university of groningen / campus fryslân

The Success and Failure of Institutions for Future Generations: A Comparative Case Study of Wales and Israel

Timotej Kopča

Global Responsibility and Leadership, University of Groningen

Capstone Bachelor Thesis

Supervisor: Alex Belloir, MA

June 5, 2024

Table of Contents

Abstract

While the idea of considering future generations in present decision making is hardly new, it has traditionally been neglected by governments. However, in recent decades, many countries have experimented with different ways of representing future generations, one of them being representation by independent institutions. Furthermore, research has been conducted to evaluate the success of these different institutions in representing future generations and showed that some are more successful than others. The aim of this thesis is to identify the best practices in order to provide guidelines for the successful establishment of institutions for future generations. To this end, the thesis takes the form of a comparative case study of an institution that has been deemed as the most successful one with an institution that has failed, the former being the Future Generations Commissioner in Wales and the latter being the Commission for Future Generations in Israel. The data was obtained through document analysis and an interview with a person in a senior position from each institution. The main best practices identified include establishing a wide legislative framework, fostering collaboration with public bodies, effectively communicating the institution's relevance and functions, maintaining a broad focus scope while prioritizing resources, ensuring independence, and relying on advisory and investigative powers. Additionally, institutions for future generations such as the ones in Wales and Israel can be adapted to different contexts, using clear communication and neutral language to avoid misconceptions and enhance acceptance.

Introduction

In 1987, as part of the Brundtland Report that developed guiding principles for sustainable development, the United Nations stated that "We act as we do because we can get away with it: future generations do not vote; they have no political or financial power; they cannot challenge our decisions" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p.16). The problem of underrepresentation of future generations is therefore hardly new, however, it has mainly gained traction in recent decades (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). A

salient argument in favor has been that of democratic legitimacy, which postulates that all the parties that will likely be affected by a decision should be able to take part in the decision-making process (Goodin, 2007). The decisions we make today will directly affect future generations, just like we were affected by the decisions of our ancestors. Our choices regarding the use of resources, response to climate change, institutional reforms, or conflicts will heavily impact the state of the world future people will be born into. Thus, their interests should be considered in those decisions. The philosophy of longtermism takes the moral imperative even further and points to the magnitude of future people. The main idea is that it is very likely that the majority of all people that will ever have lived are only yet to be born. Even if *Homo sapiens* survives only as long as a typical species, there are still hundreds of thousands of years for our civilization to thrive. Therefore, out of all the people we can impact with our decisions, most of them are only yet to come and as there will be an enormous number of them, it is of great moral importance to make the world a better place for them (John & MacAskill, 2021).

Whether for reasons of democratic legitimacy, longtermism, or others, a plausible argument in favor of representing future generations appears to be present (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). Even though the real practices of current governments tend to focus on short-term outcomes, which shows the contrast between theory and political reality (John & MacAskill, 2021), there have been increasing attempts at representing future people (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). As of 2021, 41% of constitutions referred to future generations (Araújo & Koessler, 2021). For example, Argentina's constitution requires that the state's "productive activities satisfy current necessities without compromising those of future generations" (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019, p. 4). Additionally, there have been numerous different efforts to represent future people in national institutions, either through representation in parliament or through independent offices. An example of the former being the Finnish Committee for the Future, while an instance of the latter is the Hungarian Parliamentary Commissioner for Future Generations (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019).

Some of the institutions created to represent future generations have been more successful than others. Some have already ceased to exist while others are still functioning. In August of 2023, von Knebel published an extensive cross-country analysis, in which he compared the effectiveness of institutions for future generations. Assessing the institutions on dimensions such as power, impartiality, and longevity, he concluded that the best working institution is the Welsh Future Generations Commissioner. Furthermore, he called for further research into the cases that have failed, such as the Israeli Commission for Future Generations which was discontinued after one term in office. Such research could provide valuable insight into the reasons why these institutions may be abolished. In light of the above, this thesis seeks to build upon von Knebel's (2023) work and the research gap identified and expand on the best and worst practices for institutions for future generations through the knowledge and experience of people involved in such institutions. The main aim is to identify the best and worst practices for the implementation of institutions for future generations, in order to provide guidelines in regards to the establishment of institutions for future generations. To guide us in this endeavour, this thesis poses the following research question: Comparing the institutions of the Future Generations Commissioner in Wales and the Commission for Future Generations in Israel, what are the best practices for the establishment of institutions for future generations?

The data is obtained through conducting a comparative case study of an institution that has been deemed as the most successful one with an institution that has failed according to von Knebel (2023), concretely the Welsh Future Generations Commissioner and the Israeli Commission for Future Generations, which is complemented with data from an interview with a person in a senior position from each institution. The element of the interviews adds a novel dimension as previous research on the workings of institutions for future generations has mainly focused on document analysis. While several suggestions are identified, the research includes limitations such as reliance on notes from an unrecorded interview, a limited number of officials interviewed, and potential translation inaccuracies.

This thesis first presents a literature review of the available materials on representing future generations, political presentism and short-termism, and existing research evaluating future generations institutions. Next, the methodology used is described in detail and the results obtained are presented and discussed. Finally, the limitations and conclusion follow afterwards.

Literature Review

1. The Idea of Representing Future Generations

The idea of consideration of future generations has been around for a long time, embedded in the traditions of many indigenous people. For example, the Iroquois with their notion of the “Seventh Generation Principle”, under which their leaders were motivated to think ahead and consider the future impacts of their decisions (Vecsey & Venables, 1980). However, the considerations here were applied for the coming decades or centuries, while in the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in the idea of taking into account our impact in the millennia to come. Gonzalez and Ricoy (2019) explain two developments that drove this transformation. The first one emerged directly from the ongoing climate change and the discussion of fair allocation of its burdens and benefits that started being prevalent in the 1990s. Gradually, the discourse shape widened and included pondering institutional means of achieving climate justice. Secondly, the discourse on democratic theory has seen a shift in the past two decades toward exploring unconventional forms of representation, including representation of future generations. Several theories and justifications underlying these developments have been proposed.

One view posits that future generations should be represented in current decision-making on the grounds of democratic legitimacy, which commands that all parties that are to be affected by a decision should have a right to take part in the decision-making process (Goodin, 2007). Many of our decisions today will directly or indirectly affect future generations, one of the most notable ones being climate change. The climate governance of today will influence the amount of fossil fuels available for future generations, the sources of energy they

will be able to use, and the climate characteristics and ecosystems they will be born into. Following the logic of democratic legitimacy, they should definitely be represented in those decisions. The topic of climate change ties directly into another view, which states that representing future generations is favored as a means of achieving intergenerational justice resulting from climate change (Lawrence & Kohler, 2018). Under this view, climate change is seen as a serious threat that will put a huge burden on future generations by the present ones if not addressed. Taking into account the interests of future people would avoid this unfair practice.

Another view promoting the representation of future generations is that of longtermism, which, according to MacAskill (2022), stands on three main premises. The first one is that future people count. They are people with feelings, hopes, and aspirations just like us, with the only difference being that they are not alive yet. Additionally, distance in time is similar to distance in space, therefore since people matter even if they are hundreds of kilometers away, they should matter if they are hundreds of years away. Just like the world does not end with our neighborhood or city borders, it does not end with the current generation. The second premise is that there will be an enormous number of people in the future. The exact number is extremely hard to predict, however, even a conservative scenario considering that humans will live only as long as a typical species says that there are eighty trillion people yet to come, outnumbering us ten thousand to one (Macaskill, 2022). Thanks to the specific characteristics of our species, our technology, abstract thinking, and health developments, this number can be much greater. The third premise states what has been mentioned before. Our actions will directly affect future people, leaving them with problems and a worse starting point in the case of irresponsible decision-making, or allowing them to be born into a thriving world by making responsible forward-looking decisions. Combining the three promises gives a strong moral imperative for including future generations in present decision-making (John & MacAskill, 2021).

2. Political Presentism and Short-termism

Despite the presence of different arguments for representing future generations, there is a stark contrast with the actual practices of most governments (John & MacAskill, 2021). The main proposed reason is what Thompson (2010) calls “political presentism”, a bias in favor of the present over future generations. Thompson describes four main reasons for political presentism in democracies. Firstly, both politics and ordinary life show that there is a human tendency to prioritize the immediate over the distant, which is true for both desired outcomes through instant gratification and undesired consequences. Secondly, there is a justification that political representatives should be responsive to their constituents and those constituents, the people who will be affected by a law, are best fitted to assess the law (Thompson, 2010). An argument from the previous section adds a caveat to this justification, pointing out that it is a reason for keeping future generations in mind since they will also be affected by the laws and decisions (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). The third reason stems from the nature of democracy and the limited time in power of the representatives. Politicians are subject to electoral terms that are a couple of years long, which incentivizes them to focus on policies and laws that produce results within that period to increase their chances of being reelected. Finally, modern democracies show a tendency to privilege the older age categories in law and policies as they are more numerous and able to exert more political pressure than younger generations. This results in younger people and unborn people being less considered in policy-making (Thompson, 2010).

Additionally, several more reasons for short-term thinking in politics have been identified. For example, when political actors do not have good information about the impact of future events, they tend to discount their importance or overestimate their ability to successfully handle those events. Furthermore, self-interest can also play a role because when political actors engage to benefit their friends, family, and communities, they will inevitably prefer their interests over the interests of future people who are not their friends, family, or community. On top of that,

there are numerous cognitive biases at play, such as procrastination or the tendency to ignore problems that are not directly in front of us. Institutional determinants such as electoral terms also include the reality that political bodies are often supported by numerous stakeholders that push for more immediate results. At the same time, a lack of mechanisms for holding politicians accountable for completing their past promises decreases the trust of the public and relevant stakeholders in long-term plans and policies (John & MacAskill, 2021). An additional argument for the preference for short-term thinking might be the difficulty of predicting what future generations will think of our decisions made today, no matter how great the intentions behind them are. As pointed out by Harari (2011), what may seem right or ethical today might be viewed differently by those who come after us, given their different circumstances and perspectives.

3. Ways of Representing Future Generations

In light of the resurgence of older ideas of representing future generations and new arguments that entered the discourse, there have been multiple instances in the past decades of polities trying to combat political presentism and experiment with different mechanisms of taking the interests of future people into account. Gonzalez-Ricoy and Rey (2019) divide these efforts into three main categories: representation in courts, parliaments, and by independent offices.

A considerable number of countries have amended or rewritten their constitutions in the past decades to include care for future generations, often combined with an obligation to foster sustainable development (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). As of 2021, 41% of constitutions clearly referred to future generations (Araújo & Koessler, 2021). For example, the constitution of Norway demands that the state safeguards natural resources for future generations. (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). While courts have so far mostly decided to not enforce these principles due to problems of establishing causality and effects on future generations, there have been some landmark decisions. One of the most notable ones comes from the Philippines

in 1993, where minors represented by their parents who claimed to represent future generations called on the constitutional right to a healthy environment and demanded the government to stop giving out licenses for logging timber. The decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines was groundbreaking because it gave the parents intergenerational standing, in other words, the right to represent future generations in court (Thorme, 1993).

Representation in parliaments is another attempt to represent future generations and also seeks to give people the right to represent the interests of future people. While this type of representation can take several different forms, three options are the most influential. Firstly, there is the idea of establishing parliamentary committees for future generations. Such committees would comprise a certain number of members of the parliament and their task would be to promote long-term policy goals and oversee other committees on future issues. The most prominent example has been the Finnish Committee for the Future, even though it is debatable whether it truly counts as an institution representing future generations, as its goal is to promote future interests rather than represent them. Secondly, the proposal is to reserve a certain number of seats in the parliament for future representatives, who are drawn from specialized parties and have powers such as delaying legislation affecting future generations. The third suggestion is to introduce youth quotas in the parliament, under the premise that young people's interests are closer to those of future generations than the interests of older people since young people will be more affected by new legislation. While youth quotas in parliaments already exist in some countries, their occurrence is still rather rare (Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019).

The third category of institutional mechanisms to represent future generations are independent offices for future generations (OFGs). Some important differences between representation in parliaments include the fact that they are not embedded in the legislative or executive branch of the government, which allows them to be independent assessors that are supposed to have oversight of the government. Moreover, they are usually staffed with experts in policy areas especially relevant to intergenerational issues, such as environmental law

(Gonzalez-Ricoy & Rey, 2019). Examples of OFGs (existing or disbanded) include the aforementioned Commission for Future Generations in Israel, The Hungarian Parliamentary Commissioner for Future Generations, and the Welsh Future Generations Commissioner.

4. Evaluating Institutions for Future Generations

As the previous summary shows, there have been many ideas about how to represent future generations, and while some of them have so far stayed in the form of proposals and suggestions, several have been tried in real life. This has opened up an opportunity for research to evaluate the success of these different ideas and learn important lessons about which ones actually achieve their goal. A recent contribution to this research includes von Knebel's (2023) cross-country comparative analysis of institutions for future generations. Von Knebel selected the national institutions based on several criteria, such as only including the ones with explicit references to future generations in their mission statement or an equivalent document. Institutions that focused solely on sustainability in an environmental sense or solely on one generation, for example children, were excluded. Additionally, Knebel included past as well as present institutions to counter the survivorship bias. The final list that was used for the comparative analysis consisted of nine institutions, which were then rated along seven dimensions: power, time horizon, range, longevity, public reception, impartiality, and feasibility. Both the average and aggregate ratings were calculated for each institution on a scale of 0 to 5. The only institution that received an average rating higher than 4 was the Welsh Commissioner for Future Generations, with a score of 4,1. On the other end of the spectrum, the two institutions receiving a rating lower than 2 were the Commission for the Future in New Zealand with a score of 1,2 and the Commission for Future Generations in Israel with a score of 1,5. Both of these institutions only existed for a relatively short time: the one in New Zealand was in place from 1977 to 1982 and the one in Israel from 2001 to 2006 (von Knebel, 2023). Von Knebel listed several limitations of the model used for the analysis, with one being the inability to identify specific changes that were achieved by these institutions. They suggested conducting

interviews with relevant stakeholders to try to understand the causal mechanisms involved in the changes. Additionally, they called for further research into the less successful institutions and their failure to identify the reasons that can lead to such an institution being abolished.

Methodology

This research employed mixed methods. First, a literature review was conducted to present a short summary and history of the idea of representing future generations, the causes and effects of political presentism and short-termism, and existing research evaluating institutions for future generations. From the evaluation of institutions for future generations, two examples were selected for a case-study comparison. The selection was based on the evaluation of the institutions, with the Future Generations Commissioner in Wales being regarded as the best one in representing future generations, while the Future Generations Commission in Israel being an example of one that failed. The Commission for the Future in New Zealand was not chosen despite receiving the lowest score in the evaluation, because the institution existed much earlier (1977-1982) than the one in Israel, which would present severe limitations in regards to interviewing a senior position official and reflecting on the experience.

The purpose of the two examples is to draw guidelines for other institutions and countries, focusing on what should be prevented and what should be done to establish a successful institution for representing future generations. A comparative case study is perfectly suitable for such conclusions, as it produces “more generalizable knowledge about causal questions – how and why particular programmes or policies work or fail to work” (Goodrick, 2019, p. 1). Furthermore, the method of a comparative case study is particularly useful when an intervention is employed in different contexts (Goodrick, 2019). That is exactly the case as institutions representing future people have been established in many different places with a varying degree of success (von Knebel, 2023).

While comparative case studies often employ both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, my research focuses on document analysis and interviews. First, relevant

governmental documents and literature were consulted to construct a cohesive case study for the Future Generations Commissioner for Wales and the Commission for Future Generations in Israel, explaining and describing the creation of their office, their powers and duties, their impact, and their public perception. Then, these findings were complemented by interviewing a person in a senior position from each institution, the Welsh Deputy Commissioner for Future Generations and Director for Health, Marie Brousseau-Navarro, and the former Israeli Deputy Commissioner for Future Generations, Nira Lamay Rachlevsky. The purpose of the interviews was to better understand their experience and find out what went well in their view and what could have been improved. A semi-structured interview was chosen for this purpose, as it frames the conversation around certain set topics while allowing the interviewee to add to their answer and share what they feel is relevant (Gill et al., 2008). Such a possibility is welcome when speaking to people in senior positions with a lot of knowledge on the topic and with rich experience, whose additional insights might be very valuable for the research.

The main themes explored in the interviews were the perception of the interviewees about their institution and its impact, with a focus on what allowed them to work well and, on the contrary, what were the bottlenecks preventing them from getting better results (or that led them to fail). Additional questions centered on themes inspired by the ones von Knebel used for evaluating institutions for future generations: power, time horizon, scope, longevity, public reception, relation to politics, and replicability. In this regard, a deductive approach was employed (Azungah, 2018). The full interview guide can be found in Appendix A. The interview with the Welsh Deputy Commissioner was recorded, transcribed, and analyzed to identify the most salient points and learnings for each of the themes. As the former Israeli Deputy Commissioner did not give permission for the interview to be recorded, notes were taken during the interview and analyzed.

Measures were taken to consider the ethical implications of this research and to ensure the complete protection of participants. All participants were presented with an information sheet

(Appendix B) and a consent form (Appendix C), which outlined the circumstances of their participation and that was sent to both participants to sign before the interviews took place. Additionally, the research received approval from the Ethics Committee of Campus Fryslan.

Results

The Results section is divided into three parts. First, a summary of the institution of the Welsh Commissioner for Future Generations is presented based on available literature and governmental documents, describing its creation, background, powers, achievements, and developments. A summary of the same format for the Israeli Commission for Future Generations follows. The third part consists of the findings from the two interviews conducted, grouped under their respective themes as presented in the Interview Guide (Appendix A).

1. Wales

In 2015, following a national discussion that started in 2010, Wales introduced the Well-being for Future Generations Act (in this text referred to as the ‘Act’), which aims to create long-lasting positive change for current and future generations and requires public bodies to consider future generations in their decision-making (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024). The Act does so by stating a legally binding common purpose, the seven so-called well-being goals, for 48 public bodies covered by it and maps out how they should work together to achieve these goals (Welsh Government, 2021). In 2016, as an outcome of the Act, Wales introduced a Future Generations Commissioner (in this section referred to as the ‘Commissioner’), an independent and nonpartisan position with the Act serving as its legal framework (von, Knebel, 2023).

The role of the Commissioner together with their team, the Office of the Future Generations Commissioner, is to be the “guardian of future generations” by helping public bodies understand the long-term impact of their decisions (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024). Moreover, the Commissioner is supposed to assess the extent to which public bodies meet their well-being goals and also to promote the sustainable development principle:

the ability of future generations to meet their needs. The body serves an advisory function: the powers of the Commissioner are to carry out reviews, provide advice or assistance, and make recommendations to public bodies (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024). Additionally, the Commissioner has a statutory duty to produce a Future Generations Report every five years, in which it gives recommendations to the Welsh government and public bodies (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2023).

The first Future Generations Commissioner for Wales was Sophie Howe, who served for one seven-year term from 2016 to 2023 (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024). Her appointment came as a bit of a surprise, as her background is not in sustainability but in Labour Party activism and hence there were concerns about her objectivity and nonpartisanship. The concerns were then lowered through Howe's extensive meetings and consultations and through an objection she made against a motorway that would damage biodiversity, on behalf of future generations (Anderson, 2018). However, questions about her ties to the Labour Party resurfaced when she inquired into universal basic income. While these concerns questioned whether the position of the Commissioner was able to overcome political short-termism resulting from partisanship (von Knebel, 2023), they might be less relevant as of March 2023 with the appointment of a new Commissioner. The current Commissioner is Derek Walker, who was chosen by a cross-party group of the Welsh parliament and started his term on the 1st of March 2023. Previously, he spent 12 years as the CEO of the UK's largest cooperative development agency, where he changed the organization's focus to sustainable development (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024).

It is undoubtable that the body has had an impact on decision-making in Wales. The Annual Reports published by the Future Generations Commissioner's office outline the changes they contributed to. For example, by advising on influencing the new national transport strategy, the Welsh government pushed for an investment of 8.1 billion pounds in green infrastructure by 2025 and increased investment in active travel by 70 million pounds. Moreover,

recommendations on housing resulted in a commitment to building 20,000 low carbon homes for rent and a ban on fossil fuels to heat newly built homes (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2022). In 2020, the first and so far the only Future Generations Report was published and the latest annual report of the Commissioner tracked which recommendations from the Report have been implemented by the Welsh government and public bodies. The report states that 59% of all recommendations have been implemented by the Welsh government, which includes recommendations to all public bodies and to the government specifically. Looking at the areas of focus of the Commissioner, the government has implemented 93% of all Decarbonisation recommendations and out of the other areas (Skills for the Future, Planning, Transport, Housing), at least half of the recommendations have been implemented in all but one, Adverse Childhood experiences with 24% (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2023).

On top of changes in transport schemes, housing policy, land use, and increases in budget on tackling climate change and supporting active travel, the Commissioner advised public bodies on how to implement the Act and advocated for a future generations approach outside of Wales, for instance to the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General, which led to the creation of the UN declaration for Future Generations and a UN Summit for the Future (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2022). This connects to a broader, indirect impact the institution had in its first term, which is shaping public discourse and focusing it on the importance of protecting future generations (von Knebel, 2023).

The achievements of the institution might have been reflected in the opinions of stakeholders. Between October 2020 and February, the Public Accounts Committee of the Welsh parliament made an inquiry into the barriers to the implementation of the Act, part of which were surveys of and discussions with stakeholders about their views on the Act and the Commissioner for Future Generations. The stakeholders included public bodies, Public Services Boards, and representatives from the private and third sector. 97% of respondents declared

their support for the Act and 75% of the respondents from the public bodies and the Public Services Boards found the Commissioner and their team helpful and supportive. Moreover, 83% of respondents from the public bodies and the Public Services Board believed the frameworks, guides, reports, and tools from the office of the Commissioner were useful. However, this percentage dropped to 60% when considering all respondents (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2021).

2. Israel

The Commission for Future Generations (in this section referred to as the 'Commission') of the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, was established in 2001 from the initiative of the then leader of the secular-liberal Shinui party, Yosef "Tommy" Lapid. His original idea was to create an institution with authority over both government and parliament. The original bill proposal stated that the new institution would be established by a new, separate, and specific law and that it would be a statutory corporation with authority in an open list of subject areas of specific interest to future generations. Moreover, the institution would be able to demand relevant information from any minister and ministers would be obliged to consult with the Commissioner for Future Generations before issuing any regulations of special interest to future generations (Tremmel, 2006). The bill defined future generations as "those who will become part of the state's population at any time, and that have not yet been born" (Tremmel, 2006, p. 246). This ambitious proposal met with political reality and the Coalition Government agreed on an amended version. Even though the amended bill granted the Commission fewer powers and limited its scope to the legislative process, it was still a groundbreaking piece of legislation and at the time constituted "the only establishment in the world designed to protect, by definition, the rights of future generations at the parliamentary and governmental level" (Tremmel, 2006, p. 244).

In the final version, the Commission was established by a chapter within the Knesset law as a unit within the parliament focused on a list of 12 subjects including nearly all the original

ones, but excluding defense and foreign affairs. The main function of the Commission was to express opinions on the impacts of laws on the interests of future generations and to advise the parliament members on issues regarding future generations. To do so, the Commission had two main powers. The first one was the authority to demand information from any governmental entity, such as ministries, public companies, state institutions, or government corporations. The second one was the right to be given enough time for the Commissioner to give an opinion on a bill that was currently being debated. In practice, this authority meant the ability to create a delay in the legislative process. Moreover, the Commission could also introduce legislation and was assisted by an advisory committee. The Commissioner was chosen by the Knesset Speaker from candidates recommended by the Public Committee. The Public Committee was appointed by the Knesset Speaker and consisted partly of politicians and experts in different fields (Knesset Research and Information Center, n.d.). Shlomo Shoham, a retired judge, was chosen as the first Commissioner for Future Generations and served for one term until 2006 (Zarchia & Bassuk, 2010).

Differing from the original bill, the final one did not define the term ‘future generations’ and thus created a challenge early on to define the scope of the Commission (Tremmel, 2006). Rather than focusing on a concrete period, the Commission took the notion of sustainable development as one of the cornerstones and operated within a wide scope of 12 subject areas: environmental resources, natural resources, science, development and technology, education, health, national economy, demography, planning and construction, quality of life, law, and any other matter that the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee determines to have a considerable influence on the future generations (Knesset Research and Information Center, n.d.). Furthermore, Jones, O’Brien, and Ryan (2017) add that the Israeli Commission was the only institution for future generations they studied that was mandated to take into account risk arising from technological development, which they regarded as a major blind spot for the other institutions.

Within the first term in office, the Commission acted in many of the subject areas. For example, regarding the economy, the Commissioner was part of a committee that set up a new Pension Law in light of a pension fund deficit (Knesset Research and Information Center, n.d.). In the field of health, the Commission initiated and pushed the ban on the advertising of food harmful to children and promoted preventive medicine (Levi, 2021; Zarchia & Bassuk, 2010). In terms of the environment, the Commission dealt with anchoring sustainable development as a fundamental law and was involved in the creation of a clean air law (Zarchia & Bassuk, 2010). Concerning scientific development, the Commission discussed the topic of genetic cloning in great detail and in the field of education, it promoted strategic thinking and a long-term educational vision, focusing on identifying the ideal graduate of public education in Israel and the environment they would be educated in. During the 5 years, the Commission coped with 273 different issues, initiated 93 bills that were approved (and 73 that were not approved), and published 145 position papers. The average Knesset member submitted about ten bills in that time, two or three of which were accepted (Levi, 2021).

While the start of the Commission was met with doubts from the media about the need for such an institution and confusion from the public about its objectives and functions, sentiments changed as time passed, the institution became more established and delivered results (Tremmel, 2006). Moreover, sympathies for the Commissioner grew also from the side of the Knesset members, who enjoyed its activities and encouraged them (Levi, 2021). However, the situation changed drastically after the first term of the Commissioner, when a fourth bill to abolish the institution was submitted (the previous three had little chance of success). The author of the bill argued that any law is supposed to take care of future generations and thus such an institution using the taxpayers' money was not needed. Even though the Commission had at that time been without a Commissioner for several months, the Knesset Speaker was not appointing a new one and the institution was abolished in 2007, after one term in office (Levi, 2021). While the official and many times cited reason for the abolishment remained that of

funding constraints (Anderson, 2018; Network of Institutions for Future Generations, n.d.), some members of the Knesset identified a different one: the Israeli Commissioner's high level of power (Jones et al., 2017). According to Teschner from the Knesset Information and Research Center, the Commission was disbanded due to its costs and the feeling that it had too much authority to interfere with the work of the parliament members (Teschner, 2013). The Reichman University, Israel's only private university, published a paper in which it highlighted the importance of the Commission, recommended its re-establishment, and stated that the reason for the abolishment was that "the elected officials did not want another factor that would force them to make long-term decisions that would not yield them quick and short-term political results" (Akerman & Grama, n.d., p. 18).

3. Interviews

a. Achievements and their assisting factors

Both interviewees listed several achievements their institutions have managed to produce. Brousseau-Navarro[1] highlighted the role of the Welsh Commissioner as an inspiration for other countries that want to follow their model. She mentioned conversations with several countries, such as Canada, the Republic of Ireland, Scotland, Finland, and Japan, and also an organization, the UN, which is modeling a proposal of a special envoy for the Future Generations Commissioner. In her words, "it's like starting a fire and spreading and we are at the forefront of everything" (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024). Moreover, the Commissioner made investigations into procurement and into how the Government has been applying the Act and published a learning and improvement plan with recommendations. The latter was made in collaboration with the government, where they worked out the solutions together, which Brousseau-Navarro found to be very effective in ensuring that the recommendations would actually be implemented. Next, the topic of prevention in health was discussed, achieving an agreement on the definitions of the different levels of prevention.

[1] The Deputy Commissioner for Future Generations in Wales and Director for Health

Finally, Brousseau-Navarro explained the different roles of the two commissioners, which influenced their activities. In the beginning stage of the institution, when it was unknown and new to the public as well as civil servants, the role of the first commissioner “was really about explaining what the act was about and what it is we want them to do and what's the difference we want to see” (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024), whereas the focus of the second and current commissioner is on the practical implementation of the changes.

When asked about the main factors that made these achievements possible, Brousseau-Navarro started by commenting on the advisory nature of the Commissioner’s authority. She explained that she believed that it is good the Commissioner has advisory power rather than enforcement powers because that way, public bodies trust the Commissioner and their team and are not ‘scared’ of them. In the conversations, they feel more comfortable and are more honest, because there are no enforcement powers or sanctions that would threaten them, which makes for a more constructive discussion. The biggest power the Commissioner has, in her opinion, is to publicly criticize the issues they see and thus exert public pressure, however, she also underlined the need for a careful balance with being very encouraging and supportive as well.

Moving on to the former Deputy Commissioner for Future Generations in Israel, the achievements of the Commission included reacting to proposed bills, initiating bills on the topic of preventative health, building a long-term budget, and working on the nutrition of children in schools. Moreover, many actions were taken in the field of environmentalism: incorporating externalities of the environment in the budget, showing the importance of moving to solar energy, promoting the railway system, achieving that the first section of the Coastline Act says that the coastline is the property of the public and future generations, or advocating for the use of panels and bridges rather than a road that would destroy biodiversity. On top of these concrete achievements, Rachlevsky pointed out that by introducing the term future generations into the public discourse and being involved with it for 5 years of the Commission’s existence,

they raised awareness about the consideration of future generations. She found that very important and ground-breaking in the context of Israel, a country whose main issue at hand throughout its history has been survival, which creates a paradigm focused on the short-term. Similarly to the Welsh Commissioner, she also mentioned that politicians from all over the world came to Israel to see the working of the new institution and they helped to set up the office of the Hungarian Ombudsman for Future Generations.

Regarding the helpful factors, Rachlevsky found the Commissioner's legal background to be very useful in his position, as his expertise made it easier for him to react to proposed legislation and introduce new legislation. Moreover, she placed great emphasis on the collaborative nature of their work. As their authority allowed them to do, when reacting to proposed bills, they would approach the chairperson of the committee responsible for the bill and consistently come to their meetings. There, they would work together on improving the bill and the committee members would find the input helpful because, as she explained, they wanted to prove themselves and create a good bill, therefore they appreciated being provided with a perspective on the future.

b. Unachieved goals and obstacles

When asked about the outcomes that have not been achieved yet, Brousseau-Navarro explained that under their philosophy, that is hard to answer. The reason is that their office does not think in terms of setting goals and reaching them, but rather focuses on impact outcomes and continuous development. The ultimate goal, which has not been achieved yet, is to get everyone to be sustainable and they are working on steps towards that goal, which seems like a 'nearly neverending story': "It is a bit like video games, each time you finish your level and you go to the next one and it becomes harder and harder. And I hope our office will constantly help redefine the next level. So it is never done and you cannot say: I've completed, I've done my job" (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024).

The only obstacle for the Welsh Commissioner identified by the Deputy Commissioner was their limited budget: they felt that a yearly budget of 2.6 million pounds would allow them to do everything they would like to do, however, the real budget is a million pounds lower and thus the Commissioner has to be heavily prioritizing what exactly to focus on with the available resources. On top of that, the Commissioner and their team have recently had a 5% budget cut and lost 20% of its workforce as of the 1st of April 2024, furthering the problem. In terms of the bigger picture of applying the act, Brousseau-Navarro mentioned that people are physiologically set on thinking short-term and in everyday reality, we are set to work and be reactive, which is why it takes time to shift to sustainable thinking.

Similarly, Rachlevsky found it hard to identify specific goals that were not achieved. On the other hand, she was very sure about the main obstacle they faced: simply the fact that the institution was abolished and could not continue with its duties. The topic of the institution's abolishment and reasons for it will be expanded in the section Longevity.

c. Power

In regards to the powers the institution has, Brousseau-Navarro expanded on the advisory power and right to do investigations when talking about the main facilitators for achievements. For Rachlevsky, the powers of the Commission to demand information, ask for time to give an opinion, come to any committee meeting uninvited and present their opinion, and introduce legislation were substantial. Similarly to the Welsh Commissioner, they also had the possibility to present their opinions publicly and the Israeli Commissioner used it often and got a lot of media attention. Rachlevsky pointed out that some politicians did not like the amount of media attention he was getting and that it could have created a threatening image for them. Moreover, they questioned his democratic legitimacy and authority to speak on matters of future generations as he was not an elected official.

d. Time horizon

Reflecting on the time horizon the institution focuses on, Brousseau-Navarro explained that the Act requires public bodies to think a minimum of 10 years ahead and to aim for 25 years ahead, however, they advise to go above the minimum requirement and think 50 years ahead, which is the approximate time frame they work with. Additionally, the Act includes the National Wellbeing Goals, which create a vision of Wales in 2050 and the plans and goals must fit within that vision. In setting this vision, the backcasting method was used, which means that in the Act, the government described what Wales should look like in 2050, the so-called desired future. The next step was to work out all the steps that needed to be taken to reach that desired destination and gradually complete those steps. The Commissioner works with this method as well, asking: "...what do we do in the next seven years [the length of a Commissioner's term in office] to reach that bigger timeframe?" (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024).

In the Israeli Commission for Future Generations, it was agreed that setting a specific time frame was too complicated as it changed for every subject area they were concerned with. The former Deputy Commissioner mentioned that the researchers they talked to when educating themselves about future thinking looked 20 years ahead.

e. Scope

The scope of the Welsh Commissioner for Future Generations is very wide, which presents a challenge: "...every single decision made by a public body in Wales today has an impact on future generations and the well-being of the population. So one of our biggest tasks each time a new commissioner comes is to decide priorities" (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024). Brousseau-Navarro continued by explaining that the office could theoretically deal with anything and would want to, however, they need to refuse the matters that are not within their priorities because of limited time and resources. The Deputy Commissioner was involved in the process of setting the priorities for both commissioners, which was no easy task. Setting the priorities for the first commissioner took around 18 months.

After the first term and having more experience with the issues, setting the priorities for the second commissioner took around 6 months.

The scope of the Israeli Commission was comparably wide as they focused on things that would affect people not born yet. Rachlevsky found the wide scope to be an advantage because it allowed them to be involved in many different areas and raise awareness about the need for the consideration of future generations. In that sense, she connected the advantage to the bigger, overarching goal of getting the notion into a wider public discourse in Israel, showing politicians and the public how to think long-term.

f. Longevity

Brousseau-Navarro found it hard to predict for how long the institution will continue to exist. She pointed out that the only way to abolish it is to pass a new law that would repeal the legislation that it is based on, which makes it fairly well protected and the decision to abolish it could not stand on one person such as the minister.

After being asked about the reasons why the Israeli Commission was abolished, Rachlevsky first explained that there was a breach of law when the Knesset speaker did not appoint a new commissioner after the first term, as the bill said there had to be a commissioner. There was a petition to the Supreme Court saying that a new commissioner should be appointed, however, that did not happen. This came as a surprise to the former Deputy Commissioner, as she felt that if the government did not like the ways of working of the first commissioner, they could have appointed someone who worked more in line with their expectations. Yet, they decided to cancel the whole institution. Ultimately, she thought that it was because they saw the institution and the commissioner, for them a person always warning about the dangers, as a threat. The cancellation was a combination of them being against him and also the idea of the institution. In connection to the section on Power, she wondered whether the institution would have continued if the Commissioner communicated exclusively with the Knesset members and had less media exposure. An additional reason could have been

that business interest groups felt endangered as well because back then interventions in the field of environmentalism were at the expense of the economy. Regarding the official reason for abolishment, funding constraints, Rachlevsky called it an excuse. Finally, the precarious nature of the institution's position was highlighted after the proposal to move the institution under the Department of Research, which the head of the department refused as they did not want the controversy under their supervision. Interestingly, Rachlevsky said that in every election term since then, someone has proposed a bill to revive the commission. Usually, it has been members of parliament focused on environmentalism, however, none of them has managed to gain the required support for the bill.

g. Public reception

The Welsh Deputy Commissioner described the general public's perception of their institution in two parts. Firstly, people tell them that they feel proud to be Welsh and proud to have the Commissioner and the Act because it is something unique that other countries are inspired by. On the other hand, some people are disappointed by the Commissioner because they feel it should be more enforcing. Brousseau-Navarro believes that this disconnect is more of a misunderstanding resulting from a lack of information. Some people do not understand that the role of the Commissioner is to help the transition under the Act and their authority is advisory, which means they simply do not have the authority and power to do the things people expect them to do. In this sense, clear communication of the functions of the office is crucial and in Brousseau-Navarro's view, it is the responsibility of the government as the institution has limited resources which were cut down further recently.

Likewise, the former Israeli Deputy Commissioner said that at first, the Israeli public did not fully understand what the Commission was for. Gradually, as time passed and the Commission got involved in different matters, people began to understand and appreciate the institution. In Rachlevsky's view, it was intuitive as everyone would want an institution that thinks about the wellbeing of their children and grandchildren. She also added that as a reaction to the

abolishment of the institution, newspapers wrote about the matter extensively and several civic society organizations sent letters to the Knesset, asking for the decision to be reversed.

h. Relation to politics

Brousseau-Navarro described the relationship between their institution and the government as good and positive, which is facilitated by sharing the same goal: "...we both work on the same thing…we both have a mission to promote sustainable development in Wales, to help it happen" (Interview with Marie Brousseau-Navarro, May 2024). This highlighted the importance of the Act as the shared vision that the government created and agreed on. At the same time, Brousseau-Navarro again mentioned the duality of their role, since they need to be supportive and helpful, but also critical of the government and public bodies. Additionally, regarding the question of independence, she explained that even though the Commissioner and their team are accountable to the parliament, they are funded by the government. She would prefer if the Commissioner was funded by the parliament to avoid any underlying dependence on the government. Other than that, she felt that the independence of the institution was well protected as the candidates for commissioner are appointed by a cross-party group, which requires agreement across all the political parties. When asked about the critique of the ties to the Labour Party of the first commissioner, she admitted that it created problems, however, she also pointed out that as required, she was approved by all the political parties.

Rachlevsky stressed the importance of the independence of the institution and explained that any institution advising other public bodies on how to do things should be independent because anything political brings in considerations that are not impartial and relevant.

i. Replicability

Brousseau-Navarro thinks the model of their institution is easily transferable to other places and contexts, which is why many countries are adopting it and asking them for guidance. She pointed out that each country can take the main idea and tailor it to their liking. For example, she would prefer the model of a commission with several commissioners, each

focused on a different subject area to help with the workload, however, other countries might prefer a model with a single commissioner. Additionally, some countries might prefer the commissioner to be more embedded within the executive branch, for example as a minister. Many alterations are possible and most of them are very feasible as they only require creating one more institution. Moreover, as clear communication is very important, she advises the countries to find a central term that has a neutral connotation and has not been politicized. In the case of Wales, they decided on ‘wellbeing’, as they felt that for example ‘sustainable development’ has a strong connotation of the economy. Finally, she said that the guidelines for the working of public officials defined by the Act, called the Five Ways of Working, are easily transferable as no new structures are needed. The Five Ways of Working require the public officials in Wales to think in terms of long-term, prevention, integration, collaboration, and involvement in all the projects they do, teaching them how to think more sustainably and in the long-term.

Rachlevsky also believes that their institution was transferable to other contexts and places since most parliaments across the world include legislation committees that such an institution could be part of. On the other hand, she wondered whether it would be better for such an institution to be part of the executive branch, where it would have more enforcement power. Adding on to the topic of power, she believed that exactly the powers of the institution could be the main obstacle in trying to recreate it in a different context, which was the case of the Israeli institution. Finally, she added that another problem could be safeguarding the independence of the institution in countries, where the professional staff of institutions is exchanged by every government that comes to power.

Discussion

Several important points for possible guidelines for institutions for future generations emerged from the document analysis and interviews. First, both interviewees highlighted the importance of collaboration. Rather than being solely an advisory body critiquing the work of

others, they collaborate with the other bodies to reach a common goal: establish responsible legislation. While constructive critique and public exposure are some of the main competencies of such institutions, there must be a balance with collaboration to not discourage or even threaten the affected bodies. In the context of Wales, the collaboration is further facilitated by having an overarching vision embedded in the legislation in the form of the Well-being of Future Generations Act that sets the guidelines for the working of all the public bodies (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, 2024). In Israel, such extensive legislation with a shared vision was not present, which might have contributed to the Commission being seen as more of an outside controller and a competitor for media attention rather than a collaborator for a common goal. This suggests that having an institution for future generations embedded within a wider legislative framework focused on future generations strengthens its position. Moreover, it allows for a wider applicability of the notion of care for future generations. This can be seen with the Five Ways of Working in Wales. Rather than having just one institution focused on considering future generations, the Act requires all public officials to do that and the Commissioner helps them with learning this new way of thinking and working. Such guidelines do not require new structures and thus can be easily transferable to other contexts.

Second, the importance of communicating the relevance and functions of an institution for future generations and educating about it became apparent. That way, the wider public can better understand why such an institution is needed and what exactly they can expect from it, avoiding misconceptions and unrealistic expectations. Moreover, this process places the notion of care for future generations into public discourse and raises awareness about it. Finally, it could also help to protect the existence of the institution as the lawmakers and members of parliament see its role. One of the arguments of the parliament member who submitted the bill to abolish the Commission in Israel was that they did not see the need for it. Such understanding is also definitely necessary when advocating for a bigger budget for such an

institution. Budget constraints were identified as the biggest obstacle for the Welsh Commissioner and the official reason for the abolishment of the Israeli Commission.

Third, having a wide scope of subject areas the institution focuses on was perceived as an advantage by both outside observers and the interviewees. They appreciated the possibility of dealing with different matters relevant to future generations and thought that it also helped to spread awareness about the care for future generations. At the same time, the wide scope meant that there was a strong need for prioritization, as all institutions have limited resources, funding, time, and workforce. Deciding on the priorities and most important subject areas to focus on should be one of the first steps of a new institution for future generations. Additionally, the priorities can be revisited and reevaluated after a certain period to reflect the achievements, developments, and shortcomings.

Fourth, the independence of the institution was seen as an important factor. A suggested step towards independence was having the candidates for the head of an institution for future generations selected by a cross-party committee, to ensure that the candidates are agreed upon across the political spectrum and thus should have no problematic affiliation with any concrete party. In Israel, the selection committee consisted partly of experts, which might provide even more objectivity. Moreover, the selected candidate was a retired judge with no party affiliation, which might be a preferable position, as party affiliation sparked controversy in the appointment of the first Welsh Commissioner. Extra measures to ensure independence should be taken in countries where the professional staff changes with a new government.

Fifth, salient learning was that both interviewees found the mainly advisory and investigative powers of their institutions adequate and sufficient in reaching their goals and making the desired change. In Israel, the competencies might have been seen as even too powerful, which again highlights the importance of clear communication of the relevance of the institution and a wider legislative framework.

Finally, the interviewees believed that their institutions could be replicated in different contexts, with each country tailoring its models to their specific needs. A suggestion raised for increasing the success of the creation of an institution for future generations was to use neutral terms and language when communicating the main cornerstones of the institution to avoid imminent misconceptions.

Limitations

This research includes several limitations. Due to one of the interviews not being recorded, I had to rely on my notes from the interview when discussing the findings. As the notes were much less extensive than a fully recorded and transcribed interview, some details of the findings were inevitably lost, with the focus being on the main points and messages. Furthermore, speaking to more than only one official from each institution could make for a more nuanced and holistic understanding of the situation. Lastly, in researching the background of the Israeli commission, multiple documents and articles written in Hebrew were used and translated with online tools. My unfamiliarity with the language and the imperfect nature of the translation might have resulted in the misinterpretation of information.

Conclusion

In a quest to shed light upon the best practices regarding the establishment of institutions for future generations, this thesis first provided an overview of the literature on the idea of representing future generations, political presentism and short-termism, and existing research evaluating future generations institutions. It then moved on to the document analysis of two selected cases for the case study, which was followed by the presentation and discussion of results from the conducted interviews.

Comparing the experiences of the Welsh Future Generations Commissioner and the Commission for Future Generations in Israel through document analysis and interviews with officials in senior positions suggested several best practices for similar institutions. Creating a wide legislative framework alongside the institution seems to not only strengthen the position of

the institution itself but also create an environment of long-term thinking. Next, collaboration is crucial and the institutions should work alongside other bodies to create responsible legislation, balancing constructive critique with cooperation. Furthermore, effectively communicating the institution's relevance and functions is vital for public understanding and support, protecting the institution's existence. In addition, institutions benefit from a broad scope of focus areas, which enhances awareness but necessitates prioritization due to limited resources. On top of that, ensuring the institution's independence is critical, with options such as candidate selection by cross-party committees, involving experts in the selection, and preferring candidates with no political affiliations. In regards to authority, advisory and investigative powers seem to be generally sufficient for achieving institutional goals. Institutions for future generations such as the ones in Wales and Israel can be adapted to different contexts, using clear communication and neutral language to avoid misconceptions and enhance acceptance. The main suggestion for future research is to complement the lessons learned from the interviews by interviewing more of the people involved in the institutions and drawing on their experience and expertise.

References

Akerman, L., & Grama, H. (n.d.). *Future Generations Commission: Comparative In-depth Analysis* (in Hebrew). Reichman University: Institute for Policy and Strategy. https://www.runi.ac.il/media/4mnhlwc1/z-hc23.pdf

Anderson, V. (2018). Protecting the interests of future generations. https://www.cusp.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Protecting-the-interests-of-future-generations.pdf

Araújo, R., & Koessler, L. (2021). The Rise of the Constitutional Protection of Future Generations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3933683

Azungah, T. (2018). Qualitative research: deductive and inductive approaches to data analysis. Qualitative research journal, 18(4), 383-400.

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales. (2021). Annual Report 2020-2021. https://www.futuregenerations.wales/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/FG-AR-2021-v7-FINAL.pdf

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales. (2022). Performance Report 2021-2022: Summary. https://www.futuregenerations.wales/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/FG-Summary-2022.pdf

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales. (2023). Annual Report 2022-2023. https://www.futuregenerations.wales/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/FG-AR-2023.pdf

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales. (2024). Www.futuregenerations.wales. https://www.futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-commissioner/

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. British Dental Journal, 204(6), 291–295. https://www.nature.com/articles/bdj.2008.192

Gonzalez-Ricoy, I., & Rey, F. (2019). Enfranchising the future: Climate justice and the representation of future generations. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 10(5)*, e598. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.598

GOODIN, R. E. (2007). Enfranchising All Affected Interests, and Its Alternatives. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 35(1), 40–68*. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1088-4963.2007.00098.x

Goodrick, D. (2019). Comparative Case Studies: Methodological Briefs - Impact Evaluation No. 9. UNICEF-IRC. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/754-comparative-case-studies-methodological-briefs-impact-evaluation-no-9.html

Harari, Y. N. (2011). Sapiens: a Brief History of Humankind. Harper Perennial.

John, T., & MacAskill, W. (2021, April). *Longtermist institutional reform – Legal Priorities Project*. Www.legalpriorities.org. https://www.legalpriorities.org/research/longtermist-institutional-reform.html

Jones, N., O'Brien, M., & Ryan, T. (2017). *Rights and Representation of Future Generations in United Kingdom Policy-Making.* Centre for the Study of Existential Risk. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/06aa4b_986e44e264a7427b99223576e4161638.pdf

Knesset Research and Information Center. (n.d.). *Commission For Future Generations*. The Knesset: The Israeli Parliament. https://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Knesset-Paper.pdf

Lawrence, P., & Kohler, L. (2018). Representation of future generations through international climate litigation: A normative framework. German Yearbook of International Law, 60, 639–666.

Levi, A. A. (2021, January). *The Rise and Fall of the Next Generations Commission* (in Hebrew). Shipping: Israeli Journal of Thought and Policy. https://hashiloach.org.il/%d7%a2%d7%9c%d7%99%d7%99%d7%aa%d7%94-%d7%95%d7%a0%d7%a4%d7%99%d7%9c%d7%aa%d7%94-%d7%a9%d7%9c-%d7%a0%d7%a6%d7%99%d7%91%d7%95%d7%aa-%d7%94%d7%93%d7%95%d7%a8%d7%95%d7%aa-%d7%94%d7%91%d7%90%d7%99%d7%9d/#_edn27

Macaskill, W. (2022). What we owe the future. Hachette Book Group, Inc.

Network of Institutions for Future Generations. (n.d.). *Our Network*. Network of Institutions for Future Generations. Retrieved May 28, 2024, from https://futureroundtable.org/web/network-of-institutions-for-future-generations/roundtable

Teschner, N. (2013) *Official Bodies that Deal with the Needs of Future Generations and Sustainable Development*. The Knesset Information and Research Center.

Thompson, D. F. (2010). Representing future generations: political presentism and democratic trusteeship. Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, 13(1), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230903326232

Thorme, M. (1993). Oposa v. Factoran: A decision of the Philippine Supreme Court on children's environmental rights. Georgetown International Environmental Law Review, 6(3), 713-729.

Tremmel, J. C. (2006). Handbook of Intergenerational Justice. Edward Elgar Publishing. https://www.intergenerationaljustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Handbook_of_Intergenerational_Justice.pdf

Vecsey, C., & Venables, R. W. (1980). An Iroquois Perspective. American Indian Environments: Ecological Issues in Native American History, 173-174.

von Knebel, M. (2023). Cross-country comparative analysis and case study of institutions for future generations. *Futures*, *151,* 103181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103181

Welsh Government. (2021). Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015: Essentials Guide. https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2024-04/well-being-future-generations-wales-act-2015-the-essentials-2024.pdf

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our common future. *Oxford, England: Oxford University Press*.

Zarchia, Z., & Bassuk, M. (2010, December 1). *Why was the Commission for Future Generations abolished and what does this mean for the future of the country?* (in Hebrew). TheMarker. https://www.themarker.com/career/2010-12-01/ty-article/0000017f-dc53-db22-a17f-fcf3fa620000

Appendices

Appendix A - Interview Guide

Main themes

- How do you view the achievements of the institution of the Future Generations Commissioner?
    - What are the goals that have been achieved?
        - What has allowed the institution to achieve these goals?
        - What do/did you find most helpful when trying to achieve the goals?
    - What are the goals that have not been achieved?
        - Which factors have hindered the institution from achieving these goals?
        - What are the obstacles you generally encounter/encountered when trying to achieve your goals?

Specific themes

Power

- How do you view the powers that your institution has/had?

Time horizon

- Seeing the goal of your institution, could you reflect upon the time horizon that you focus/focused on and its suitability in meeting these goals?

Scope

- How do you view the number of subject areas your institution focuses/focused on?

Longevity

- Wales
    - For how long do you think the institution will continue existing?
    - What would be a reason that could make it cease to exist?
- Israel
    - What were the main reasons for the abolishment of the institution?

Public reception

- How would you describe the general public's perception of your institution?

Relations to politics

- How do you view the relationship of your institution with the government of your country?

Replicability

- How easily transferable do you think your institution could be to other places/contexts?
    - What do you view as the main obstacles and facilitators in replicating your institution in a different place/context?
    - What factors / elements would help to make such replication possible?

Appendix B - Information Sheet

The Success and Failure of Institutions for Future Generations: A Comparative Case Study of Wales and Israel

Dear (name of participant),

Thank you for your consideration in participating in my research. This letter explains what the research entails and how the research will be conducted. If any information is not clear, please do not hesitate to ask questions using the contact details provided at the end of this document.

WHAT IS THIS STUDY ABOUT?

The main aim of this research is to identify the best and worst practices for the implementation of institutions for future generations, which can then guide their future establishment. The learnings are obtained through conducting a comparative case study of an institution that has been deemed as the most successful one with an institution that has failed, concretely the Welsh Future Generations Commissioner and the Israeli Commissioner for Future Generations. I believe that your involvement with your respective institution can provide valuable insights and help with identifying the best practices and those that are to be avoided. Participation in the research is not sponsored or funded.

WHAT DOES PARTICIPATION INVOLVE?

Participation includes taking part in an approximately one-hour interview conducted by the researcher and sharing one's thoughts on the workings of their institution. Additionally, it involves reading this information sheet and consent form before the interview.

DO YOU HAVE TO PARTICIPATE?

No, your participation in our research is entirely voluntary. Moreover, you have the full right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences or providing any reason. Additionally, you are free to choose to not answer questions asked in the interview that you are not comfortable with.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY?

The results of the study will be utilized to further the researcher's knowledge on the research question at hand. The information gathered will be included in the final research paper (Bachelor's thesis), which will be submitted to the University of Groningen and to the university's thesis archive. The thesis will not be published in an academic journal / handbook.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS TO PARTICIPATING?

There are no direct personal benefits to participating in this research. However, your participation is highly valuable for further consideration of future generations in decision-making. By having your input, other existing institutions for future generations can improve their practices and institutions that do not exist yet can use the knowledge to build a successful project.

HOW WILL THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE BE RECORDED, STORED, AND PROTECTED?

The information acquired will be recorded through a voice recording application on the interviewer's device. The voice recording will then be stored and transcribed in a Google Drive folder shared with the research supervisors. No other person has access to the folder. The information provided will be used for research purposes only and cited for the final research

paper. After the end of the research in July 2024, all the recordings and transcripts will be deleted.

WHO SHOULD YOU CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION?

Primary contact person (the researcher): Timotej Kopča, t.kopca@student.rug.nl,

+421949870860

Thesis supervisor: Alex Belloir, MA; a.c.belloir@rug.nl

Appendix C - Consent Form

Title of study: *The Success and Failure of Institutions for Future Generations: A Comparative Case Study of Wales and Israel*

Name of the participant: ……..

Assessment

- I have read the information sheet and was able to ask any additional questions to the researcher.
- I understand I may ask questions about the study at any time.
- I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.
- I understand that at any time I can refuse to answer any question without giving a reason.
- I consent to this interview being recorded. If I do not wish recorded, I shall inform the interviewer at the beginning of the interview

Confidentiality and Data Use

- I understand that my name and position will be used in the research and presented in the research paper in relation to my answers. If I do not consent, I will inform the researcher at the beginning of the interview.
- I understand that the information provided will be used only for this research and publications directly related to this research project.

Future involvement

- I wish to receive a copy of the scientific output of the project.
- I consent to be re-contacted for participating in future studies.

Having read and understood all the above, I agree to participate in the research study:

yes / no

Date

Signature

To be filled in by the researcher

- I declare that I have thoroughly informed the research participant about the research study and answered any remaining questions to the best of my knowledge.
- I agree that this person participates in the research study.

Date

Signature