carbon-market-scandal/
30. Governing Cooperative Approaches Under the Paris Agreement, https://ceepr.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/2018-017.pdf
31. The effectiveness of international climate finance in enabling low, https://www.zora.uzh.ch/server/api/core/bitstreams/fd038962-5a0e-478d-b357-6f9571a01346/content
32. Ground Truth: An Assessment of Forest Carbon Credit Protocols,

https://www.forestcarbonprotocols.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Forest-Carbon-Credit-Protocols-Assessment-Report.pdf
33. Reengineering the Climate Regime - RFF.org, https://www.rff.org/documents/959/RFF-DP-06-48-REV.pdf
34. All planetary boundaries mapped out for the first time, six of nine, https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/research-news/2023-09-13-all-planetary-boundaries-mapped-out-for-the-first-time-six-of-nine-crossed.html
35. Multilateral Environmental Agreements: From Montreal to Kyoto, https://digitalcommons.du.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1254&context=djilp
36. Robustness over efficiency: a design principle for climate policy, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3727642_1/component/file_3727643/content
37. A farewell to the market! Constructing a Carolingian subsistence, https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/propylaeumdok/3984/1/Meier_A_farewell_2011.pdf
38. Analyzing long-enduring CPRs, https://faculty.washington.edu/stevehar/GtC3.pdf
39. Writing women's history: international perspectives 9780333541616, https://dokumen.pub/writing-womens-history-international-perspectives-9780333541616-9780333541609.html
40. EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE, GEOGRAPHIC, https://editorial.tirant.com/free_ebooks/E000020005504.pdf
41. GOVERNING theCOMMONS, https://ia802902.us.archive.org/8/items/governingthecommons/Governing%20the%20Commons.pdf
42. Convivencia and Medieval Spain: Essays in Honor of Thomas F, https://dokumen.pub/convivencia-and-medieval-spain-essays-in-honor-of-thomas-f-glick-mediterranean-perspectives-3319964801-9783319964805.html
43. convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, https://www.cultura.gob.es/dam/jcr:1c71b40b-57b8-4345-b69e-05cfd253f6ea/01612-en.pdf
44. The Central Commission for the Navigation on the Rhine, 1815-1914., https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267314708_'The_Central_Commission_for_the_Navigation_on_the_Rhine_1815-1914'
45. Introduction - Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine, https://www.ccr-zkr.org/11010100-en.html
46. Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine, https://www.chr-khr.org/en/institute/central-commission-navigation-rhine
47. Documents and articles regarding the history of the CCNR, https://www.ccr-zkr.org/11010200-en.html
48. (PDF) Earth System Governance: A Research Framework, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/215962863_Earth_System_Governance_A_Research_Framework
49. Taking Stock and Moving Forward (Chapter 14) - Architectures of, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/architectures-of-earth-system-governance/taking-stock-and-moving-forward/270F8A91E2676FFC147374DB2F60630E
50. (PDF) Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries - ResearchGate,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373948004_Earth_beyond_six_of_nine_planetary_boundaries
51. Planetary boundaries alignment | NSW State of the Environment, https://www.soe.epa.nsw.gov.au/about-the-report/planetary-boundaries-alignment
52. Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries, https://publications.pik-potsdam.de/rest/items/item_28636_2/component/file_28730/content
53. 2023 Revision of the nine planetary boundaries framework, https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/edition-numerique/la-france-face-aux-neuf-limites-planetaires/en/14-2023-revision-of-the-nine
54. Planetary Boundaries: Earth's 9 Safe Operating Limits - GLOBAÏA, https://globaia.org/boundaries/
55. Doughnut Economies in Practice and the Affective Dynamics of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/399996430_Towards_an_Alternative_Economy_Doughnut_Economies_in_Practice_and_the_Affective_Dynamics_of_Change_in_Amsterdam
56. 'Earth system governance' as a crosscutting theme of global change, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222542415_'Earth_system_governance'_as_a_crosscutting_theme_of_global_change_research
57. Transforming governance and institutions for global sustainability, http://www.ask-force.org/web/Regulation/Biermann-Transforming-Governance-Sustainability-2012.pdf
58. Climate Clubs: Overcoming Free-riding in International Climate Policy, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277595450_Climate_Clubs_Overcoming_Free-riding_in_International_Climate_Policy
59. Climate Clubs to Overcome Free-Riding, https://issues.org/climate-clubs-overcome-free-riding-climate-agreement-policy/
60. Can Corporations Fulfil Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/transnational-environmental-law/article/can-corporations-fulfil-greenhouse-gas-emissions-reduction-responsibilities-by-using-carbon-credits/51295C9318FFCA5E1C3408465C770F8E
61. Advantages of Tibetan Fraternal Polyandry | PDF | Marriage - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/543457123/Tibetan-Fraternal-Polyandry-A-Review-of-its-Advantages-and-Break
62. Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?, https://www.earthsystemgovernance.org/publication/governing-climate-change-polycentricity-in-action/
63. Governing climate change: Polycentricity in action?, https://research.vu.nl/en/publications/governing-climate-change-polycentricity-in-action-2/