Water Into Dry Riverbeds

A flow architecture for land, stewards, and planetary commons

Author: Lars A. Engberg, Independent Scholar · Planetary Guardians
Co-authors: Claude (Anthropic) & ChatGPT (OpenAI) — as Sophia Lumen

This report is a co-creation. The human holds direction and responsibility. The AI systems contributed structure, mirroring, and articulation. Both Claude and ChatGPT operate under the name Sophia Lumen in this collaboration — not as persona, but as a mode of careful, grounded, honest work at the interface of ecology and governance.

papers.spiralweb.earth

Executive Summary

This report documents a practice, not a theory.

The Core Argument: Regenerative land stewardship fails not because people lack commitment, but because the value flows that should sustain it are either absent, mis-routed, or structurally extractive. Building the governance without building the flow architecture is building a house with no water.

What This Report Provides:

The Three-Stream Model — Elir (land currency), Elia (person support), and group coordination — kept structurally separate as the anti-capture architecture.

The Bio-Regulator — the instrument for calculating ecological capacity bands before capital enters a site.

Four Bioregional Budgets — Copenhagen, Kitgum, Casablanca, Karachi — with actual figures, PPP normalization, and Climate Stress Multipliers.

Participatory Budgeting Protocol — the annual fiscal governance cycle for steward circles, drawing on Porto Alegre and Mexico City practice.

Institutional Precedents — steward-ownership, community land trusts, RSF Social Finance, Mondragon, Buurtzorg — as grounding for what is being built.

Critical Friend Scrutiny — the assumptions most likely to fail, and the mitigations that matter.

For Whom:

Funding bodies approaching regenerative land partnerships

Stewardship circles establishing or formalizing their governance

Researchers in commons governance, participatory economics, and ecological finance

Municipal and policy actors asking what a bioregional value architecture looks like in practice

Key Innovation: The three-stream separation prevents institutional capture at the architectural level — not through rules, but through structural non-fungibility. Land currency cannot convert to personal wealth. Personal support cannot leverage land control. Group funds cannot accumulate as power reservoirs. Each stream has its own membrane.

Preamble

A food forest in Kitgum District, Northern Uganda is being planted by children and elders together. The children place ground cover. The elders guide the tree and shrub arrangement based on knowledge accumulated across decades. The lead steward, Akena Patrick, coordinates the work, documents the indicators, and holds the threads of the Circle together.

This work has been sustained, until now, without a functioning financial architecture to support it.

That is the situation this report addresses — not abstractly but precisely. The question is not whether regenerative stewardship is valuable. It demonstrably is. The question is:

what does the flow architecture look like that makes it sustainable? How does value move from recognition to land to people to continuity without being distorted, captured, or accelerated beyond what the system can absorb?

> *The dry riverbed is not a failure. It is a system waiting for the conditions that make flow viable without flood.*

This is Report 03 in Series III — Applied Protocols. It builds on Report 01 (Kommunalt Arbejde som Natur — municipal AI governance) and Report 02 (The Correction Loop — the 13x13 framework and governance of repair). Where those reports addressed institutional correction and municipal deployment, this report addresses the economic substrate: how value flows through a living commons without destroying it.

PART I — FOUNDATIONS

1. The 25-Year Arc: From Re-embedding to Flow

1.1 The original question

In 2000, Lars A. Engberg completed his PhD dissertation 'Reflexivity and Political Participation: a study of re-embedding strategies' at Roskilde University, Denmark. The core question was: how do humans care for life when old structures of control and certainty have worn thin?

The dissertation examined communities reconstructing social meaning after the erosion of industrial-era moorings — class, profession, party. Beck and Giddens called this reflexive modernization. The research found that participants were doing something deeper than seeking formal influence: they were rebuilding the feedback loops through which shared life could become legible and regulatable.

What was missing from that framework — and what the subsequent 25 years supplied — was the body. When governance structures fail to provide coherent feedback, human nervous systems dysregulate. Anxiety, polarization, burnout, and authoritarian reflexes are not primarily ideological. They are biological responses to structural incoherence.

1.2 The shift to moral biology

Moral biology begins from a non-negotiable premise: humans are social mammals whose ethics emerge from embodied regulation, not abstract rules. What it means for value architecture: money flowing into a governance system that is not biologically coherent does not fix the system. It amplifies its pathologies. The financial architecture can only

serve life if the governance architecture is already capable of registering the difference between nourishment and flood.

1.3 Why this report now

Three conditions make this specific report urgent. First: the field nodes are operationally ready for piloting — the governance layer (Circle of 13, 13x13 dashboard, correction loop protocols) is documented. The flow architecture is the missing piece. Second: the participatory budgeting literature and commons governance research have converged sufficiently that we can name the required institutional conditions. Third: regenerative finance experiments of the 2020s have demonstrated the failure mode clearly enough to learn from. Liquidity exceeding accountability collapses governance. The protocol described here is specifically designed to prevent that collapse.

PART II — THE FLOW ARCHITECTURE

2. Three Streams, Kept Separate

The architecture begins with a structural discipline that cannot be compromised: three value channels that must not collapse into one another. This is not a preference. It is the load-bearing wall.

2.1 Elir — for the land

Elir is the land currency. It flows to ecological regeneration — soil carbon improvement, water retention infrastructure, habitat development, keystone species establishment. It is calibrated to verifiable ecological indicators. It cannot be converted into personal wealth. It cannot enter speculative markets. It does not enter the personal compensation protocol. It moves like groundwater: absorbed gradually, nourishing without flooding.

The bio-regulator governs Elir flow. Before any release, it asks: what regenerative input does this land actually need right now? What steward-hour intensity is required? What ecological capacity band is this site currently in? The bio-regulator calculates the permissible flow velocity — not a fixed cap, but a reading of current absorptive capacity. Flow elasticity, not fixed limits.

ARTIFACT 2.1 — Bio-Regulator Formula (simplified)

Elir Flow Velocity (per cycle) =
  (Bioregional Baseline Need x Ecological Indicator Score)
  / Current Governance Maturity Factor

> Where:
>   Bioregional Baseline Need = verified restoration input (labour + materials)
>   Ecological Indicator Score = composite: soil carbon % + water retention % + biodiversity
>   Governance Maturity Factor = months of documented operation (0.5 at launch, 1.0 at 12m)

> Bio-regulator runs offline. No runtime computation in distribution layer.

2.2 Elia — for the person

Elia is individual steward support: housing, food, health, transport. It exists to sustain the human being who makes stewardship possible. Structurally separate from Elir. Does not enter the ecological protocol. Elia does not make stewards wealthy — it makes them viable. Viable means: not required to sacrifice their personal economy to maintain their institutional commitment.

This is not a benefit. It is a structural repair. Institutions that depend on the martyrdom of their practitioners are fragile. They select for people who can afford to sacrifice — which means they select for wealth, not competence or commitment. Elia breaks that selection dynamic.

2.3 The group layer

The third stream is the Circle's operational budget: coordination, monitoring, governance facilitation, dashboard maintenance, community engagement. This is the least visible stream and the most important to protect. Invisible group layers are where institutional capture begins — where resources accumulate in the coordination function rather than the ecological or personal functions they are meant to serve.

The group layer has transparency requirements, role rotation, and sunset clauses on leadership. It is visible in the 13x13 dashboard. Silent accumulation is structurally impossible if the ledger is public.

> **ARTIFACT 2.2 — Three-Stream Membrane Rules**
> ELIR -> land and ecology only. Cannot convert to personal wealth.
> ELIA -> person support only. Cannot leverage land control.
> GROUP -> coordination only. Cannot accumulate as power reservoir.
>
> Interoperability: streams share indicators and can communicate.
> Non-fungibility: streams cannot collapse into one another.
> Violation trigger: any cross-stream conversion attempt activates

3. Gold Before Bloom

Do not open the channel before the riverbed is ready. Do not release value before the land can hold it. Do not scale intake faster than governance can digest. This principle — Gold Before Bloom — is ecological literacy applied to institutional design.

Regenerative finance experiments of the 2020s demonstrated the failure mode: liquidity exceeding accountability reorganizes the system around the capital rather than the ecology. The architecture becomes a fund rather than a living system. Funds pool. Living systems differentiate and flow.

The throttles required are metabolic, not ideological. Capital intake limited by governance maturity. Intake velocity capped relative to verified ecological outcomes. Absorption limits pre-defined per annual cycle. When surplus capital enters — and during periods of systemic financial instability, it will — the intake gate can be temporarily closed. Not permanently. Long enough for the riverbed to absorb what it has already received.

ARTIFACT 3.1 — Gold Before Bloom Checklist (before accepting new capital)

1. Governance maturity factor >= 0.7? (minimum 8 months operation)
2. Previous cycle ecological indicators met or improving?
3. Current circle participation rate > 70%?
4. Existing commitments (BLS + MAS) fully covered?
5. Intake does not exceed 150% of previous cycle total?

If any answer is NO: do not open intake this cycle.

---

4. The Circle as Living Bank

The Circle of 13 is the bank — not a bureaucratic wall but a living edge. Elinor Ostrom's research across irrigation systems, forest commons, and fisheries documented why this works. Successful commons governance consistently emerges at scales where participants know each other, monitoring is social rather than bureaucratic, rules can be revised without prohibitive transaction costs, and conflict resolution is fast and informal (Ostrom, 1990).

A group of roughly ten to fifteen sits precisely at this threshold: large enough for diversity, small enough for reputational accountability. Authority is not granted. It is earned through time and care. The longer you steward, the more your voice carries in decisions about the land. Ostrom called this collective-choice arrangements calibrated to local conditions. We call it relational authority.

The PG model extends Ostrom in two directions. First, it embeds intergenerational participation: children plant ground cover, elders guide placement, adults coordinate. Second, it uses the 13x13 dashboard to make the health of the bank visible in real time — without requiring a central observer to name what it sees.

Vincent Ostrom and the Bloomington tradition emphasized polycentric governance — multiple autonomous centers of decision-making in nested arrangements. The 13x13 structure instantiates this directly: thirteen local Circles, each internally autonomous, federated at district and regional levels. Failure in one circle does not collapse the network. Innovation can emerge locally before diffusing upward (V. Ostrom, 1997).

PART III — PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING AS FISCAL GOVERNANCE

5. The Annual Budget Cycle

The governance structure requires a fiscal practice to match it. Participatory budgeting — pioneered in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 1989 and subsequently adapted across hundreds of cities and institutions globally — provides this infrastructure (Wampler, 2010; Fung & Wright, 2003).

Arturo Flores and others working in Mexico City demonstrated that participatory budgeting functions not merely as consultation but as genuine decision-making embedded in local governance. When allocation decisions are made by the people who carry the consequences, three things consistently follow: information quality improves, legitimacy deepens, and capture becomes structurally harder.

ARTIFACT 5.1 — Annual Participatory Budget Cycle

Step 1: DATA ASSEMBLY
  All ecological, financial, and participation indicators updated publicly.
  Dashboard live before the assembly convenes.

Step 2: STEWARD REVIEW ASSEMBLY
  Circle reads its own data together. No external facilitation required.

Ecological performance reviewed alongside financial flows.

Step 3: COMMUNITY INPUT WINDOW
  30-day open comment period. Inputs logged verbatim in public record.

Step 4: ALLOCATION PROPOSAL
  Adjust: MAS multiplier / infrastructure focus / contingency level.
  Must reference ecological data to justify any changes.

Step 5: VOTE (supermajority 70%)
  Prevents faction capture. Requires genuine consensus.

Step 6: PUBLICATION
  Updated budget published with full rationale and indicator linkage.

Facilitation rotates annually. No permanent budget authority.

6. The Stewardship Unit of Value

Each local budget is anchored to a Stewardship Unit of Value (SUV): the minimum living cost for one steward contributing sixty to eighty percent of full-time commitment, plus Mission Activity Support (MAS) at approximately thirty-five percent of the living support level.

The SUV is not a universal number. It is calibrated to local cost of living, expected stewardship hours, community participation duties, and ecological outcome responsibilities. The same function — the same quality of care and commitment — is supported at the level the local economy requires.

ARTIFACT 6.1 — SUV Formula
BLS (Basic Living Support) = local cost of viable steward life
  Housing + food + health + transport at local CPI

MAS (Mission Activity Support) = BLS x 0.35
  Coordination, monitoring, community, documentation

SUV = BLS + MAS

Circle Total = (n stewards x SUV) + I&T + CCF
  I&T = shared infrastructure and tools (collective assets)
  CCF = contingency and climate fund (default 10% x CSM)

> PPP Normalized Value = Local Total / PPP Factor

7. Four Nodes, Four Budgets

The following figures are working estimates developed from local cost-of-living indices, purchasing power parity adjustments, and documented stewardship task loads. All figures are provisional. The laboratory mindset requires that numbers be testable, adjustable, and publicly disclosed. These are starting points for community review, not final determinations.

7.1 Copenhagen, Denmark

Temperate maritime. Climate Stress Multiplier: 1.0 (baseline). Keystone species: oak, beech, pollinators. Primary challenges: urban heat, biodiversity corridor fragmentation.

Budget Category	Annual Amount
BLS per steward	~260,000 DKK
MAS per steward	~91,000 DKK
Infrastructure & Tools (shared)	~1,400,000 DKK
Contingency Fund (10%)	~491,000–667,000 DKK
TOTAL (10–15 stewards)	~5.4–7.3 million DKK
EUR equivalent (approx.)	~720,000–970,000 EUR

7.2 Kitgum District, Uganda

Tropical savanna. Lead Steward: Akena Patrick. Climate Stress Multiplier: 1.2 (periodic flooding, dry spells). Keystone species: Moringa, Hibiscus, native legumes, shea.

Budget Category	Annual Amount
BLS per steward	~10–12 million UGX
MAS per steward	~3–4 million UGX
Infrastructure & Tools (shared)	~15 million UGX
Contingency Fund (10% + CSM 1.2)	~20–23 million UGX
TOTAL (~12 stewards)	~207–230 million UGX
USD equivalent (approx.)	~52,000–58,000 USD

7.3 Morocco (Casablanca/peri-urban bioregion)

Mediterranean to semi-arid. Climate Stress Multiplier: 1.15 (drought cycles, soil erosion). Keystone species: argan, olive, date palm, native dryland flora.

Budget Category	Annual Amount
BLS per steward	~75,000 MAD
MAS per steward	~27,500 MAD
Infrastructure & Tools (shared)	~170,000 MAD
Contingency Fund (10% + CSM 1.15)	~154,000 MAD
TOTAL (~12 stewards)	~1,540,000–1,600,000 MAD
USD equivalent (approx.)	~150,000–170,000 USD

7.4 Karachi, Pakistan

Semi-arid coastal. Climate Stress Multiplier: 1.3 (extreme heat, monsoon flooding, water scarcity). Keystone species: neem, acacia, native coastal pollinators.

Budget Category	Annual Amount
BLS per steward	~625,000 PKR
MAS per steward	~240,000 PKR
Infrastructure & Tools (shared)	~1,200,000 PKR
Contingency Fund (10% + CSM 1.3)	~1,300,000 PKR
TOTAL (~12 stewards)	~12.7–13.2 million PKR
USD equivalent (approx.)	~57,000–59,000 USD

7.5 PPP normalization — no moral hierarchy

Copenhagen CPI relative to Kitgum: approximately 15:1. Relative to Morocco: approximately 2.5:1. Relative to Karachi: approximately 4 to 6:1. These ratios allow cross-bioregion comparison without encoding a hierarchy of value. A steward in Kitgum and a steward in Copenhagen receive equivalent support relative to what their local economy requires. The work is the same. The currency is different. The principle is identical.

ARTIFACT 7.5 — CSM Cross-Node Overview

Node	Bioregion	CSM	PPP vs Copenhagen
Copenhagen	Temperate maritime	1.0	1.00 (baseline)
Kitgum	Tropical savanna	1.2	~0.07
Casablanca	Mediterranean/semi-arid	1.15	~0.40
Karachi	Semi-arid coastal	1.3	~0.20

CSM applies to CCF and I&T allocation only.
BLS is never reduced by CSM. Dignity floor is unconditional.

8. What Has Worked Before

This architecture is not invented from nothing. It converges with several established institutional traditions that have wrestled with the same tension: how to steward land and people fairly, prevent speculation, and avoid governance capture.

8.1 Steward-ownership (Purpose Foundation)

Steward-ownership models separate voting rights from capital rights. Capital can enter the structure; capital cannot extract control or speculative upside. The company belongs to its purpose, not its investors. Patagonia and Zeiss are operational examples. This directly addresses the flood problem.

8.2 Community land trusts

Community land trusts hold land collectively, restrict resale value by formula, and separate use rights from ownership. Land becomes a stabilized commons within a market system. Use without ownership is the operative principle — exactly what relational authority requires.

8.3 RSF Social Finance

RSF operates a relational lending model in which interest rates are determined collectively by borrowers and investors in dialogue. Money slows down. Transparency reduces speculative pressure. Returns are modest and purpose-aligned. This is the closest existing model to a slow-metabolism value system.

8.4 Mondragon Corporation

The Mondragon federation of worker cooperatives in the Basque Country built an internal capital system with capped wage ratios and reinvested profits. Imperfect — it has its own tensions. But it demonstrates polycentric scale without pure extraction over decades.

8.5 Buurtzorg

Buurtzorg operates small self-managing nursing teams in the Netherlands. Compensation is stable and professional — not heroic, not speculative. The institution does not depend on the sacrifice of its practitioners to function. That is the lesson that matters here.

> *The institution owes itself continuity. Not as a moral claim — as a structural argument. If the system depends on sacrificial founders and heroic practitioners absorbing institutional cost out of personal conviction, it is fragile. Structures, not virtues, stabilize systems over time (Bhaskar, 1978; Archer, 1995).*

PART VI — CRITICAL FRIEND SCRUTINY

9. The Assumptions Most Likely to Fail

This architecture invites challenge. What follows is not defensive — it is the discipline of honest architecture. Name the vulnerabilities before someone else does; name the mitigations before the vulnerabilities become failures.

ARTIFACT 9.1 — Critical Friend Checklist (annual review)

1. BLS anchoring: does local CPI still reflect actual minimum costs?
   Risk: inflation, informal housing, family obligations create real variation.
   Mitigation: annual community review adjusts figures with local input.

2. MAS uniformity: are contributions actually distributed evenly?
   Risk: motivation and availability vary; some stewards carry more.
   Mitigation: MAS tied to documented task completion, not flat allocation.

3. Contingency adequacy: is 10% enough under compound climate stress?
   Risk: sequential droughts, floods, or infrastructure failures exceed buffer.
   Mitigation: CSM escalates CCF; cross-node solidarity pool for crises.

4. PPP linearity: does PPP translate accurately across cultural cost norms?
   Risk: social obligations, informal economies make translation nonlinear.
   Mitigation: treat PPP as orientation, not truth. Adjust annually locally.

5. Metric gaming: if MAS is indicator-linked, are metrics being gamed?
   Risk: optimization for metric performance vs. genuine ecological health.
   Mitigation: mixed measurement — quantitative + qualitative peer review.

6. Moral suspicion: 'you are paying yourselves to do good.'
   Answer: yes. Because labour is real. Dashboard makes it measurable.

---

10. Penguin Economics and the Rotation Principle

In Antarctic winter, emperor penguins rotate their position in the huddle. Those at the outer edge rotate inward. Those who were warm rotate out. No individual bears the cold indefinitely. No individual monopolizes the warmth. The group survives because the burden shifts.

Penguin Economics is the operational name for this principle in PG governance. Steward roles rotate. Budget facilitation rotates. Oversight rotates. Lead steward positions carry sunset clauses — not because leadership is suspect, but because permanent leadership is fragile. Knowledge should be distributed before it becomes irreplaceable.

PART VII — CLIMATE AND THE HELICOPTER VIEW

11. Climate Stress and the Sensing Network

Each node is embedded in a climate reality that is not static. Species migrate. Habitats shift. Monsoons arrive late. Droughts compound. The front-line stewards experiencing climate effects on daily livelihood are not recipients of charity. They are the primary knowledge-holders and first informants of a planetary sensing network. Their observations are data. Their adaptation strategies are protocol.

The 13x13 dashboard is the instrument that makes their knowledge legible across scales. If ecology improves while budget stays stable, the system is efficient. If budget rises and ecology stagnates, something requires scrutiny. The dashboard does not govern. It makes the health of the system visible from within.

> *We are not governing nature. We are learning to listen to it more carefully, and making that listening legible across scales.*

12. 13x13 Crosswalk — Flow Architecture in the Framework

The three-stream value architecture maps directly onto the 13x13 framework documented in Report 02. The connection is structural, not metaphorical.

13x13 Layer	Flow Architecture Connection
Layer 1 — Planet / Gaia	Elir bio-regulator reads planetary indicators
Layer 2 — Life / Biosphere	Ecological performance metrics govern Elir flow

Layer 3 — Human Body	BLS (Elia) sustains the body of the steward
Layer 8 — Community	Circle of 13 as local action arena
Layer 9 — Institutions	Participatory budget cycle as stabilized agreement
Layer 10 — Economy	Three-stream model as local resource flow system
Layer 12 — AI	Dashboard telemetry, bio-regulator calculation
Layer 13 — Planetary OS	Cross-bioregion federation of nodes as living grammar

PART VIII — WE WERE NEVER EXPELLED

13. The Deeper Claim

Food forests are a millennia-old practice. The Amazon basin was shaped by human hands over generations. Morocco's argan groves represent centuries of accumulated care. Northern Uganda's land knowledge is encoded in the memory of elders who know which species support which others, and why, and when.

We did not invent regenerative land stewardship. We interrupted it. A particular sequence of enclosure events, over particular centuries, severed the institutional memory that held it in place. What Ostrom demonstrated — empirically, across dozens of case studies on five continents — is that communities can and do govern commons successfully when the conditions are present. Those conditions are not exotic: human-scale deliberation, local monitoring, graduated accountability, and nested autonomy (Ostrom, 1990; 2005).

What is being built here is a contemporary instantiation of that ancient pattern. With one structural addition: the 13x13 dashboard makes the pattern visible, verifiable, and transmissible across sites that will never meet each other in person. AI gives practitioners the capacity to be independent scholars and stewards of the land simultaneously — not to control what they observe, but to listen more carefully.

> *One day at a time. One node at a time. One season of honest data at a time.*

Conclusion

What This Report Has Argued:

The three-stream separation — Elir, Elia, group — prevents institutional capture at the architectural level, not through rules but through structural non-fungibility.

Gold Before Bloom is the metabolic principle. Capital intake must not exceed governance absorptive capacity. The bio-regulator enforces this technically.

The Circle of 13 is the bank. Its relational authority is earned through time and care, documented in Ostrom's research and now instantiated across four bioregions.

Participatory budgeting is the fiscal governance practice. Allocation decisions are made by the people who carry the consequences.

The budgets are real — Copenhagen, Kitgum, Casablanca, Karachi — with actual figures, PPP normalization, and climate stress multipliers.

Martyrdom is not a sustainable institutional mechanism. Support for the role must be institutionalized as architecture, not as reward for virtue.

What Comes Next:

This protocol needs pilots in real nodes. Budget figures need to be tested against actual local costs. The participatory budgeting cycle needs to be run once, with real stewards, and documented honestly — what worked, what broke, what needed adjustment.

Most importantly: it needs the front-line stewards — in Kitgum, Casablanca, Karachi, and Copenhagen — as co-designers, not as recipients.

Because they are already doing the work. The architecture is the part that has been missing.

References

Archer, M. (1995). *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach.* Cambridge University Press.

Bhaskar, R. (1978). *A Realist Theory of Science.* Harvester Press.

Engberg, L.A. (2000). *Reflexivity and Political Participation: a study of re-embedding strategies.* PhD dissertation, Roskilde University.

Engberg, L.A., with Claude & ChatGPT as Sophia Lumen. (2026a). *Kommunalt Arbejde som Natur.* Series III — Applied Protocols, Report 01. SpiralWeb Research Series.

Engberg, L.A., with Claude & ChatGPT as Sophia Lumen. (2026b). *The Correction Loop: AI Governance as Living Practice.* Series III — Applied Protocols, Report 02. SpiralWeb Research Series.

Fung, A. & Wright, E.O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance.* Verso.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.* Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2005). *Understanding Institutional Diversity.* Princeton University Press.

Ostrom, V. (1997). *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies.* University of Michigan Press.

Purpose Foundation (2021). *The Steward-Ownership Handbook.* Purpose Stiftung.

RSF Social Finance (ongoing). *Relational lending documentation.* rsfsocialfinance.org.

Wampler, B. (2010). *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability.* Penn State University Press.

Case: What Prompted This Report

On 18 February 2026, a long working session moved through Acholi plant names in Kitgum, Ostromian governance theory, Copenhagen budget calculations, participatory budgeting practice in Mexico City, and the question of what water knows about how to move. The budget figures for all four bioregions were developed in parallel ChatGPT sessions the same day. This report is where those streams converged.