

Identifying a Safe and Just Corridor for People and the Planet

Johan Rockström, Joyeeta Gupta, Timothy M. Lenton, Dahe Qin, Steven J. Lade ET AL

Abstract

Keeping the Earth system in a stable and resilient state, to safeguard Earth's life support systems while ensuring that Earth's benefits, risks, and related responsibilities are equitably shared, constitutes the grand challenge for human development in the Anthropocene. Here, we describe a framework that the recently formed Earth Commission will use to define and quantify target ranges for a “safe and just corridor” that meets these goals. Although “safe” and “just” Earth system targets are interrelated, we see safe as primarily referring to a stable Earth system and just targets as being associated with meeting human needs and reducing exposure to risks. To align safe and just dimensions, we propose to address the equity dimensions of each safe target for Earth system regulating systems and processes. The more stringent of the safe or just target ranges then defines the corridor. Identifying levers of social transformation aimed at meeting the safe and just targets and challenges associated with translating the corridor to actors at multiple scales present scope for future work.



Photo by [Neil Thomas](#) on [Unsplash](#)

Plain Language Summary

For the first time in human history, we are now forced to consider the real risk of destabilising our home, planet Earth. This is an existential risk, as we all need a planet that can sustain life and provide the basis for the well-being of all people. Here, we outline a conceptual framework for a global-scale “safe and just corridor” that delivers on these goals

for people and the planet. The recently formed Earth Commission will use this framework to map key functions that regulate the state of the Earth system and provide life support to us humans, including processes such as biodiversity and nutrient cycling. It will also analyse the related justice components, for each of these Earth system target domains, in terms of how such ranges can be defined and how nature's contributions to people can be justly shared. Furthermore, social transformations that meet safe and just targets for all people and how the global-scale targets can be translated to targets for actors at other scales will be explored.

Introduction

Human development depends on safeguarding the stability of the planet (Steffen et al., 2018¹; Xu et al., 2020²). Current human activities, especially of high consuming wealthy societies, are threatening the stability of Earth's life support systems and its capacity to support our future well-being in the Anthropocene (Steffen, Broadgate, et al., 2015³). Simultaneously, key human development needs remain, including attaining the UN Sustainable Development Goals for all by 2030, and ensuring continued human well-being for a world population of possibly 10 billion people in 2050. Addressing these challenges requires a full integration of people's lives and the planet's stability.

Critical to achieving a full integration of 'safe' and 'just' is to scientifically assess a safe and just corridor for human development on Earth (Figure 1), which we define as follows:

"Safe Earth system targets are those where biophysical stability of the Earth system is maintained and enhanced over time, thereby safeguarding its functions and ability to support humans and all other living organisms."

"Just Earth system targets are those where nature's benefits, risks, and related responsibilities are equitably shared among all human beings in the world."

"A safe and just corridor for people and the planet is where safe and just Earth system target ranges overlap."

This corridor bounds pathways of future human development that are both safe and just over time. This safe and just corridor will provide high-level "outcome" goals and the context for companies, cities, governments, and other actors who want to take action by operationalising scientifically guided sustainability in their ventures (Andersen et al., 2020⁴). Safe and just also implies that the Earth's natural resources, such as budgets for carbon, nutrients, water, and land, are finite (defined by safety) and have to be shared between people and with nature.

¹ ↪ Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., et al. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth system in the anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **115**(33), 8252–8259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115>

² ↪ Xu, C., Kohler, T. A., Lenton, T. M., Svenning, J.-C., & Scheffer, M. (2020). Future of the human climate niche. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **117**, 11350. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910114117>

³ ↪ Steffen, W., Broadgate, W., Deutsch, L., Gaffney, O., & Ludwig, C. (2015). The trajectory of the Anthropocene: The great acceleration. *The Anthropocene Review*, **2**(1), 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019614564785>

⁴ ↪ Andersen, I., Ishii, N., Brooks, T., Cummis, C., Fonseca, G., Hillers, A., et al. (2020). Defining "Science-based targets". *National Science Review*, nwaa186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwaa186>




Figure 1: The challenge: To define, and navigate toward, a safe and just future for people and the planet.

We use target in the general sense of a measurable goal or objective, such as the target to limit climate change to “well below 2°C” (UNFCCC, 2015⁵; Xu & Ramanathan, 2017⁶), and target range to emphasise both (i) the uncertainty in science for both safe and just target setting, and (ii) our goal of synthesising a range of safe and just conditions rather than prescribing any specific solution. We distinguish between scientific Earth system targets, targets at the global or near-global scale that are generated primarily by scientific inquiry but may be informed by societal judgments about risks (Pickering & Persson, 2020⁷), and science-based targets, targets for actors that are aligned with scientific evidence but which may involve negotiations based on responsibility and feasibility (Andersen et al., 2020⁸). Hence, practical downscaling of global scientific targets to specific science-based targets for different actors is beyond the scope of this study.

⁵ ↪ UNFCCC. (2015). *Adoption of the Paris agreement*. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev1. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09r01.pdf>

⁶ ↪ Xu, Y., & Ramanathan, V. (2017). Well below 2°C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **114**(39), 10315–10323. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618481114>

⁷ ↪ Pickering, J., & Persson, Å. (2020). Democratising planetary boundaries: Experts, social values and deliberative risk evaluation in Earth system governance. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, **22**(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2019.1661233>

⁸ ↪ Andersen, I., Ishii, N., Brooks, T., Cummis, C., Fonseca, G., Hillers, A., et al. (2020). Defining “Science-based targets”. *National Science Review*, nwaa186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwaa186>

Previous frameworks, such as the planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009⁹) and donut economics

How biophysically “safe” targets can be achieved while also meeting goals for human well-being and justice is difficult to explore in such frameworks.

(Raworth, 2018¹⁰), have advanced our understanding of safe ceilings on human disruptions of the Earth system and just foundations for human access to natural resources. These frameworks, however, do not fully integrate safe and just, representing them with different dimensions (Earth system processes

vs. social goals) and incomparable variables. How biophysically “safe” targets can be achieved while also meeting goals for human well-being and justice is difficult to explore in such frameworks, for example, determining a safe and just allocation of land for food production.

Furthermore, these prior frameworks explicitly incorporate neither sub-global scales (Dearing et al., 2014¹¹), interactions and feedbacks between variables (Lade et al., 2020¹²), nor potential trade-offs between planetary targets and development and equity (Biermann & Kim, 2020¹³; Pickering & Persson, 2020¹⁴). An integrated framework is needed that aligns safe and just Earth system variables while also accounting for sub-global scales and interactions between Earth system processes. We now expand on the motivation, definition, and challenges associated with our proposal of an integrated safe and just corridor.

Defining Safe Earth System Targets

We are now experiencing rapid global changes due to human pressures in the Anthropocene, likely exceeding ‘safe’

Species extinction rates are tens to hundreds of times higher than they were on average over the last 10 million years; we have the highest atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases in the last 3 million years, (in the Quaternary global mean temperatures never exceeded 2°C of global warming); nine tipping elements that regulate the state of the Earth system have known tipping points that show worrying signs of destabilisation; and we have widespread pollution of air and water through our use of minerals, chemicals, and novel substances. The frequency of spillover of zoonotic diseases from animals to humans has increased, manifested in the COVID-19 pandemic.

levels in several dimensions. Species extinction rates are tens to hundreds of times higher than they were on average over the last 10 million years with an average of 68% decline in wild animal populations since just the 1970s (WWF, 2020¹⁵); we have the highest atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases in the last 3 million years, a geological period (the Quaternary) when global mean temperatures never exceeded 2°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels (Steffen et al., 2018¹⁶); nine tipping elements that regulate the state of the Earth system have known tipping points that show worrying signs

⁹ ↪ Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., et al. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, **461**(7263), 472–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/461472a>

¹⁰ ↪ Raworth, K. (2018). Donut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist. Random House Business.

¹¹ ↪ Dearing, J. A., Wang, R., Zhang, K., Dyke, J. G., Haberl, H., Hossain, M. S., et al. (2014). Safe and just operating spaces for regional social-ecological systems. *Global Environmental Change*, **28**, 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.06.012>

¹² ↪ Lade, S. J., Steffen, W., de Vries, W., Carpenter, S. R., Donges, J. F., Gerten, D., et al. (2020). Human impacts on planetary boundaries amplified by Earth system interactions. *Nature Sustainability*, **3**(2), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0454-4>

¹³ ↪ Biermann, F., & Kim, R. E. (2020). The boundaries of the planetary boundary framework: A critical appraisal of approaches to define a “safe operating space” for humanity. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **45**, 497–521. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-080337>

¹⁴ ↪ Pickering, J., & Persson, Å. (2020). Democratising planetary boundaries: Experts, social values and deliberative risk evaluation in Earth system governance. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, **22**(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2019.1661233>

¹⁵ ↪ WWF (2020). In R. E. A. Almond, M. Grooten, & T. Petersen (Eds.), Eds., *Living planet report 2020 – Bending the curve of biodiversity loss*. WWF.

¹⁶ ↪ Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., et al. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth system in the anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **115**(33), 8252–8259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115>

of destabilisation (Lenton et al., 2019¹⁷); and we have widespread pollution of air and water through our use of minerals, chemicals, and novel substances. The frequency of spillover of zoonotic diseases from animals to humans has increased (Karesh et al., 2012¹⁸), most recently manifested in the COVID-19 pandemic, with zoonotic host diversity rising with human degradation of natural habitats (Gibb et al., 2020¹⁹). There is an urgent need to define the safe targets for a stable Earth system, where risks of human-triggered irreversible changes and crossing of tipping points (Lenton et al., 2019²⁰) are avoided.

The scientific community has provided evidence-based targets to avoid dangerous climate change (Hoegh-Guldberg

It is crucial to establish the key feedbacks regulating, or destabilising, each safety variable, and how they interact on different timescales.

et al., 2018²¹) or loss of biodiversity and its contributions to people (IPBES, 2019²²): for example, the “safe” climate target of holding global mean temperature rise well below 2°C (aiming at 1.5°C) above pre-industrial levels (UNFCCC, 2015²³). “Safe” targets are needed for the other vital processes and systems that regulate the state of the planet—including

the appropriate allocation and configuration of land use, the health of the oceans, and the global cycling of nitrogen, phosphorus, and water that supports life.

Identifying safe ranges for these systems in isolation, for example as the planetary boundary framework has done

Only within a Holocene-like inter-glacial climate can we be certain that Earth can continue to support human development. There is no evidence that billions of humans and complex societies can thrive in other known climates, such as the glacial ice age or Hothouse Earth.

(Rockström et al., 2009²⁴; Steffen, Richardson, et al., 2015²⁵), will not be enough to describe a safe corridor. The complex interactions and feedbacks among Earth system processes must be considered and can make a corridor much narrower (Lade et al., 2020²⁶). It is crucial to establish the key feedbacks regulating, or destabilising, each safety variable, and how they interact on different timescales. To quantitatively assess and combine these feedbacks, an established but under-used approach of calculating and combining

¹⁷ ↪ Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2019). Climate tipping points – Too risky to bet against. *Nature*, **575**, 592–595. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0>

¹⁸ ↪ Karesh, W. B., Dobson, A., Lloyd-Smith, J. O., Lubroth, J., Dixon, M. A., Bennett, M., et al. (2012). Ecology of zoonoses: Natural and unnatural histories. *The Lancet*, **380**(9857), 1936–1945. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61678-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61678-X)

¹⁹ ↪ Gibb, R., Redding, D. W., Chin, K. Q., Donnelly, C. A., Blackburn, T. M., Newbold, T., & Jones, K. E. (2020). Zoonotic host diversity increases in human-dominated ecosystems. *Nature*, **584**(7821), 398–402. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2562-8>

²⁰ ↪ Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2019). Climate tipping points – Too risky to bet against. *Nature*, **575**, 592–595. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0>

²¹ ↪ Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Jacob, D., Bindi, M., Brown, S., Camilloni, I., Diedhiou, A., et al. (2018). Impacts of 1.5°C global warming on natural and human systems. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P. R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M. I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, & T. Waterfield (Eds.), Eds., *Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*.

²² ↪ IPBES. (2019). In S. Díaz, J. Settele, E. S. Brondízio, H. T. Ngo, M. Guèze, J. Agard, et al. (Eds.), *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. IPBES Secretariat.

²³ ↪ UNFCCC. (2015). *Adoption of the Paris agreement*. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev1. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09r01.pdf>

²⁴ ↪ Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., et al. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, **461**(7263), 472–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/461472a>

²⁵ ↪ Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., et al. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, **347**(6223), 1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>

²⁶ ↪ Lade, S. J., Steffen, W., de Vries, W., Carpenter, S. R., Donges, J. F., Gerten, D., et al. (2020). Human impacts on planetary boundaries amplified by Earth system interactions. *Nature Sustainability*, **3**(2), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0454-4>

feedback “gain” factors (Lashof, 1989²⁷) can provide a useful framework. This framework needs to be fed with information on key relationships from running Earth system and integrated assessment models, including “off-line” model coupling (using the outputs of one as inputs to the other) to relate safety variables that are in separate models. Setting “safe” targets also need to account for timescales in the Earth system, for example, incorporating the change to future states of the Earth system committed by pressures now. And, the Earth system interactions may mean the safe corridor changes over time.

A useful reference Earth system state for defining safe targets is the Holocene, which began around 11,700 years ago. The Holocene's relatively stable climate, together with its configurations of biogeochemical cycling, and nature's contributions to people, have enabled extraordinary human development—from multiple independent origins of agriculture to increasingly integrated complex cities, economies, energy, agricultural, and communication systems. Only within a Holocene-like inter-glacial climate can we be certain that Earth can continue to support human development (Steffen et al., 2018²⁸). There is no evidence that billions of humans and complex societies can thrive in other known climates, such as the glacial ice age or Hothouse Earth (Steffen et al., 2018²⁹).

Integrating Justice in Earth System Targets

Human choices and actions could narrow or widen the safe and just corridor for human development. Considering the

An “unsafe” world is likely to increase inequality, so “safe” would seem a necessary pre-condition for “just”—but not always a sufficient one.

complex interactions, feedbacks, and non-linearities within and between societal activities and Earth system behaviour, we need to advance beyond previous frameworks such as the “donut” (Raworth, 2018³⁰) to understand when “safe”

and “just” ranges do and do not overlap.

First, an “unsafe” world is likely to increase inequality, so “safe” would seem a necessary pre-condition for “just”—but not always a sufficient one. A “safe” target from a biophysical perspective may not be adequate to prevent large-scale risks to humans in specific contexts. For example, there are large risks for many human populations even with a 1.5°C climate target (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2018³¹).

Second, a key question is how biophysically “safe” targets can be achieved while also meeting goals for human well-being and justice. For example, meeting the social goals of Agenda 2030 without widespread transformations may lead to crossing safe targets for the biophysical state of the Earth system (Sachs et al., 2019³²). Achieving biophysical targets,

²⁷ ↪ Lashof, D. A. (1989). The dynamic greenhouse: Feedback processes that may influence future concentrations of atmospheric trace gases and climatic change. *Climatic Change*, **14**, 213–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00134964>

²⁸ ↪ Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., et al. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth system in the anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **115**(33), 8252–8259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115>

²⁹ ↪ Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., et al. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth system in the anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **115**(33), 8252–8259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115>

³⁰ ↪ Raworth, K. (2018). Donut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist. Random House Business.

³¹ ↪ Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Jacob, D., Bindi, M., Brown, S., Camilloni, I., Diedhiou, A., et al. (2018). Impacts of 1.5°C global warming on natural and human systems. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skeea, P. R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M. I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, & T. Waterfield (Eds.), Eds., *Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*.

³² ↪ Sachs, J. D., Schmidt-Traub, G., Mazzucato, M., Messner, D., Nakicenovic, N., & Rockström, J. (2019). Six transformations to achieve the sustainable development goals. *Nature Sustainability*, **2**(9), 805–814. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0352-9>

such as 1.5°C for climate or increasing ecosystem protection, can undermine well-being, if, for example, bioenergy competes with food production, or protected areas undermine local livelihoods (Hasegawa et al., 2020³³).

Third, risks of exceeding safe and just targets are amplified for vulnerable people and can affect human health, displace people, and destabilise societies. At the same time, those most negatively impacted by environmental changes are often those who contribute the least environmental impact and have the lowest resilience and capacity to adapt (Gupta et al., 2020³⁴). A quarter of all death and disease is attributable to environmental causes (McClain et al., 2019³⁵). Extreme weather events disproportionately kill or harm the poor, women, the elderly, children, and indigenous people (McClain et al., 2019³⁶). Climate change may displace millions of people particularly in poorer parts of the world (Xu et al., 2020³⁷). The COVID-19 pandemic, linked in part to natural decline and greater human-wildlife contact (Gibb et al., 2020³⁸), has disproportionately affected the more vulnerable (Mesa Vieira et al., 2020³⁹). Their vulnerability is not innate but is often created by societal structures, attitudes, and governance systems that are unjust and do not prioritise well-being for all.

We propose that the stricter of the safe and just target ranges for each variable should define the safe and just corridor (Figure 2). Furthermore, we propose to identify a spread of safe and just targets corresponding to different physical risk tolerances and different understandings of environmental justice. For example, a climate target that is just for all humans could be stricter than a target that avoids most climate tipping points, which in turn could be stricter than a target that is just for only a minority of humans.

*Transforming toward a “just” world
may be a pre-condition for being able to
achieve a “safe” world.*

Levers of Transformation and Challenges of Translation

By identifying safe and just target ranges, the question arises: How can we achieve these targets and live within the corridor? Transforming toward a “just” world may be a pre-condition for being able to achieve a “safe” world. Leverage points to achieve such transformations are essential for governing our commons. They need to be explored from equity, responsibility, and risk sharing, and participatory perspective to be effective (Ostrom et al., 1999⁴⁰) in the increasingly crowded, hyper-connected, turbulent, and high-risk world of the Anthropocene.

³³ ↪ Hasegawa, T., Sands, R. D., Brunelle, T., Cui, Y., Frank, S., Fujimori, S., & Popp, A. (2020). Food security under high bioenergy demand toward long-term climate goals. *Climatic Change*, **163**(3), 1587–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02838-8>

³⁴ ↪ Gupta, J., Scholtens, J., Perch, L., Dankelman, I., Seager, J., Sándor, F., et al. (2020). Re-imagining the driver-pressure-state-impact-response framework from an equity and inclusive development perspective. *Sustainability Science*, **15**(2), 503–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00708-6>

³⁵ ↪ McClain, S. N., McMullen, C. P., Abiodun, B. J., Armiento, G., Bailey, R., Balasubramanian, R., et al. (2019). Cross-cutting Issues. In U. N. Environment (Ed.), Ed., *Global environment outlook – GEO-6: Healthy planet, healthy people* (pp. 74–103). Cambridge University Press.

³⁶ ↪ *ibidem*.

³⁷ ↪ Xu, C., Kohler, T. A., Lenton, T. M., Svenning, J.-C., & Scheffer, M. (2020). Future of the human climate niche. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **117**, 11350. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910114117>

³⁸ ↪ Gibb, R., Redding, D. W., Chin, K. Q., Donnelly, C. A., Blackburn, T. M., Newbold, T., & Jones, K. E. (2020). Zoonotic host diversity increases in human-dominated ecosystems. *Nature*, **584**(7821), 398–402. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2562-8>

³⁹ ↪ Mesa Vieira, C., Franco, O. H., Gómez Restrepo, C., & Abel, T. (2020). COVID-19: The forgotten priorities of the pandemic. *Maturitas*, **136**, 38–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2020.04.004>

⁴⁰ ↪ Ostrom, E., Burger, J., Field, C. B., Norgaard, R. B., & Policansky, D. (1999). Revisiting the commons: Local lessons, global challenges. *Science*, **284**, 278–282. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5412.278>

A key challenge is to identify systems that enable sharing of Earth's limited resources and nature's benefits to ensure human well-being in equitable ways. Agenda 2030 (UNGA, 2015⁴¹) provides a global consensus on key justice principles of access and a starting point for an

Agenda 2030 provides a global consensus on key justice principles of access and a starting point for an analysis of a safe and just corridor that aims to ensure that “no one will be left behind.” But while it calls for reducing inequality, it has yet to set targets relating to how resources and risks should be shared.

analysis of a safe and just corridor that aims to ensure that “no one will be left behind.” But while it calls for reducing inequality, it has yet to set targets relating to how resources and risks should be shared. Although it calls for strengthening the means of implementation, it is unclear how such transformations will actually be leveraged. Learning the lessons regarding equity in sharing resources, rights, responsibilities, and risks is critical (Ensor & Hoddy, 2020⁴²). For example, the evolution of transboundary water law has led to the identification of key criteria for sharing water between nations (UNGA, 1997⁴³). Furthermore, the politics of who gets what, when, where, and how is often determined by those who are more powerful in the system. Rules of access and distribution then become locked-in and difficult to transform. Existing environmental assessments, with a few exceptions (IPBES, 2019⁴⁴), often do not make space to discuss the critical political science and international relations literature with respect to these issues.




Figure 2: Integration of safe and just targets into the corridor. (a) For each biophysical variable, safe and just target ranges are identified. (b) We define the corridor (shaded) as the stricter of the safe and just ranges. In this example, the just range is stricter than the safe range. (c) We propose to identify a spread of safe and just target ranges corresponding to different risk tolerances. The variables and targets shown are strictly examples only.

An independent synthesis of the broader social science literature is needed to map out: which response strategies are most effective in managing not just the symptoms of a problem but its underlying causes; which response strategies match the diversity and evolving nature of societies, cultures, economies, and technologies, and fulfil minimum criteria for ethics, transparency, trust, collaboration, recognition, and inclusive governance; the trade-offs and synergies between different goals and targets; and which actors and levers are most effective in enabling a

⁴¹ ↪ UNGA. (2015). United nations general Assembly resolution 70/1, transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. A/RES/70/1 (21 October 2015)). Retrieved from <http://undocs.org/A/RES/70/1>

⁴² ↪ J., & Hoddy, E. (2020). Securing the social foundation: A rights-based approach to planetary boundaries. *Earth System Governance*. 100086.

⁴³ ↪ UNGA. (1997). The United nations Convention on the Law of the non-navigable uses of international watercourses. (General Assembly resolution 51/229, annex, Official Records of the general Assembly. Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 49 (A/51/49)). Retrieved from https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_3_1997.pdf

⁴⁴ ↪ IPBES. (2019). In S. Díaz, J. Settele, E. S. Brondízio, H. T. Ngo, M. Guèze, J. Agard, et al. (Eds.), Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES Secretariat.

transformation which shares the remaining Earth's resources in a just way, to ensure the continued functioning of Earth system processes for human development.

To put any of these ideas into practice requires the involvement of diverse actors across scales from the local to global (Ostrom et al., 1999⁴⁵). While cross-scale translation is necessary to inform decisions by such actors at sub-global scales, translation is complicated by the spatial heterogeneity of pressures and impacts (Biermann & Kim, 2020⁴⁶) and the value-laden (Biermann & Kalfagianni, 2020⁴⁷; Häyhä et al., 2016⁴⁸) and potentially iterative (Pickering & Persson, 2020⁴⁹) judgments involved in the allocation of these targets. Therefore, a synthesis of the challenges associated with translating global-scale Earth system targets to actors at other scales is needed.

Conclusions

We have introduced a conceptual framework for defining a safe and just corridor for human development in the Anthropocene. The Earth Commission (<https://earthcommission.org/>), convened by Future Earth, is an independent international scientific assessment initiative that will use this framework to conduct a scientific assessment of the safe and just corridor. As part of the Global Commons Alliance (<https://globalcommonsalliance.org/>), the Commission's theory of change includes providing results to the Science-Based Targets Network (SBTN), the Systems Change Lab, and Earth HQ, who jointly will mobilise actors to take appropriate measures. In particular, the Earth Commission's report will be used to underpin the development of science-based targets for business and cities by SBTN.

The Earth Commission now faces the challenge of identifying an integrated safe and just corridor for people on Earth, based on safe and just targets for all Earth system regulating systems and processes such as land, oceans, biodiversity, water, and nutrient cycles (nitrogen and phosphorous). We will then analyse levers of transformation and review methods and challenges associated with translating the safe and just corridor to actors across scales. We see this task as a much-needed advancement of integrated global sustainability research aimed at finding solutions for human development in the Anthropocene. We welcome scientific inputs based on new or existing work from scholars around the world to secure our future on Earth by defining a safe and just corridor and addressing this grand challenge on how to define scientific targets and levers of transformation (please submit through <https://earthcommission.org/contribute/>). Earth system and integrated assessment modelling groups are specifically sought to join in formulating the protocol and running a set of simulations for a new Earth and human system model inter-comparison project.

The present mutually reinforcing crises of climate change, biodiversity decline, and health problems illustrate that this frontier research is overdue. The COVID-19 pandemic shows that many jurisdictions are willing to prioritise health over monetary wealth, even if briefly, opening up transformation lessons for the future.

⁴⁵ ↪ Ostrom, E., Burger, J., Field, C. B., Norgaard, R. B., & Policansky, D. (1999). Revisiting the commons: Local lessons, global challenges. *Science*, **284**, 278–282. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5412.278>

⁴⁶ ↪ Biermann, F., & Kim, R. E. (2020). The boundaries of the planetary boundary framework: A critical appraisal of approaches to define a “safe operating space” for humanity. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **45**, 497–521. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-080337>

⁴⁷ ↪ Biermann, F., & Kalfagianni, A. (2020). Planetary justice: A research framework. *Earth System Governance*, **6**, 100049. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100049>

⁴⁸ ↪ Häyhä, T., Lucas, P. L., van Vuuren, D. P., Cornell, S. E., & Hoff, H. (2016). From Planetary Boundaries to national fair shares of the global safe operating space – How can the scales be bridged? *Global Environmental Change*, **40**, 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.008>

⁴⁹ ↪ Pickering, J., & Persson, Å. (2020). Democratizing planetary boundaries: Experts, social values and deliberative risk evaluation in Earth system governance. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, **22**(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2019.1661233>

Related links:

- The Jus Semper Global Alliance
- Álvaro J. de Regil: [Transitioning to Geocratia the People and Planet and Not the Market Paradigm — First Steps](#)
- Álvaro J. de Regil: [Marketocracy and the Capture of People and Planet](#)
- Álvaro J. de Regil: [COVID-19 and Marketocracy](#)
- John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark: [The Expropriation of Nature](#)
- John Bellamy Foster, Brett Clark and Hannah Holleman: [Capitalism and Robbery](#)
- John Bellamy Foster: [Marxism and Ecology: Common Fonts of a Great Transition](#)
- John Bellamy Foster: [Marx, Value and Nature](#)
- John Bellamy Foster: [Marxism and the Dialectics of Ecology](#)
- John Bellamy Foster: [Capitalism Has Failed — What Next?](#)
- John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark: [The Robbery of Nature](#)
- John Bellamy Foster: [The Contagion of Capital](#)
- John Bellamy Foster, Hannah Holleman and Brett Clark: [Imperialism in the Anthropocene](#)
- Reinhard Olschanski: [After Industrialism: Reviving Nature in the 21st Century](#)
- Erald Kolasi: [Energy, Economic Growth, and Ecological Crisis](#)
- Erald Kolasi: [The Physics of Capitalism](#)
- Ian Angus: [When Did the Anthropocene Begin... and Why Does It Matter?](#)
- Ian Angus: [Facing the Antropocene — An Update](#)
- Paul Burkett: [An Eco-Revolutionary Tipping Point?](#)
- Simon Mair: [Neoliberal economics, planetary health, and the COVID-19 pandemic: a Marxist ecofeminist analysis](#)
- Víctor M. Toledo: [What are we saying when we talk about sustainability?](#)



- ❖ **About Jus Semper:** The Jus Semper Global Alliance aims to contribute to achieving a sustainable ethos of social justice in the world, where all communities live in truly democratic environments that provide full enjoyment of human rights and sustainable living standards in accordance with human dignity. To accomplish this, it contributes to the liberalisation of the democratic institutions of society that have been captured by the owners of the market. With that purpose, it is devoted to research and analysis to provoke the awareness and critical thinking to generate ideas for a transformative vision to materialise the truly democratic and sustainable paradigm of People and Planet and NOT of the market.
- ❖ **About the authors:** [Johan Rockström](#), [Joyeeta Gupta](#), [Timothy M. Lenton](#), [Dahe Qin](#), [Steven J. Lade](#), [Jesse F. Abrams](#), [Lisa Jacobson](#), [Juan C. Rocha](#), [Caroline Zimm](#), [Xuemei Bai](#), [Govindasamy Bala](#), [Stefan Bringezu](#), [Wendy Broadgate](#), [Stuart E. Bunn](#), [Fabrice DeClerck](#), [Kristie L. Ebi](#), [Peng Gong](#), [Chris Gordon](#), [Norichika Kanie](#), [Diana M. Liverman](#), [Nebojsa Nakicenovic](#), [David Obura](#), [Veerabhadran Ramanathan](#), [Peter H. Verburg](#), [Detlef P. van Vuuren](#), [Ricarda Winkelmann](#)
- ❖ **About this Brief:** Identifying a Safe and Just Corridor for People and the Planet was originally published in English by Earth's Future in March 2021. This paper has been published under Creative Commons, CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0. You are welcome to reproduce the material for non-commercial use, [crediting the author and the original publisher](#).
- ❖ **Quote this paper as:** Johan Rockström, Joyeeta Gupta, Timothy M. Lenton, Dahe Qin, Steven J. Lade ET AL — Identifying a Safe and Just Corridor for People and the Planet — The Jus Semper Global Alliance, January 2022.
- ❖ **Tags:** democracy, ecology, climate change, justice, equity, anthropocene, sustainable development, tipping points.
- ❖ The responsibility for opinions expressed in this work rests only with the author(s), and its publication does not necessarily constitute an endorsement by The Jus Semper Global Alliance.



Under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

© 2021. The Jus Semper Global Alliance
Portal on the net: <https://www.jussemper.org/>
e-mail: informa@jussemper.org