

CIIS Report



Global Governance Initiative: Towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World

Xi Jinping Thought on Diplomacy Studies Centre

October 2026

A large, stylized globe graphic is positioned in the bottom right corner of the cover. The globe is composed of a grid of dots connected by lines, creating a network-like structure. The dots are of varying sizes, and the lines are thin and light blue, blending into the background.

In September 2025, President Xi Jinping solemnly proposed the Global Governance Initiative (GGI) at the Tianjin Summit of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). He articulated the core principles of adhering to sovereign equality, abiding by international rule of law, practicing multilateralism, advocating the people-centered approach, focusing on taking real actions, and called on all countries to work together for a more just and equitable global governance system. The GGI represents another significant public good that China has contributed to the world, following the Global Development Initiative (GDI), the Global Security Initiative (GSI), and the Global Civilization Initiative (GCI). It systematically answers the questions of the times on what kind of global governance system to build and how to reform and improve global governance, and charts the way for addressing the fundamental and pressing challenges facing the human society today.

Xi Jinping Thought on Diplomacy Studies Centre has prepared this report based on dedicated and systematic research from multiple perspectives, including the historical evolution of the global governance system, the necessity of reforming and improving global governance, the GGI's comprehensive transcendence of traditional global governance theories, China's practical achievements in translating the GGI from concept to action, and future directions for advancing the implementation of the GGI.





CIIS Report



Global Governance Initiative: Towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World



**Xi Jinping Thought on Diplomacy Studies Centre
October 2026**

Contents |

01	Abstract	2
02	Evolution of the Global Governance System: A Natural Outcome of Advancements in Productive Forces and Shifts in the International Landscape	6
03	Reforming and Improving Global Governance: An Issue of the Times that the World Must Address Today	14
	(i) The global governance system faces a justice challenge as a few developed countries cling to the existing benefit structure, undermining international fairness and justice	14
	(ii) The global governance system faces an inclusiveness crisis as developing countries are underrepresented, with many obstacles to equal co-governance	16
	(iii) The global governance system faces an order challenge as unilateralism undermines the authority of multilateral mechanisms, increasing turbulence and disorder in the international system	17
04	The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories	22
	(i) Opposing hegemonic acts with sovereign equality, clarifying the basic norms of global governance	23
	(ii) Responding to the disorder of rules with the international rule of law, consolidating the legal foundation of global governance	24
	(iii) Combating pseudo-multilateralism with true multilateralism, building consensus for cooperation in global governance	27
	(iv) Correcting the instrumentalization tendency with a people-centered approach, calibrating the value orientation of global governance	29
	(v) Breaking deadlock with an action-oriented approach, enhancing global governance effectiveness through multi-pronged measures	31

The GGI continues to translate from conceptual vision into practical action

36

- (i) Promoting the concept of multilateralism, building consensus on reforming and improving global governance 37
- (ii) Advocating reform of international institutions, actively enhancing the representation and voice of developing countries 38
- (iii) Building multilateral cooperation platforms to support the reform and improvement of global governance 41
- (iv) Focusing on governance in emerging fields, promoting global governance to keep pace with the times 48

Implementing the GGI: An Important Pillar for Advancing towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World

58

- (i) Promoting UN reform for greater efficiency and upholding the UN-centered international system 58
- (ii) Advancing democracy in international relations and defending international fairness and justice 60
- (iii) Adapting peacekeeping operations to the changing times and actively safeguarding world peace and regional stability 61
- (iv) Forging international consensus on development as a priority and bringing benefits of global governance to all 62
- (v) Recalibrating international human rights governance and building a just, equitable and inclusive global human rights governance system 63
- (vi) Advancing reform of economic and financial governance and promoting a universally beneficial and inclusive economic globalization 64
- (vii) Establishing rules for AI governance and forging international consensus on AI-enabled growth 65
- (viii) Strengthening governance in new frontiers such as cyberspace and addressing governance deficit in emerging fields 66
- (ix) Promoting civilizational exchanges and mutual learning and drawing inspiration to tackle global challenges 67

Concluding Remarks

72

01

Abstract

01

Abstract

Global governance is a common endeavor that bears on the wellbeing of all humanity, and building a just and equitable global governance system is a shared vision long pursued by people from across the world. The evolution of global governance is driven by the development of productive forces and the expansion of international exchanges, reflecting profound shifts in the international power landscape and interest pattern. In the context of accelerating changes unseen in a century, the Global South is rising collectively; a new round of sci-tech revolution and industrial transformation is deepening; and the interests and futures of all countries are becoming increasingly intertwined. Meanwhile, hegemonism, unilateralism and protectionism undermine the international order, revealing growing deficiencies of the current governance system in terms of representation, fairness of rules and effectiveness of actions. Reforming and improving global governance has emerged as a common issue that impacts the future and destiny of humanity. In September 2025, at the Tianjin Summit of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), President Xi Jinping solemnly proposed the Global Governance Initiative (GGI). He highlighted the core principles of adhering to sovereign equality, abiding by international rule of law, practicing multilateralism, advocating the people-centered approach, and focus on taking real actions, and called on all countries to work together for a more just and equitable global governance system. In September 2026, at the SCO Bishkek Summit coinciding with the first anniversary of the GGI, President Xi Jinping addressed what kind of multipolarity the

world needs, and deeply expounded the core essence of an equal and orderly multipolar world. He stressed that sovereign equality and mutual respect are fundamental principles; balance, order and the rule of law are inherent requirements; multilateralism, dialogue and consultation are essential pathways; and mutual benefit, win-win and inclusiveness are the way forward for development. This speech provides ideological guidance and pools greater strength for building a multipolar world, clearly outlining the vision advocated by the GGI. The GGI systematically answers the questions of the times: what kind of global governance system to build and how to reform and improve global governance. It represents an innovative and elevated understanding of global governance principles, breaking away from the traditionally Western-dominated narrative framework of global governance, and avoiding the outdated discourse traps of “a strong country is bound to seek hegemony” and “bloc confrontation.” The GGI is another important public good that China has contributed to the world, helping to solidify international consensus on reforming and improving global governance to advance towards a more just, inclusive and orderly world.

02

**Evolution of the Global Governance System:
A Natural Outcome of Advancements
in Productive Forces and Shifts in the
International Landscape**

02

Evolution of the Global Governance System: A Natural Outcome of Advancements in Productive Forces and Shifts in the International Landscape

With the continuous development of productive forces and profound shifts in the international power landscape, countries worldwide have become increasingly interconnected and face multiplied issues that require joint responses. The global governance system has emerged and developed within this historical process. Enhancing international cooperation and improving global governance are essential to align with the trend of history and respond to the demands of the times. Fundamentally, the revolution in productivity determines the scope, scale and nature of global interactions. Transformations in the international power landscape drive continuous adjustments in power distribution and rule framework within global governance, and global challenges consistently impose new requirements for reforming and improving the global governance system. Looking back over centuries of historical evolution, global governance has generally progressed from localized coordination to comprehensive governance, from great-power monopoly to diverse participation, from fragmented mechanisms to systematic institutions, and from interest-based competition to collaborative international governance. Each systemic innovation and rule renewal has deeply aligned with the development process of productivity transformation and international landscape restructuring.

The origin of modern global governance can be traced back to the early stage of the shift from traditional agricultural civilization to industrial civilization. It emerged



as an initial outcome of expanded transnational interactions and changes in regional power structures. In the early 19th century, Europe established a system of great-power coordination marked by the Vienna System following the Napoleonic Wars, which is considered a precursor to global governance.^① This system was based on regular diplomatic consultations and great-power consultations for balance of power, replacing the chaotic state of traditional war treaties and temporary alliances. It enabled institutionalization for international order and effectively reduced geo-security conflicts in Europe. However, constrained by the productivity level and colonial international order of the time, this system was distinctly Eurocentric and driven by power politics. Its governance was limited to core European areas, excluding vast colonial regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America from this international framework. The essence was dividing power and balancing interests among European powers, without establishing universally applicable international norms or addressing global public governance needs.

The First Industrial Revolution brought a revolutionary increase in productivity that shattered the traditional world pattern with geographical isolation. It advanced global governance from mere great-power security coordination to multi-sector institutional development, thereby completing the initial formation of the modern global governance system. The widespread adoption of disruptive technologies such as rail, ocean shipping and telegraph communication fundamentally reshaped global production, trade and human mobility. Transnational economic exchanges, public affairs, and technical cooperation grew exponentially in frequency and scale. The traditional model of single-state sovereignty-based jurisdiction and bilateral diplomatic negotiations could no longer satisfy the new demands arising from economic globalization, leaving a governance gap in the transnational public sphere that became a global concern. Development demands for socialization and globalization of productive forces pushed governance beyond political and security issues, expanding into public domains like humanitarian aid, communications and postal services, technical standards, and dispute resolution. This shift propelled global governance towards specialization, permanence, and standardization.

^① Fu Xiaoqiang, “How to Reform and Improve Global Governance,” *Qiushi Journal*, No. 22, 2025, November 16, 2025, <https://www.qstheory.cn/20251114/482dce6d29d84d91bb35f4623c26c791/c.html>.

In the mid-to-late 19th century, a series of permanent international institutions and standardized governance conventions were established. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was founded in 1863, and the first Geneva Convention was adopted in 1864, which constructed the core framework of modern international humanitarian governance. The International Telegraph Union was formed in 1865, and the General Postal Union (GPU) was established by the Treaty of Bern in 1874 and later renamed the Universal Postal Union (UPU) in 1878, setting unified technical standards and collaboration mechanisms for global communications and postal services. The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 further regulated the conduct of warfare, established an international dispute resolution system, and promoted the institutionalization of international security governance. These institutional practices completely transformed the previously loose cooperation model of ad hoc consultation and issue-specific negotiation to a basic system of permanent institutions, specialized rules and standardized frameworks in international governance. Production socialization and globalization driven by the Industrial Revolution created public demand for collaborative governance among nations. Such demand was the fundamental driver behind enhanced international cooperation, as well as the emergence of the modern global governance system while providing institutional experiences and practical models for its development.

The two world wars in the first half of the 20th century fully exposed the structural defects of the old hegemonic governance system, pushing global governance towards universality, comprehensiveness, and security and leading to significant advancements in governance concepts and institutional structures. The unprecedented devastation of World War I led the international community to deeply realize that governance models based on power balancing and zero-sum games could not maintain lasting peace. Governance concepts of collective security and multilateral co-governance emerged at this time. The League of Nations, the first world intergovernmental organization aimed at maintaining peace, pioneered efforts in disarmament, refugee resettlement, public health and other areas. However, constrained by the international context of the time, this governance system had critical flaws. The colonial system was still intact, leaving many developing regions without sovereignty or voice in governance, resulting in unrepresentative governance actors. Imbalances in rights and responsibilities among great powers, rigid decision-making processes, and weak enforcement capacity meant that hegemonic self-interests often trumped collective security, ultimately causing the failure of this system and the resurgence of war. This history demonstrates that



the effectiveness of international mechanisms depends not only on the design of rules but also on broad participation, balanced rights and responsibilities, and genuine commitments to shared rules.^①

After World War II, the international balance of power underwent a fundamental transformation. The great victory in the anti-fascist war united countries worldwide in a common consensus to pursue peace, oppose war and uphold equality, laying the groundwork for building a new global governance system that is more universal, just and institutionalized. In 1945, the United Nations (UN) was founded, and its Charter set forth basic principles of international relations such as sovereign equality, peaceful dispute resolution, and non-interference in internal affairs, forming the institutional cornerstone of modern international relations. Institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Health Organization (WHO) were successively established, promoting international cooperation further into finance, trade, development, health and other fields. However, the Bretton Woods system led by the United States, along with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), gave the West an advantageous position in rule-making and major decision-making in international economic governance, resulting in historical limitations of insufficient representation and uneven power distribution. As national liberation movements gained momentum, many newly independent countries emerged on the global stage. UN membership increased from the original 51 to the current 193, enhancing the representativeness and universality of the international governance system. The international system with the UN at its core, the international order underpinned by international law, and the basic principles of international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter have become vital institutional guarantees for post-war world peace and development, laying the foundation for the development and improvement of the global governance system.

Following the end of the Cold War, the geopolitical pattern of bipolar confrontation dissolved, and ideological conflicts gradually gave way to deep integration through economic globalization and collaborative governance of global risks. Global governance

^① The United Nations Office at Geneva, “The League of Nations,” <https://www.ungeneva.org/en/about/league-of-nations/overview>.

entered into a new stage of comprehensive expansion. Along with the transition towards a multipolar world, advancement in economic globalization, and a new round of sci-tech revolution, human societies have become more interconnected and interdependent than ever before. Global challenges such as climate change, systemic financial risks, major transnational public health events and cyberspace security have become intertwined and superimposed, exhibiting distinct cross-border, interconnected and global characteristics. Against this backdrop, multilateral governance mechanisms have accelerated their improvement, and governance rules have been continuously updated: The establishment of the WTO created an institutionalized framework for global trade governance; the G20 upgraded from a specialized financial dialogue mechanism to a central platform for coordinating global macroeconomic policies, risk prevention, and development governance; major multilateral international arrangements such as the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement have comprehensively expanded global governance beyond traditional security and economic and trade fields to emerging areas such as sustainable development, ecology and climate. Regional international organizations, transnational city networks, research think tanks, market enterprises, and social organizations widely participate in global governance, forming a new governance pattern of multi-level linkage and multi-stakeholder collaboration among states, markets and societies. Nevertheless, the end of the Cold War did not eliminate power politics. Some Western countries continue to dominate key international mechanisms, and many developing countries remain underrepresented with their voice insufficiently heard. As global challenges multiply amid the continuous shifts in the international power landscape, problems such as delayed reforms and weak responses within the existing governance system have become increasingly apparent, while unilateralism and geopolitical rivalry have further undermined the effectiveness of multilateral cooperation. On the whole, post-Cold War global governance has continuously expanded in terms of cooperation areas and participating actors, but the current governance system has not fully adapted to new changes in the international power landscape nor effectively responded to growing common challenges. This underscores the need to reform and improve global governance alongside deepening international cooperation. These efforts aim to foster joint forces to tackle global challenges while ensuring equal rights to participate in global governance for all countries, especially developing countries, steering global governance towards a more just and equitable future.

Looking back at history, the evolution of the global governance system follows its



inherent laws: the advancement of productive forces determines the breadth and depth of international interactions; changes in the international landscape affect rule-making bodies and methods; and global common challenges test the adaptability of institutions. Every governance system carries the imprint of its era. It should not be simply negated without considering historical context, nor should maintaining a “rules-based international order” be used as a pretext for clinging to hegemony. As a new round of sci-tech revolution and industrial transformation accelerates, global risks and challenges are emerging amid profound shifts in the international power landscape. Reforming and improving the global governance system to create a new pattern that is more just, inclusive and orderly is a historical imperative aligned with the developing productive forces and evolving international landscape. It is also a practical necessity to meet the shared needs of all countries, safeguard the common interests of humanity, and promote the sustainable development of human society.

03

Reforming and Improving Global Governance: An Issue of the Times that the World Must Address Today

- The global governance system faces a justice challenge as a few developed countries cling to the existing benefit structure, undermining international fairness and justice
- The global governance system faces an inclusiveness crisis as developing countries are underrepresented, with many obstacles to equal co-governance
- The global governance system faces an order challenge as unilateralism undermines the authority of multilateral mechanisms, increasing turbulence and disorder in the international system



Reforming and Improving Global Governance: An Issue of the Times that the World Must Address Today

At present, as changes unseen in a century accelerate, deficits in peace, development, security and governance are intertwined. The structural contradictions within the current global governance system have become fully exposed, such as in its institutional structure, power distribution, rule framework and operational mechanism. This system struggles to adapt to the profound shifts in the international power landscape and finds it difficult to manage compound global risks and challenges and even more difficult to meet the widespread demands of developing countries for fairness and justice, shared development, and security and stability. Reforming and improving the global governance system is no longer optional but rather essential to conform to historical trends, address issues of our times, and safeguard peace and development.

(i) The global governance system faces a justice challenge as a few developed countries cling to the existing benefit structure, undermining international fairness and justice

Justice lies at the heart of global governance, expressed through equal rights and responsibilities, balanced power and accountability, and equal access to opportunities and resources among nations. Under shared rules, all countries should have corresponding rights and responsibilities, and their peoples should enjoy fair access to



development opportunities, public resources and governance outcomes. However, the persistence of hegemonic governance dominated by several Western countries remains unbroken. There is a serious mismatch between the power distribution established after World War II and the contemporary international power landscape, leading to a continuous erosion of justice in global governance.

Power allocation within international mechanisms increasingly fails to reflect actual contributions of various countries. The power structures, share distributions and decision-making rules of key global governance mechanisms largely stem from the post-World War II era and are closely tied to the vested interests of Western developed countries. Over recent decades, many emerging markets and developing countries have risen collectively, making more substantial contributions to global economic growth, trade, poverty reduction and development, and public governance. Yet, the rights to make rules, set agendas and allocate resources in core mechanisms such as international finance, trade, and security remain long monopolized by a few countries, creating a mismatch between rights and responsibilities. Benefit distribution under the global governance system heavily favors traditional powers.

Some countries implement “double standards” arbitrarily, undermining the moral foundation and institutional authority of international governance. Unequal application of rules erodes both the moral and political basis of the international order.^① Applying rules in a selective manner, certain countries frequently withdraw from international organizations and treaties and veto or delay multilateral agreements, and selectively fulfill international obligations. They engage in unilateral bullying practices, prioritize domestic laws over international law, and abuse unilateral sanctions and technology blockades, as well as long-arm jurisdiction, artificially severing global industrial and supply chains and damaging the basic order of international cooperation. In areas such as human rights, economy and trade, technology and security, they apply lenient

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, “Concept Paper on the Global Governance Initiative,” September 1, 2025, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjb_673085/zzjg_673183/gjs_673893/xwlb_673895/202509/t20250901_11699909.shtml; Information Office of the State Council, “More Just and Equitable Global Governance: China’s Principles, Proposals and Actions,” June 17, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/gjhdq_676201/gjhdqzz_681964/zgzyjz_148206/zywj_688970/202606/t20260617_11947249.shtml.

standards to themselves while imposing harsh standards on others, and politicize and weaponize the public attributes of economic and technological interdependence to create bloc confrontations and development barriers.

Governance injustice further entrenches global development disparities. Progress lags far behind schedule for the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, while the development gap between the Global North and South is widening. Critical challenges remain in poverty reduction, food security, education and health. In emerging areas such as green transition and digital technology, some developed countries shift transformation costs onto developing countries and impose binding requirements beyond their development stages. Through technological monopolies, financial barriers, and market access restrictions, they deprive developing countries of legitimate development rights, resulting in unfair distribution of development opportunities and governance rights in emerging areas. Such practices, which prioritize individual interests over common development, deviate from the true purpose of global governance — to enhance shared wellbeing — highlighting the urgent need to reform and improve global governance and uphold international fairness and justice.

(ii) The global governance system faces an inclusiveness crisis as developing countries are underrepresented, with many obstacles to equal co-governance

Inclusiveness fundamentally means upholding sovereign equality, respecting the diversity of civilizations and differences in development stages of countries, and ensuring equal participation, voice and benefits for all countries. A major flaw in current global governance is that some countries, seeking to maintain their hegemony and interests, have long obstructed the reform process of the UN and its agencies, causing significant delays in reforms such as IMF quota reform and World Bank shareholding reform. Many developing countries remain underrepresented, with their voice insufficiently heard. The global governance system is thus facing an inclusiveness crisis, which contradicts the trend of the collective rise of the Global South.

The collective rise of the Global South has reshaped the international power landscape, yet their influence within global governance remains critically inadequate. Today, the Global South is a key force driving global development, supporting the multilateral order, and addressing global challenges. By purchasing power parity, the Global South accounts for over 60% of the world economy and contributes 80% of global economic



growth. However, in major multilateral institutions like the UN, IMF and World Bank, seat allocation, voting power and agenda setting still follow outdated patterns. Many developing, small and medium-sized, and least developed countries lack institutional influence commensurate with their actual contributions. The times demand a more inclusive, equitable and sustainable global governance model. The process by which Global South countries gain greater respect for their development rights, voice, and decision-making power in international affairs will be a historic journey towards a more dynamic, effective and hopeful global governance system.

Capacity gaps among countries limit inclusive participation in global governance. Inclusiveness requires respecting civilizational differences, considering the development stages of various countries, and incorporating the knowledge and experiences of diverse interest groups during governance. However, in emerging areas like AI and digital governance, some major powers leverage their technological, financial and talent advantages to dominate agenda-setting and rule-making, while smaller countries often face funding, technology and expertise constraints, hindering their effective participation. If dominant countries further use rules to protect their interests and restrict others' development, the strong will grow stronger while the weak fall further behind. Capacity gaps will turn into inequalities in participation opportunities and development rights. Allowing power advantages to translate into rule privileges undermines inclusiveness and sovereign equality in global governance.

(iii) The global governance system faces an order challenge as unilateralism undermines the authority of multilateral mechanisms, increasing turbulence and disorder in the international system

Orderly global governance requires countries to adhere to common rules, ensure stable operation of international mechanisms, and manage differences and resolve disputes through recognized procedures. Currently, a prominent risk for global governance is that unilateralism and hegemonic practices continuously weaken the multilateral system, exacerbating fragmentation of mechanisms and disorder in rules. The stability and effectiveness of the governance order face serious threats.

The authority of multilateral mechanisms is increasingly eroded, and the operational framework of the global governance system is under systemic stress. Unilateralism and protectionism are rising noticeably. Some major powers deviate from the purposes and

principles of the UN Charter, instrumentalizing multilateral platforms for geopolitical purposes. They frequently withdraw from international organizations, renege on treaty commitments, and cut off funding, deliberately obstructing the normal functioning of multilateral mechanisms. They paralyze the WTO dispute settlement system, and weaken global health and climate governance, intentionally creating blockages in multilateral operations. Moreover, they form exclusive groups and regional closed mechanisms, and replace multilateral cooperation with bloc confrontations, leading to duplicated governance bodies, fragmented rules, and internal competition that wastes governance resources. These actions disrupt the global governance system established after World War II.

Intertwined and overlapping risks, both old and new, further intensify the disorder crisis in global governance. Traditional security conflicts continue to spill over, with risks spreading across energy, food, industrial and supply chains, and financial markets. Technological advances in AI, cross-border data, and digital platforms outpace rule development, with competing systems and standards emerging. Facing complex transnational challenges, no single country, however powerful, can provide effective solutions alone. Without authoritative coordination mechanisms and widely accepted rules, governance risks descending into a chaotic state where each acts independently and obstructs others, and crisis management costs are borne collectively by the international community.

Justice, inclusiveness, and order complement each other. Without justice, it is difficult for rules to gain acceptance; without inclusiveness, decisions fail to reflect the majority's needs; and without order, even the best agreements cannot be implemented. Reforming and improving global governance does not mean dismantling the existing system and rebuilding in full or replacing one power with another. Instead, it aims to better align the international system with new shifts in the global power landscape, respond to emerging global challenges, and protect the legitimate rights and interests of all countries, especially developing ones. This is a defining issue of our times that the international community must address together.



Reforming and Improving Global Governance: An Issue of the Times that the World Must Address Today

The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

- Opposing hegemonic acts with sovereign equality, clarifying the basic norms of global governance
- Responding to the disorder of rules with the international rule of law, consolidating the legal foundation of global governance
 - Combating pseudo-multilateralism with true multilateralism, building consensus for cooperation in global governance
- Correcting the instrumentalization tendency with a people-centered approach, calibrating the value orientation of global governance
- Breaking deadlock with an action-oriented approach, enhancing global governance effectiveness through multi-pronged measures

04

The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

Traditional theories of global governance, rooted in Western institutional experience, face significant explanatory and adaptive deficiencies, struggling to address the inadequacies in representation, authority, and effectiveness of the global governance system.^① The Global Governance Initiative proposed by China, with its core principles of upholding sovereign equality, abiding by the international rule of law, practicing multilateralism, advocating a people-centered approach, and focusing on taking real actions, employs the methodology of “two integrations,” grounding itself in the fundamental tenets of Marxism while inheriting the essence of fine traditional Chinese culture. It answers the epochal questions of “who governs, how to govern, and for whom to govern,” achieving a sublation and transcendence of traditional global governance theories. This initiative provides a systematic solution for reforming and improving global governance, as well as a new pathway for resolving the fundamental and pressing problems facing human society today.

^① Zhao Long, “Theoretical Innovation of the Global Governance Initiative and the Path to Building Independent Knowledge System,” *Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies*, 2026, No. 4, pp. 14–33, 157.



(i) Opposing hegemonic acts with sovereign equality, clarifying the basic norms of global governance

The GGI takes sovereign equality as its primary premise, fundamentally transcending the jungle logic of defining interests by power and advancing inclusive global governance with shared participation. ^①The Western neorealist hegemonic stability theory posits that the world order should be dominated by a single hegemonic power, with international rules formulated by Western major powers. ^②Under this model, the vast majority of small and medium-sized and developing countries often find themselves in subordinate positions, passively accepting Western rules. The GGI, by contrast, insists that sovereign equality is the most important norm governing relations between states and the primary principle that the UN and all international institutions and organizations should collectively uphold. Only by putting sovereign equality into practice can global governance have a solid moral and practical foundation.

It advocates equality among all countries, regardless of size, and opposes the hegemonic logic that “might is right”. Proceeding from a so-called “position of strength”, a small number of states decide international affairs based on who has the “bigger arms and stronger fists”, placing the will of the powerful above international rules and reducing international relations to a jungle game where the strong prey on the weak. The GGI upholds sovereign equality, insisting that the principle of sovereignty is the cornerstone of modern international relations norms. All countries, irrespective of size, strength, or wealth, are equal members of the international community.

It advocates mutual respect for each other’s social systems and development paths, and opposes acts of interference in internal affairs and violations of sovereignty. A small number of states, under the guise of “humanitarian intervention” and “democracy promotion”, glorify interference in internal affairs as “international responsibility”, whitewash regime change as “advancing democracy”, and package the trampling of

^① Wu Zhicheng, Liu Peidong, “The Profound Connotations and Important Contributions of the Global Governance Initiative,” *Contemporary International Relations*, 2026, No. 1, pp. 5–23, 139.

^② Liu Qing, “The Global Governance Initiative: Paradigm Innovation, International Recognition, and Practical Pathways,” *Contemporary International Relations*, 2026, No. 1, pp. 24–45, 139.

sovereignty as a “rules-based international order”. In essence, they presume that the sovereignty of other countries is inferior to their own and that other nations have no right to independently choose their development paths. The GGI upholds sovereign equality, asserting that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries must be respected, that internal affairs are not subject to interference, and that every nation has the right to independently choose its social system and development path. It opposes the export of systems and the transplantation of models, refusing to judge other countries by the sole yardstick of one’s own system and development path.

It advocates promoting the democratization of international relations, and opposes the monopoly of international affairs by a small number of states. For a long time, Western countries have monopolized the power to formulate international rules and set the discourse, leaving emerging markets and developing countries lacking international voice, agenda-setting power, and rule-making authority. They are often placed in the position of objects of governance rather than subjects of governance, with their interests and demands frequently overlooked.^① The GGI upholds sovereign equality, advocating that all countries have the right to equal participation, equal decision-making, and equal benefit-sharing in the process of global governance, so as to enable the global governance system to better embody and reflect the interests and demands of the majority of countries, and to enhance the representation and voice of developing countries.

(ii) Responding to the disorder of rules with the international rule of law, consolidating the legal foundation of global governance

The GGI establishes adherence to the international rule of law as its fundamental guarantee, fundamentally transcending the double standards inherent in the “rules-based order” theory. Neoliberal institutionalism in Western international relations theory advocates for reducing governance costs and promoting state cooperation through international institutions and rule systems. Certain individual states define “rules” in ambiguous terms. The “rules-based international order” they champion does not

^① Sun Jisheng, “Global Governance Challenges and the Main Paths for Implementing the Global Governance Initiative,” *World Economics and Politics*, 2025, No. 12, pp. 3–23, 161.



The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

refer to the internationally recognized “international system centered on the United Nations, the international order based on international law, and the basic norms of international relations founded on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations”. Instead, it serves as an ideological tool for a small number of states to pursue hegemonism and construct a hierarchical order. The GGI, by contrast, insists that the international rule of law is the cornerstone of the international order, that international law constitutes the code of conduct to be observed by all states, and that global governance must operate within the recognized framework of international law. Only when all states participate equally and benefit equally under the framework of the rule of law can global governance truly move toward fairness and reasonableness, enhancing the well-being of people across all nations.

It advocates adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and opposes the practice of “using them when convenient and discarding them when not.” Certain individual states cling to a narrow conception of national interest, selectively applying internationally recognized rules like items from a menu based on their own strategic needs. When international law aligns with their interests, they emphasize its binding force; when it constrains them, they ignore it or resort to a “rules-based” exceptionalism.^① Individual states have both conducted cross-border military operations without authorization from the Security Council and promoted regime change, while also imposing unilateral sanctions, manipulating long-arm jurisdiction, and withdrawing from international treaty mechanisms when things do not go their way. Such double standards severely trample upon the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and undermine the foundation of the international rule of law. The GGI adheres to the international rule of law, insisting that all states should comprehensively, fully, and faithfully observe the basic norms of international relations, including the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It upholds the strict observance of the rule of law and compliance with rules, rejects double standards and exceptionalism, and ensures the organic unity of responsibilities, rights, and obligations.

^① Yang Leixin, “The Critique and Transcendence of the Global Governance Initiative over the ‘Theory of Rules-Based Order’ and Its Practical Significance,” *Indian Ocean Economic and Political Review*, 2025, No. 6, pp. 1–22, 170.

It advocates defending the impartiality and seriousness of the international rule of law, and opposes the imposition of “family rules and gang regulations” on others. Some states claim to uphold a so-called “rules-based international order”, but in reality, they are imposing their own will on others, replacing the universally accepted international legal norms with the “family rules and gang regulations” crafted within their own exclusive circles of allies, packaging a “hegemonic order” as an “international order”. The United States, relying on self-defined legal standards such as the “effects doctrine” and “minimum contacts”, extends the reach of its domestic law infinitely across the globe, exercising jurisdiction without the consent of other states, even carrying out arrests on the territory of third countries, completely disregarding the legal sovereignty and judicial jurisdiction of the states where the conduct occurs.^① Such conduct reduces international law to a tool that can be arbitrarily interpreted and selectively applied, seriously undermining the authority and credibility of international law and exposing the international community to the risk of a hegemonic order of “might makes right”. The GGI adheres to the international rule of law, asserting that major countries are the key force in promoting the international rule of law. They should take the lead in becoming advocates and defenders of the international rule of law, and must not place their “family rules and gang regulations” above international law, infringing upon the legitimate rights and interests of other states or undermining international peace and stability.

It advocates that international rules must be jointly written by all states, and opposes the monopolization of rule-making power. Hegemonic states extend zero-sum game thinking to emerging domains crucial to the future of all nations, such as artificial intelligence, cyberspace, outer space, the deep sea, and the polar regions. By monopolizing rule-making power and opportunities for technological development, they deprive the vast majority of developing countries of their right to equal participation and sharing of development achievements, turning these domains that should benefit all of humanity into hegemonic private property. Certain individual states create hierarchies and distinctions of closeness in the field of artificial intelligence under the pretext of national security, constructing exclusive technological ecosystems

^① Du Lan, “The Long-Arm Jurisdiction of the U.S.: A Hegemonic Tool Endangering the International Order,” People’s Daily Online, May 27, 2026, <https://world-app.people.cn/n1/2026/0527/c1002-40728533.html>.



The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

and standard systems. They aim to deprive developing countries, including China, of the right to scientific and technological progress and equal participation in rule-making, exacerbating the global AI divide. The GGI adheres to the international rule of law, insisting that international law and international rules must be jointly formulated by all states. International rules for emerging fields should be developed on the basis of broad consensus, ensuring that they comprehensively, balancedly, and fairly reflect the rights, obligations, and responsibilities of all states.

(iii) Combating pseudo-multilateralism with true multilateralism, building consensus for cooperation in global governance

The GGI takes the practice of multilateralism as its fundamental pathway. It opposes pseudo-multilateralism and advocates pooling the collective strength of the international community to jointly advance the reform and development of the global governance system. Certain individual states, while paying lip service to multilateralism, actually engage in club-style bloc politics^①, dividing the world along “value lines” and suppressing those who differ from them. This pseudo-multilateralism manifests itself in three typical forms: “self-interest-first multilateralism”, which privatizes multilateral mechanisms for selfish gains; “small-circle multilateralism”, which turns multilateral platforms into exclusive blocs; and “selective multilateralism”, which instrumentalizes multilateral rules as tools of convenience. Conversely, the GGI maintains that global governance must be advanced through true multilateralism, which guarantees that the voice of every country is heard and respected, and that the benefits of governance are beneficial to all parties.

It upholds the banner of extensive consultation, joint contribution, and shared benefits, opposing the self-serving logic of “self-interest-first multilateralism”. Extensive consultation, joint contribution, and shared benefits serve as the touchstone for distinguishing true multilateralism from its counterfeit. “Self-interest-first multilateralism” verbally acknowledges multilateral co-governance, yet in practice

^① Yang Leixin, “The Critique and Transcendence of the Global Governance Initiative over the ‘Theory of Rules-Based Order’ and Its Practical Significance,” *Indian Ocean Economic and Political Review*, 2025, No. 6, pp. 1–22, 170.

treats multilateral mechanisms as tools for realizing its own national interests, transforming the “provision of responsibility” envisioned by hegemonic stability theory into the “exploitation of public instruments for private gain”. The GGI practices true multilateralism, insisting on pooling wisdom through extensive consultation, gathering strength through joint contribution, and benefiting all through shared benefits. It maintains that global affairs should be discussed and handled by all parties together, that the global governance system should be built by all countries collectively, and that the outcomes of governance should be shared by all nations.

It resolutely upholds the central role of the UN, opposing the divisive actions of “small-circle multilateralism”. “Small-circle multilateralism” draws lines based on ideology, weaves exclusive alliances, and frequently bypasses the UN packaging its own rule systems as a “rules-based international order”. In essence, it seeks to replace universally accepted international rules with “small-circle” regulations and to substitute international rule of law with “bloc will”. To counter such divisive actions, the main battleground of global governance must be firmly anchored in the most broadly representative multilateral platforms. The UN is the primary platform for practicing multilateralism and advancing global governance, and its authoritative status must not be shaken. The GGI upholds multilateralism, advocating the breaking down of “small circles” through “great unity”, returning global governance to the original meaning of multilateralism that international affairs should be discussed and decided by all parties together, and that the future of the world should be in the hands of all countries.

It steadfastly promotes multilateral dialogue, consultation, and cooperation, opposing the double standards of “selective multilateralism”. “Selective multilateralism” treats issues differently and applies disparate standards to different actors: it champions cooperation on matters advantageous to itself while shelving or avoiding those that are not; it applies entirely different rules to allies versus adversaries, substituting “selectivity” for “universality” and negating “fairness” with “exceptionalism”. Such selective engagement is, in essence, the practice of double standards, treating international rules as optional tools. The GGI practices multilateralism, advocating the building of consensus through dialogue, the resolution of differences through consultation, and the achievement of win-win outcomes through cooperation. It calls for all parties to jointly participate in rule-making on an equal footing, maximizing the openness and inclusiveness of cooperation mechanisms, concepts, and policies, so that global governance moves from “being dictated by a few” to “being decided by all



together”.

(iv) Correcting the instrumentalization tendency with a people-centered approach, calibrating the value orientation of global governance

The GGI steadfastly advocates a people-centered value orientation, shifting the focus of governance from “capital-centric” back to “people-centric”. Traditional theories of global governance, taking the liberal international order as their basic framework, are essentially designed to safeguard the interests of Western developed countries. ^①Under the Western-dominated governance paradigm, Western experience and norms are regarded as the sole correct standard, capital logic dominates global development, and the interests and demands of the vast majority of people are marginalized. ^②By contrast, the GGI asserts that governance should be for the people, rely on the people, and have its fruits shared by the people. It aims to turn the aspiration of people in all countries for a better life into reality, making the people of all nations the true participants in and beneficiaries of global governance.

It advocates promoting human rights through development, and opposes the politicization, instrumentalization, and weaponization of human rights issues. Certain individual states frequently impose sanctions on other countries in the name of upholding human rights, yet turn a blind eye to their own human rights records, including racism, gun violence, forced labor, and violations of indigenous peoples’ rights. Such practices distort human rights into a political tool for pressuring other countries and interfering in their internal affairs, severely damaging the right to subsistence and the right to development of the people in other countries, and deviating from the core values and essential requirements of human rights. Living a life of contentment is the ultimate human right, and development holds the key to delivering better lives to the people. The GGI advocates a people-centered approach, committed to promoting human rights through development. It maintains that the right to subsistence

^① Zhang Yuhuan, “Global Governance Initiative: Core Connotations, Contemporary Value, and Practice Pathways,” *Northeast Asia Forum*, 2026, No. 2, pp. 67–78, 128.

^② Wu Zhicheng, Liu Peidong, “The Profound Connotations and Important Contributions of the Global Governance Initiative,” *Contemporary International Relations*, 2026, No. 1, pp. 5–23, 139.

and the right to development should be regarded as the primary and fundamental human rights, effectively guaranteeing the equal right to development of people in all countries, promoting the sharing of development achievements by all people, and enhancing the sense of fulfillment, happiness, and security of people across nations.

It advocates safeguarding world peace and tranquility, and opposes the instigation of confrontation and antagonism along ideological lines. Certain individual states cling to Cold War mentalities, dividing the world into a binary opposition between “democratic” and “non-democratic”, replacing universally recognized international rules and consensus with “value-based alliances”. They pursue “decoupling and severing supply chains” in the economic and trade sphere, erect “small yards with high fences” in the scientific and technological field, and piece together exclusive military blocs in the security domain. Such practices draw lines based on camps, sever normal exchanges between countries, artificially create estrangement and suspicion, seriously erode the foundation of mutual trust among nations, and threaten world peace and tranquility. The aspirations of people in all countries for a better life are interconnected, and their desire for peace and development is shared. The GGI advocates a people-centered approach, promoting understanding and fostering mutual trust through dialogue, advancing solidarity and seeking consensus through exchange, encouraging peaceful coexistence among nations, and enhancing the sense of security of people across the world.

It advocates fostering mutual understanding and affinity among the peoples of all countries, and opposes the creation of civilizational estrangement through the notion of civilizational superiority. Certain individual states cling to the “clash of civilizations” and “civilizational superiority” theses, elevating their own civilizational models and values to the status of “universal standards”, while denigrating, suppressing, and isolating civilizations different from their own, turning civilizational exchange into civilizational infiltration and value exportation. Such conduct artificially transforms civilizational differences into civilizational antagonism, attempting to assimilate diverse civilizations with a single civilizational model, thereby eroding the humanistic foundation of global governance. Civilizations communicate through diversity, learn from each other through exchanges, and progress through mutual learning. The GGI advocates a people-centered approach, focusing on people-to-people connectivity, striving to eliminate ideological barriers between different countries and groups, intensifying cultural and people-to-people exchanges, promoting mutual understanding and affinity among the peoples of all countries, enabling the fruits of civilizational



The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

exchange and mutual learning to benefit the people of all nations more extensively and directly, and effectively enhancing the sense of happiness of people across the world.

(v) Breaking deadlock with an action-oriented approach, enhancing global governance effectiveness through multi-pronged measures

The key to global governance lies in pragmatic action to “change the world”. The GGI takes action orientation as an important principle, advocating that the vitality of global governance lies in action and its key lies in results. It seeks to propel global governance from agenda-setting to tangible outcomes, responding to the governance demands of people across nations. Only by putting the action-oriented principle into practice can global governance be translated from a vision map into a roadmap, a construction blueprint, and a real-scene picture, effectively addressing global challenges and enabling people of all countries to share in the dividends of governance.

It insists on combining holistic advancement with breakthroughs in key areas to address the structural predicament of fragmentation and lagging reform in the global governance system. The institutional system envisioned by neoliberal institutionalism was supposed to be mutually complementary and synergistic, yet the reality is a proliferation of mechanisms operating in silos across various fields, with overlapping rules, intersecting functions, and inconsistent standards. At the same time, reforms of the global governance system lag significantly behind changes in the balance of international forces. Emerging economies and developing countries have long lacked voice, institutional reforms remain stagnant, and the governance architecture still clings to the power structure of the mid-20th century. The institutional efficacy envisioned by neoliberal institutionalism has been greatly compromised under the twin pressures of fragmentation and inertia. The GGI emphasizes action orientation, advocating both the coordinated advancement of all global governance agendas to jointly address the governance deficit, and a focus on the practical issues of greatest concern to all countries, especially developing nations, by delivering more visible results and providing effective solutions to avoid governance lag and fragmentation.

It insists on combining symptomatic treatment with root-cause solutions to address the institutional gridlock where multilateral bodies deliberate endlessly without reaching decisions, and make decisions without implementing them. Currently, protracted geopolitical conflicts, increasingly severe climate change, emerging risks

and challenges such as AI governance, and intertwined non-traditional security threats including public health crises, food and energy security, present a complex situation where urgent problems coexist with long-term challenges. Certain individual states, acting out of self-interest, frequently withdraw from international organizations and multilateral agreements, chronically and substantially default on their assessed contributions to the UN, and paralyze the dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO, causing increasing difficulties in the operation of multilateral mechanisms, leaving reforms of international institutions seriously lagging, and rendering many multilateral agendas mere empty talk. The GGI emphasizes action orientation, asserting that the international community should anchor itself to common goals, proposing effective responses to pressing issues while exploring fundamental solutions to long-term challenges. In particular, permanent members of the UN Security Council should play an exemplary role.

It insists on combining North-South cooperation with South-South cooperation to address the dual dilemma of “promises unfulfilled” and “insufficient institutional voice.” Developed countries have made resolute commitments in areas such as official development assistance and climate finance, yet repeatedly fail to deliver on them in action. Meanwhile, the Global South has long been in a passive recipient position within existing governance mechanisms, lacking the capacity to participate in agenda-setting and rule-making, and suffering from a low level of institutionalization for collective articulation, making it difficult to translate its development demands into effective international action. The GGI emphasizes action orientation, advocating that the North and South should complement each other’s advantages and move toward each other. In addition, developed countries should earnestly fulfill their international obligations and honor their commitments on aid and financing, and should not evade international responsibilities under any pretext. Developing countries should strengthen solidarity and self-reliance, making contributions within their capacity.



The Global Governance Initiative Represents a Systematic Transcendence of Traditional Global Governance Theories

05

The GGI continues to translate from conceptual vision into practical action

- Promoting the concept of multilateralism, building consensus on reforming and improving global governance
- Advocating reform of international institutions, actively enhancing the representation and voice of developing countries
- Building multilateral cooperation platforms to support the reform and improvement of global governance
- Focusing on governance in emerging fields, promoting global governance to keep pace with the times



The GGI continues to translate from conceptual vision into practical action

Since the GGI was put forward, China has worked with all parties to incorporate its relevant concepts into multilateral agendas, establish cooperation platforms, and promote the formation of institutional outcomes. These practices have been carried out within the framework of the UN and related multilateral mechanisms, focusing on addressing the common concerns of developing countries and remedying the deficiencies of existing governance mechanisms. As of September 2026, the Initiative has received active support from nearly 160 countries and international organizations. With the continuous expansion of international consensus, all parties have gradually strengthened institutional coordination, built cooperation platforms, and promoted the implementation of specific projects.^①

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, *Concept Paper on the Global Governance Initiative*, September 1, 2025, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjb_673085/zzjg_673183/gjs_673893/xwlb_673895/202509/t20250901_11699909.shtml; Xinhua News Agency, "Ministry of Foreign Affairs Introduces Progress and Achievements of the Global Governance Initiative in Its First Year," September 1, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/world/20260901/bef478784a644fea0e52bd4962a918/c.html>; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, "Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Guo Jiakun's Regular Press Conference on September 1, 2026," September 1, 2026, https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/fyrbt_673021/jzhsl_673025/202609/t20260901_12014070.shtml.



(i) Promoting the concept of multilateralism, building consensus on reforming and improving global governance

Through head-of-state diplomacy, multilateral meetings, and policy communications, China has consistently articulated the objectives, principles, and practical directions of the GGI. China has successively released the *Concept Paper on the Global Governance Initiative* and the white paper titled *More Just and Equitable Global Governance: China's Principles, Proposals and Actions*, clarifying China's goals and practical actions regarding global governance and consolidating broader consensus within the international community. Exchanges and cooperation surrounding the GGI have grown increasingly extensive. The Group of Friends of Global Governance has been established in New York, Geneva, and Vienna, with more than 60 countries as its members. All parties have engaged in intensive coordination on major issues such as the UN reform, opposition to unilateral sanctions, improvement of dispute settlement mechanisms, and digital and climate governance, issuing common positions at multilateral occasions within the UN and forming multiple consensual outcomes.

The widespread response to the GGI in its first year fully demonstrates that upholding multilateral cooperation, enhancing the representation of the Global South, and improving the effectiveness of governance are shared expectations of the international community.^① Nigeria regards the GGI as a valuable platform for advancing shared priorities, recognizing the potential for alignment between the Initiative and its national development objectives, its principle of strategic autonomy, as well as the African Union's *Agenda 2063*. Malaysia, in its statement at the May 28, 2026 meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance, indicated that the nine-point proposal put forward by Wang Yi aligns with Malaysia's multilateral priorities at the UN and

^① António Guterres, "Secretary-General's remarks to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization," September 1, 2025, <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statements/2025-09-01/secretary-generals-remarks-the-shanghai-cooperation-organization-prepared-for-delivery>; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, *Concept Paper on the Global Governance Initiative*, September 1, 2025, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjb_673085/zjzg_673183/gjs_673893/xwlb_673895/202509/t20250901_11699909.shtml; Xinhua News Agency, "Ministry of Foreign Affairs Introduces Progress and Achievements of the Global Governance Initiative in Its First Year," September 1, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/world/20260901/bef478784a644fea0e52bd4962a918/c.html>.

expressed particular appreciation for the emphasis on strengthening multilateralism, upholding the central role of the UN, promoting solidarity and cooperation, and enhancing the representation and voice of developing countries. Commentary from Chatham House, also known as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, noted that the Initiative does not seek to replace the UN with another system, but rather aims to rebalance the existing system to better reflect the changes in today's world.^① These positive responses spanning regions and levels reflect the broad aspiration of the international community to uphold multilateralism and pursue common development. They have also enhanced mutual understanding among all parties in jointly improving rules and coordinating actions within the UN framework, laying a solid foundation of cooperation for advancing global governance reform and building a community with a shared future for humanity.

(ii) Advocating reform of international institutions, actively enhancing the representation and voice of developing countries

With the collective rise of the Global South, the mismatch between the existing global governance architecture and the changing balance of international forces has become more pronounced, making it increasingly important to enhance the representation and voice of developing countries. China advocates that the reform of international institutions should adhere to sovereign equality, ensuring that all countries, regardless of size or strength, can participate equally, make decisions equally, and benefit equally. International affairs should not be monopolized by a small number of states. The reform of the Security Council should increase the representation and voice of developing countries, especially African nations. The purpose of the UN reform is to strengthen,

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, "Wang Yi Attends Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance," May 29, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/wjdt_674879/wjbxw_674885/202605/t20260529_11920267.shtml; Federal Ministry of Information and National Orientation of Nigeria, "Nigeria Endorses China's Global Governance Initiative," September 11, 2025, <https://fmino.gov.ng/nigeria-endorses-chinas-global-governance-initiative/>; Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations, "Statement: Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance," May 27, 2026, https://www.kln.gov.my/web/usa_un-new-york/post/statement-meeting-of-the-group-of-friends-of-global-governance; Yu Jie, "China Sets Out Its Vision for a New Global Order—but Will It Commit the Resources to Match Its Ambition?" Chatham House website, June 24, 2026, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2026/06/china-sets-out-its-vision-new-global-order-will-it-commit-resources-match-its-ambition>.



not weaken, the United Nations. It should be Member State-led, and ensure that the reform process is fair, inclusive, and transparent, and channel more resources toward solving major issues. The reforms advocated by China are not about starting from scratch, but about pushing existing international institutions to better reflect changes in the global landscape and more effectively respond to the demands of the vast number of developing countries.^①

At the UN level, China has long put forward specific reform proposals on improving global governance, and since the introduction of the GGI, it has further pushed for translating these concepts into reform actions. The *Position Paper of the People's Republic of China at the United Nations Summit of the Future and the 79th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*, released in 2024, stated that UN reform should be conducive to upholding multilateralism and the role of the United Nations, expanding the voice of developing countries in international affairs, and improving the implementation capacity and management efficiency of the UN bodies. It also called for improving the geographical balance of staff distribution in the Secretariat and specialized agencies, and enhancing the say of developing countries in the formulation, interpretation, and application of international rules. Regarding the UN80 Initiative process, in December 2025, China, speaking on behalf of 43 members of the Group of Friends of Global Governance, pointed out that developing countries account for two-thirds of the UN membership. Reform cannot be simplistically equated with cost-cutting and downsizing; rather, it should prioritize the development dimension in terms of mechanisms and resources, improve the representation of developing countries in the Secretariat, and ensure the equal participation of all Member States in the reform

^① Remarks by H.E. Wang Yi at the United Nations Security Council High-Level Meeting “Practicing Multilateralism, Reforming and Improving Global Governance,” February 19, 2025, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/eng/wjbzhd/202502/t20250219_11558555.html; Wang Yi, “Reforming and Improving Global Governance, Working Together for a Better Future—Keynote Speech at the Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance,” May 29, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjbzhd/202605/t20260529_11920384.shtml.

process.^①

Security Council reform is a crucial aspect of enhancing the representation of developing countries. China maintains that reform must substantively increase the representation and voice of developing countries, rectify the historical injustice against Africa, and enable more developing countries with independent foreign policies and a commitment to fairness to enter the Security Council and participate in its decision-making. At the same time, China emphasizes upholding the primary role of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform in the General Assembly, adhering to Member State leadership and full democratic consultations, and seeking a “package” solution to the interrelated issues of categories of membership, the veto, regional representation, the size of an enlarged Security Council and its working methods, and the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

^②It has also proposed further exploring reform ideas such as regional seats and rotating seats. This position embodies the global governance concept of extensive consultation, joint contribution, and shared benefits, aligns with the contemporary demand for democratizing international relations, and is committed to building a more just and equitable global governance system.

In the realm of international economic and financial governance, the reform of the international financial system has lagged seriously behind, with existing arrangements for quotas, equity, and voting rights failing to adequately reflect the profound changes in the global economic landscape. China advocates enhancing the representativeness of the international financial architecture and substantively increasing the representation,

^① Permanent Mission of the People’s Republic of China to the United Nations, “Position Paper of the People’s Republic of China at the United Nations Summit of the Future and the 79th Session of the United Nations General Assembly,” September 19, 2024, https://un.china-mission.gov.cn/hyyfy/202409/t20240919_11493225.htm; Fu Cong, “Joint Statement by Ambassador Fu Cong on Behalf of the Group of Friends of Global Governance at the UN Briefing on the UN80 Initiative,” December 11, 2025, https://un.china-mission.gov.cn/chn/hyyfy/202512/t20251212_11771276.htm.

^② Sun Lei, “Remarks by Ambassador Sun Lei, Chargé d’Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the PRC to the UN, at the First Meeting of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council Reform during the 80th Session of the UN General Assembly,” Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 21, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/zwbdt673032/wjzs/202601/t20260122_11841320.shtml.



voice, and participation of emerging market and developing countries. In October 2025, China proposed advancing the adjustment of IMF quota shares and conducting the World Bank shareholding review according to agreed timetables and roadmaps, in order to close the “democratic deficit” in global economic and financial governance as soon as possible. In May 2026, China called for accelerating the World Bank shareholding review, achieving meaningful adjustments in IMF quota shares at an early date, restoring the normal functioning of the WTO dispute settlement mechanism, and respecting the different economic systems and stages of development of all members.

^①These efforts contribute to enhancing the inclusiveness and accessibility of global economic and financial governance, creating a fairer and more favorable institutional environment for the common development of all countries.

(iii) Building multilateral cooperation platforms to support the reform and improvement of global governance

Reforming and improving the global governance system is a key measure for advancing the democratization of global governance and addressing its dysfunctions. It requires not only the guidance of sound and forward-looking concepts, but also the support of pragmatic, efficient, inclusive, and mutually beneficial multilateral cooperation mechanisms and platforms as carriers. For a long time, China has firmly upheld multilateralism, actively participated in and promoted the building of global and regional multilateral cooperation mechanisms, and continuously deepened practical cooperation in global governance, laying a practical foundation for the implementation of the GGI. Since the Initiative was put forward, responding to the real needs of global development and governance, China has promoted the establishment of a number of specialized and targeted new cooperation institutions and institutional arrangements, precisely addressing priority and difficult issues in global governance. These efforts have effectively compensated for the functional shortcomings of traditional multilateral

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, “Wang Yi: Actively Respond to the Aspirations of the Global South and Improve the Global Governance Architecture,” October 27, 2025, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjdt_674879/wjbxw_674885/202510/t20251027_11741237.shtml; Wang Yi, “Reforming and Improving Global Governance, Working Together for a Better Future – Keynote Speech at the Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance,” May 29, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjbzhd/202605/t20260529_11920384.shtml.

governance mechanisms, accurately responded to the development pain points and governance demands of Global South countries, and provided a solid institutional guarantee for continuously steering the global governance system toward a more just, equitable, inclusive, and balanced direction.

BRICS cooperation provides an open multilateral platform for the Global South to strengthen policy coordination and participate in international agendas. China has actively promoted BRICS enlargement and expanded BRICS Plus cooperation, fostering a richer and more layered cooperation network among member states and partner countries. In 2025, Indonesia became a full BRICS member, while countries such as Vietnam and Nigeria joined as partner countries. The 17th BRICS Summit issued the Rio de Janeiro Declaration and produced dedicated outcomes on climate finance, AI governance, and health cooperation, further broadening the range of issues through which BRICS engages in global governance. This enlargement has enhanced the mechanism's capacity for agenda-setting and expanded the space for industrial complementarity and cross-regional cooperation.^① The BRICS Partnership on New Industrial Revolution Innovation Center, advanced by China, organizes cooperation and facilitates project matching around industrial needs. As of early September 2026, it had promoted over 100 cooperation projects with total investment exceeding RMB 62 billion, and supported talent cultivation in industry and communications through scholarships and other means. The 2025 BRICS Media and Think Tank Forum brought together representatives from 36 countries and launched cooperative communication and joint content initiatives, expanding channels for the Global South to exchange development experience and articulate common demands. Industrial cooperation platforms enable enterprises and research institutions to translate policy dialogue into technological application and market opportunities, while media and think tank cooperation helps enhance mutual understanding of each other's national conditions and development paths. The driving forces, i.e., political security, economy, trade and finance, and people-to-people exchanges, enable BRICS not only to speak with

^① Xinhua News Agency, "BRICS Leaders' Rio de Janeiro Declaration (Summary)," July 7, 2025, <https://www.xinhuanet.com/world/20250707/66284135ed8c4411a59625b80f7ede1f/c.html>; China News Service, "Think Tank Report 'BRICS Cooperation Promotes Global South Solidarity and Common Progress' Released," July 17, 2025, <https://www.chinanews.com/gj/2025/07-17/10449275.shtml>.



a common voice on governance reform, but also to accumulate concrete cooperation outcomes around the specific needs of production and daily life, strengthening the Global South's capacity for autonomous development and its foundation for participating in international rule-making.^①

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) provides important support for closing the development financing gap. The AIIB, initiated by China, began formal operations in 2016. To date, it has grown from 57 founding members to 111 members, approved 361 projects with cumulative financing of nearly USD 70 billion, benefiting 40 member economies within and beyond Asia, with projects covering energy, transport, digital economy, urban renewal, and other fields. Its supported project to upgrade Bangladesh's distribution system helped improve rural access to electricity, reflecting the direct link between infrastructure financing and livelihood improvement. Infrastructure construction entails large investment and long cycles, and developing countries often cannot meet their needs relying solely on short-term commercial capital. Through multilateral cooperation, the AIIB organizes long-term funding, enabling members to advance connectivity and public service development in line with the practical needs of common development. From a governance perspective, this provides institutional space for economies at different development stages to cooperate, and allows China's development experience and international professional standards to inform each other in concrete projects, adding development-oriented and result-focused public goods to global economic governance.^②

The New Development Bank (NDB) translates the cooperative will of the BRICS countries into sustainable development financing capacity. As a multilateral

^① Xinhua News Agency, "Preview: President Xi Jinping Attends 18th BRICS Summit in India," September 10, 2026, <https://www2.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/20260910/cbaa3602460047039799bb4530d11c85/c.html>; Xinhua News Agency, "BRICS Media and Think Tanks Join Voices to Sketch Greater BRICS Cooperation and New Global South Landscape," July 17, 2025, <https://www.xinhuanet.com/20250717/f5592f6abe8f4ad1b19680fc66326ddf/c.html>.

^② CCTV.com, "Numbers on AIIB's Ten Years of Formal Operations: Nearly USD 70 Billion, 111 Members, 361 Projects," January 16, 2026, <https://news.cctv.cn/2026/01/16/ARTIkhzPgTuwTscm8eYyBYJV260116.shtml>; People's Daily Overseas Edition, "Exploring the AIIB's 'Success Code'," July 15, 2025, https://paper.people.com.cn/rmrbhwb/pc/content/202507/15/content_30087533.html.

development institution founded and led by emerging market and developing countries, the NDB focuses on supporting infrastructure and sustainable development projects. As of the first quarter of 2026, the bank had cumulatively approved approximately 140 investment projects, with total financing of about USD 42.9 billion, providing support for green energy, transportation, water supply, and other sectors. At the same time, the NDB has expanded local currency financing channels for member states. After issuing RMB 3 billion in Panda bonds in China in December 2025, the total amount of Panda bonds issued in China reached RMB 78.5 billion. By raising funds in member state markets and exploring local currency lending, the bank offers more options for project financing, helping to better align funding sources with development needs. Working in conjunction with the Contingent Reserve Arrangement established by China and other BRICS countries, these financial cooperation mechanisms provide support from the perspectives of long-term development financing and financial security cooperation respectively. Their significance lies in enhancing the ability of the Global South to mobilize its own resources and jointly address development challenges, while expanding channels for the international financial system to serve development through complementary multilateral mechanisms.^①

The SCO has accumulated practical experience in reforming and improving global governance. At the SCO Summit 2026 in Bishkek, President Xi Jinping explicitly supported the SCO in carrying out exemplary cooperation to implement the GGI, emphasizing the improvement of governance through dialogue and consultation, and promoting equal participation of all countries in global governance and the sharing

^① Xinhua News Agency, “Preview: President Xi Jinping Attends 18th BRICS Summit in India,” September 10, 2026, <https://www2.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/20260910/cbaa3602460047039799bb4530d11c85/c.html>; Xinhua News Agency, “BRICS New Development Bank Issues RMB 3 Billion Panda Bonds in China, December 5, 2025,” <https://www.xinhuanet.com/20251205/06f4c0ed20fb4db089d0bf2978ad25e9/c.html>; Xinhua News Agency, “The General Direction of Human Development and Progress Will Not Change—President Xi Jinping’s Visit to the BRICS New Development Bank Injects Strong Impetus for Supporting Global South Countries on the Path to Modernization,” May 1, 2025, <https://www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/20250501/f5ec958054524f-7bab39782bf0280e6a/c.html>.



of governance outcomes. ^①The SCO adheres to partnership without alliance, builds consensus through equal consultation, transforms the common needs of member states for maintaining security and pursuing development into cooperative actions, and has formed a new model of regional cooperation for jointly maintaining security and stability and promoting development and prosperity. ^②The continuous improvement of the SCO's security governance mechanisms underpins the development of this cooperation model. The SCO Summit 2025 in Tianjin announced the establishment of "four security centers," and the SCO Summit 2026 in Bishkek further approved regulations for the Integrated Center for Addressing Security Threats and Challenges and the Anti-Drug Center, perfecting the institutional basis for the early substantive operation of these bodies and for strengthening member state cooperation in counter-terrorism, anti-drug efforts, and combating transnational organized crime. ^③These arrangements help bring the security concerns of all countries into a cooperative framework of joint consultation and joint response, translating the governance principles of sovereign equality and multilateral coordination into concrete actions for maintaining regional peace and stability.

The SCO consolidates the foundation for common development through practical cooperation. Focusing on the construction and development needs of member states, the SCO has continuously advanced the building of regional development financing mechanisms on the basis of existing cooperation within the SCO Interbank Consortium.

^① Xi Jinping, "Promoting Higher-Quality Development of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization—Remarks at the 26th Meeting of the Council of Heads of State of the SCO," September 1, 2026, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/zyxw/202609/t20260901_12013951.shtml; Xi Jinping, "Jointly Advocating an Equal and Orderly Multipolar World and Achieving More Just and Equitable Global Governance—Remarks at the 'SCO Plus' Meeting," September 1, 2026, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/zyxw/202609/t20260901_12014173.shtml.

^② Wang Yi, "Remarks at the Reception Marking the 25th Anniversary of the SCO," June 15, 2026, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjbzhd/202606/t20260615_11946008.shtml.

^③ *Bishkek Declaration of the 25th Anniversary of the SCO*, September 1, 2026, Website of SCO, <https://chn.sectSCO.org/20260901/2493835.html>; "Wang Yi Introduces Eight Major Outcomes of the SCO Tianjin Summit," September 1, 2025, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/wjdt_674879/gjldrhd_674881/202509/t20250901_11699855.shtml.

The 2025 Tianjin Summit made a political decision to establish the SCO Development Bank, and the 2026 Bishkek Declaration confirmed that relevant member states have made positive progress on establishing the bank, emphasizing continued work on this front to create conditions for broadening development financing channels.^① The cooperation for development requires not only financial support but also helping countries build their capacity for self-driven development. Cooperation platforms such as the China-SCO Green Industry and Digital Economy platforms have been activated, providing support for technology exchange and industrial cooperation. China has proposed jointly implementing 100 science and technology cooperation projects with SCO countries over the next three years, and will establish a Port Economic Cooperation Center and a Basic Education Cooperation Center to better align scientific and technological innovation, connectivity, and talent cultivation with common development.^② These arrangements link financial support with capacity building, helping to enhance member states' ability to undertake cooperation projects and drive industrial transformation, enabling the fruits of regional cooperation to benefit the people of all countries more broadly and creating better conditions for countries at different development stages to share development opportunities.

The International Organization for Mediation (IOMed) has added a dedicated institutional channel for the peaceful settlement of disputes in the international community. In May 2025, the *Convention on the Establishment of the International Organization for Mediation* was signed in Hong Kong; in October of the same year, the IOMed was officially inaugurated and held its first Council meeting. As an intergovernmental legal organization, the IOMed, based on the voluntary consent of the parties, provides mediation services for disputes between states, between states

^① “Wang Yi Introduces Eight Major Outcomes of the SCO Tianjin Summit,” September 1, 2025, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/wjdt_674879/gjldrhd_674881/202509/t20250901_11699855.shtml; *Bishkek Declaration of the 25th Anniversary of the SCO*, September 1, 2026, Website of Shanghai Cooperation Organization, <https://chn.sectsc.org/20260901/2493835.html>.

^② “Joining Hands for the Development and Revitalization of All Countries, Reforming and Improving Global Governance—Wang Yi on President XI Jinping’s Attendance at the 2026 SCO Summit and State Visits to Kyrgyzstan and Egypt,” September 3, 2026, Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjzbzd/202609/t20260903_12015595.shtml



and investors of another state, and for international commercial disputes. The IOMed has successfully resolved its first international maritime dispute, and the number of cases accepted is steadily rising. ^① As of September 2026, 48 countries have signed or acceded to the Convention on the Establishment of the International Organization for Mediation, 18 of which have become Contracting Parties. ^② The expansion of the membership base and the initiation of case services indicate that this cooperation platform has begun to translate the common will for peaceful dispute resolution into actual services. By facilitating communication and coordinating interests between disputing parties through professional mediation, the IOMed helps find solutions acceptable to all sides for complex disputes and creates conditions for maintaining subsequent economic and trade exchanges and cooperative relationships. ^③

The governance significance of the IOMed also lies in its embodiment of respect for the will of the parties, equal consultation, and mutual understanding in dispute resolution procedures. Compared to adjudicative methods, mediation provides greater scope for the parties to autonomously arrange negotiations and balance legal issues with cooperation needs. The IOMed fills the institutional gap for a treaty-based organization specializing in international mediation and aims to build a global mediation cooperation network. For countries with varying levels of legal resources and dispute response capabilities, increasing specialized service channels helps broaden the options for peaceful dispute settlement. Complementing existing litigation and arbitration mechanisms, the IOMed enables the practice of international rule of law through negotiation and cooperation, and accumulates experience for parties with different legal traditions and cultural backgrounds to enhance mutual understanding and resolve differences. From policy coordination to financing and capacity building,

^① 21st Century Business Herald, “Exclusive Interview with IOMed Secretary-General Teresa Cheng: Making Mediation a ‘Lubricant’ for Asia-Pacific Cooperation,” September 16, 2026, <https://m.21jingji.com/article/20260916/c123933e7b25ccb1954405753180de60.html>.

^② International Organization for Mediation, *Basic Documents*, “Status of Signatures and Ratifications of the Convention and Related Declarations,” <https://www.iomed.int/zh-hans/基本文件/>.

^③ Wang Ping, “IOMed Resolves First International Maritime Dispute – Hong Kong Strengthens Its New Role as a ‘Rule Connector,’” *People’s Daily Overseas Edition*, May 13, 2026, p. 4; Li Xia, “Building a Global ‘Mediation Ecosystem,’” *People’s Daily Overseas Edition*, May 18, 2026, p. 4, hl..

and then to dispute resolution, multi-level cooperation platforms collectively support the translation of the GGI from concept to action.^①

(iv) Focusing on governance in emerging fields, promoting global governance to keep pace with the times

Technological evolution in emerging fields is rapid, while the supply of rules and the development of governance capacity lag behind. Climate, ecology, public health, and other areas also suffer from chronic underinvestment and prominent development gaps. By promoting the establishment of new institutions, improving cooperation rules, and providing financial and talent support, China channels governance resources toward common challenges faced by all countries. While practices vary across different fields, they all emphasize expanding cooperation on the basis of safeguarding national sovereignty and respecting development differences, enabling all countries, especially those in the Global South, to participate in governance processes, gain development opportunities, and enhance their capacity to independently address risks through cooperation.

The World Data Organization (WDO) has built a professional platform for bridging the data divide and enabling diverse actors to participate in governance. On March 30, 2026, the organization was established in Beijing. It is a professional, non-governmental, non-profit international association voluntarily formed by relevant institutions and individuals in the global data field. At the time of its establishment, it had gathered over 200 members from more than 40 countries. The WDO works to promote the exchange and use of data under compliant, secure, and trustworthy conditions, and helps all parties improve their conditions for accessing, using, and protecting data through capacity building, rule exchange, technological coordination, and industrial cooperation. Data governance requires balancing data development and security, so that governance takes into account both efficiency and equity. Data has become an important foundation for scientific and technological innovation and industrial upgrading, yet data resources, technological capacity, and institutional

^① Li Xia, "Building a Global 'Mediation Ecosystem,'" *People's Daily Overseas Edition*, May 18, 2026, p. 4.



conditions are unevenly distributed among countries. By connecting enterprises, universities, and research institutions, the WDO helps bring industry experience into rule discussions and translate practical needs in cross-border cooperation into standards alignment and application cooperation. Its value lies in providing developing countries with additional channels for professional exchange and capacity enhancement, enabling them, while contributing data resources, to be better placed to participate in data value creation, benefit sharing, and governance practice.^①

AI capacity-building cooperation lays the foundation for the Global South to participate in governance in the intelligent age. In July 2024, the UN General Assembly unanimously adopted the resolution on strengthening international cooperation in AI capacity building proposed by China, with over 140 countries as co-sponsors, placing the issue of developing countries' access to and application of AI capacities in an important position in international cooperation. In July 2026, China announced that over the next five years it would provide 5,000 special AI training places for developing countries, build international AI application cooperation centers for ASEAN, the League of Arab States, the African Union, CELAC, the SCO, and BRICS, and promote the deployment of the meteorological intelligent early-warning program "MAZU" in 30 countries. These measures bring talent cultivation and application needs into the governance agenda, helping developing countries enhance their ability to understand the technology, assess risks, and participate in rule consultations. Only when more countries are equipped with the conditions for autonomously using and governing AI can equal participation gain realistic support, and can the fruits of technological development more broadly benefit disaster prevention and mitigation, public services,

^① Xinhua News Agency, "World Data Organization Established in Beijing," March 30, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/20260330/9dbf84f1fb9b49a39abb040e7ab6f9a0/c.html>; CCTV News, "World Data Organization Formally Established in Beijing with Over 200 Members," March 30, 2026, https://ysxw.cctv.cn/article.html?toc_style_id=feeds_default&t=1774858701537&item_id=2883769554281380815&channelId=1119&fromModule=lemma_middle-info; Yang Jie, "Connecting the World Through Data, Creating the Future Through Cooperation," People's Daily, April 10, 2026, p3.

industrial development, and other fields.^①

The World Artificial Intelligence Cooperation Organization (WAICO) further provides a standing mechanism for international AI cooperation. On July 16, 2026, representatives of 29 countries signed the agreement establishing the organization in Shanghai; by September, the number of founding members had risen to 38. The organization is an independent intergovernmental international organization headquartered in Shanghai. It follows the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, attaches importance to a people-centered approach and extensive consultation, joint contribution, and shared benefits, and aims to promote international AI cooperation and global governance. It is open to all countries, supports the Global South in enhancing innovation, application, and governance capacities, and maintains communication with other international organizations. This platform helps advance cooperation in standards, security, and capacity building, allowing different governance models to become compatible through exchange and coordination. The establishment of WAICO provides small and medium-sized countries with a new platform to express their demands, engage in cooperation, and learn from governance experience, helping to make global AI governance pay greater attention to the right to development, civilizational differences, and the inclusive use of technological achievements.^②

^① Xinhua News Agency, “UNGA Adopts China-Proposed Resolution on Strengthening International Cooperation in AI Capacity Building,” July 2, 2024, <https://www.news.cn/20240702/2c92d103b7954416bf1b-ded107d66885/c.html>; Xi Jinping, “Building a Fair and Equitable Global AI Governance System—Keynote Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the 2026 World AI Conference and High-Level Meeting on Global AI Governance,” Xinhua News Agency, July 17, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/20260717/cd6f05c279b549ef81b90d3c7d3f02f6/c.html>.

^② Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Signing Ceremony of the Agreement on the Establishment of the World Artificial Intelligence Cooperation Organization Held in Shanghai,” July 16, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjzbhd/202607/t20260716_11984399.shtml; Cong Peiwu, “The Global Governance Initiative: From a Chinese Proposal to International Practice,” Published in the Iranian Students News Agency on September 5, 2026, Reprinted by the Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs on September 6, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/zwbd_673032/wjzs/202609/t20260907_12017244.shtml; Xinhua News Agency, “Chairman’s Statement of the 2026 World AI Conference and High-Level Meeting on Global AI Governance (Full Text),” July 17, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/20260717/3310820b96f949979ce6406712094935/c.html>; Xinhua News Agency, “Central Asian Expert: Establishment of WAICO Is a ‘Milestone,’” July 29, 2026, <https://www.news.cn/20260729/99d4bd69e0d34e749f76d-85de689e351/c.html>.



The International Alliance Combating Telecom and Cyber Fraud translates the governance of new types of transnational crime into a dedicated law enforcement cooperation mechanism. On September 10, 2026, the inaugural conference of the Alliance was held in Lianyungang, Jiangsu Province, with representatives from 46 founding countries, 34 observer countries, and 4 international organizations including the United Nations and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) attending. The parties jointly issued a joint statement on the establishment of the Alliance. Initiated by the Chinese government, the Alliance aims to deeply implement the Global Security Initiative and the GGI, establishing a professional intergovernmental international organization with broad participation from law enforcement agencies of various countries, whose core function is to effectively respond to transnational telecom and cyber fraud crimes and related offenses. Telecom and cyber fraud rely on cross-border communications, fund transfers, and personnel movements, making it difficult for single-country law enforcement measures to cover the entire criminal chain. Therefore, collaboration needs to be strengthened on the basis of respect for national sovereignty and legal systems. The Alliance provides an institutional platform for sustained communication, professional cooperation, and operational coordination, helping to reduce collaboration obstacles in cross-border governance and enhance the capacity to jointly address new types of crime. Its establishment links the Global Security Initiative and the Global Governance Initiative with the protection of people's property security and the maintenance of normal economic and social order, embodying an action orientation that advances cooperation by addressing specific problems and measures governance value against tangible benefits for the people..^①

China has advanced climate governance toward more comprehensive and systematic action through its new targets of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). On September 24, 2025, President Xi Jinping announced at the UN Climate Change Summit that by 2035, China's net greenhouse gas emissions across the entire economy will decrease by 7%–10% from their peak, with efforts to do better, and proposed supporting targets such as the share of non-fossil energy consumption reaching over 30%. The new targets, for the first time, set absolute emission reduction requirements

^① Xinhua News Agency, "International Alliance for Combating Telecom and Cyber Fraud Established," September 10, 2026, <https://www.xinhuanet.com/20260910/7f3b219505b1465d872353e5bd0eca76/c.html>.

covering the entire economy and all greenhouse gases, incorporating energy structure, forest carbon sinks, key industry transformation, and climate adaptation capacity building into a package of measures. This expands climate action from individual indicators into a coherent policy system, providing clearer direction for post-peak transition. At the international level, NDCs connect global long-term goals with concrete national actions, supporting the continued implementation of the *Paris Agreement*. Domestically, clear medium- and long-term targets help guide industries, investments, and technological innovation to form stable expectations. China's integrated approach to balancing mitigation and adaptation, development and emission reduction, also offers a practical reference for developing countries exploring green transition pathways suited to their own conditions.^①

The Kunming Biodiversity Fund promotes global ecological governance outcomes to benefit developing countries more broadly through project support. Officially launched in May 2024, following the successful implementation of its first nine projects, the Fund's Board of Directors approved a second batch of 22 fully funded projects in October 2025, involving 34 developing countries. With a total value of nearly USD 28 million, this batch covers regions including Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and benefits multiple developing countries including Small Island Developing States. The projects focus on marine and terrestrial ecosystem conservation, prevention and control of invasive alien species, and agricultural biodiversity. They include supporting the conservation and restoration of transboundary ecosystems in Central Asia, and assisting Pakistan in improving its biodiversity protection framework. This demand-oriented funding translates the shared goals of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework into actionable conservation activities. By integrating resource mobilization, capacity building, and ecological protection, the Fund helps alleviate the mismatch between responsibilities and implementation capacity in global ecological governance, enabling developing countries to better participate in the joint

^① Xinhua News Agency, "China Announces 2035 NDC, Embarking on a New Journey in Addressing Climate Change," September 26, 2025, <https://www.xinhuanet.com/20250926/ea3eb416433a4b4f94a80d7618f43de9/c.html>; Ministry of Ecology and Environment, "Transcript of the October Regular Press Conference," October 30, 2025, https://www.mee.gov.cn/ywdt/xwfb/202510/t20251030_1131010.shtml.



protection of the Earth's ecosystems.^①

The coordinated actions of the Group of Friends of Global Governance in the field of public health have brought the common concerns of developing countries onto the multilateral agenda. On May 19, 2026, China delivered a joint statement on behalf of 46 member countries of the Group at the general debate of the 79th World Health Assembly. The statement emphasized equal participation by all countries, supported WHO's central coordinating role, and advocated for improved access to health products, sharing of technology and experience, and the strengthening of health systems and autonomous epidemic prevention and control capacities in developing countries. The joint statement linked the principles of the GGI with specific issues in the health sector, demonstrating the extension of a multilateral policy coordination platform into a specialized field. Public health risks spread across borders, yet significant gaps exist between countries in terms of prevention and control capacity. International cooperation requires not only timely information sharing but also long-term investment in primary healthcare and professional capacity building. By collectively articulating legitimate demands, developing countries can gain greater attention in discussions on governance reform and resource allocation. The significance lies in advancing health cooperation from jointly responding to acute crises to continuously improving health service conditions, taking whether people can access affordable health products and basic services as an important measure of the fairness and effectiveness of governance.^②

From digital governance to transnational crime prevention and control, climate, ecology

^① Ministry of Ecology and Environment, "Minister Huang Runqiu Attends the Board Meeting of Kunming Biodiversity Fund," October 19, 2025, https://www.mee.gov.cn/xxgk/hjyw/202510/t20251019_1130336.shtml; Ministry of Ecology and Environment, "Transcript of the December Regular Press Conference," December 27, 2025, https://www.mee.gov.cn/ywdt/xwfb/202512/t20251227_1139115.shtml.

^② Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations Office at Geneva and Other International Organizations in Switzerland, "Joint Statement by Ambassador Jia Guide on Behalf of the Group of Friends of Global Governance at the General Debate of the 79th World Health Assembly," May 19, 2026, https://geneva.china-mission.gov.cn/dbdt/202605/t20260519_11913767.htm.

and health cooperation, the practices promoted by China place greater emphasis on translating equal participation, development needs, and people's well-being into institutional building and concrete actions. Different platforms complement each other, accumulating experience for strengthening the role of the United Nations and relevant international institutions and improving governance in key areas. As all parties continue to coordinate and implement their shared commitments, the GGI will provide more solid practical support for building a more just, inclusive, and orderly world.



**The GGI continues to translate from conceptual
vision into practical action**

Implementing the GGI: An Important Pillar for Advancing towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World

- **Promoting UN reform for greater efficiency and upholding the UN-centered international system**
 - **Advancing democracy in international relations and defending international fairness and justice**
- **Adapting peacekeeping operations to the changing times and actively safeguarding world peace and regional stability**
- **Forging international consensus on development as a priority and bringing benefits of global governance to all**
- **Recalibrating international human rights governance and building a just, equitable and inclusive global human rights governance system**
 - **Advancing reform of economic and financial governance and promoting a universally beneficial and inclusive economic globalization**
 - **Establishing rules for AI governance and forging international consensus on AI-enabled growth**
- **Strengthening governance in new frontiers such as cyberspace and addressing governance deficit in emerging fields**
 - **Promoting civilizational exchanges and mutual learning and drawing inspiration to tackle global challenges**

06

**Implementing the GGI: An Important Pillar for
Advancing towards a More Just, Inclusive and
Orderly World**

Global governance is a common endeavor that bears on the wellbeing of all humanity. Reforming and improving the global governance system is the common aspirations of countries across the world. The GGI represents a proactive response to this call of the times, offering a Chinese solution to the two pressing questions of the era: what kind of global governance system should be established, and how global governance can be reformed and improved. Pragmatic and effective actions, along with tangible outcomes, serve as core guarantees for validating the value of global governance and consolidating lasting international recognition. Advancing the GGI in a deep and practical manner is an inevitable choice on the path towards a more just, inclusive and orderly world.

(i) Promoting UN reform for greater efficiency and upholding the UN-centered international system

Reinvigorating the UN Charter for stronger leadership. The international community should return to the founding vision of the Charter, carry forward its spirit and fulfill the obligations under the Charter. We must uphold the peaceful settlement of disputes and oppose the use of force; and uphold the victorious outcomes of World War II and oppose glorifying the history of aggression. All member states should align their policies with the spirit of the Charter and jointly observe and act on the Charter. Major



countries, in particular, have the responsibility to lead by example in following the rule of law and the right path, and should not practice double standards, exceptionalism or selective application.

Reinvigorating the global governance platform for stronger execution capacity. We should give full play to the role of the UN as the core platform for global governance, and support establishing universally accepted international rules and coordination mechanisms with the UN as the main channel. The UN should unequivocally oppose protectionism and unilateral actions, oppose securitizing economic and trade issues, and oppose sci-tech blockade, decoupling and cutting off supply chain, while playing a bigger role in the political settlement of hotspot issues. As the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is woefully behind schedule, the UN needs to vigorously coordinate global actions and fully mobilize global resources. It is important to solidify the pillar of development, strengthen the development system, provide countries of the Global South with more funding, technological and intellectual support in key areas such as poverty reduction, and urge developed countries to deliver on their development financing pledges.^①

Reinvigorating the effectiveness of the UN system for stronger vitality. The ownership of member states should be respected, the three pillars should advance in a balanced manner, and the aspirations of developing countries should be addressed to keep reforms on the right focus. Budget management and financial accountability should be strengthened, and member states should effectively meet their financial obligations to the UN, support the UN in fulfilling its roles and responsibilities, and continue to contribute to the cause of the UN. Overlapping bodies and mandates in the UN system should be streamlined, resources better integrated, and a culture of efficiency

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, “Wang Yi at the United Nations Security Council High-Level Meeting ‘Upholding the Purposes and Principles of the U.N. Charter and Strengthening the U.N.-Centered International System’,” Portal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, May 27, 2026, https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/wjzb_673089/xghd_673097/202605/t20260527_11918428.shtml.

promoted.^① Efforts to streamline the Secretariat must be supported, and unnecessary procedures, documents and meetings should be reduced, so as to direct more resources to addressing the major issues, promote a culture of efficiency, and truly enhance responsiveness, service delivery, and implementation capacity.^②

(ii) Advancing democracy in international relations and defending international fairness and justice

Staying committed to mutual respect to consolidate the foundation for friendship and cooperation. It is important to respect the different histories, cultures and development stages of countries, respect each other's core interests and major concerns, and respect the development paths and systems independently chosen by people of all countries. We must oppose the acts of imposing one's own will upon others, stocking bloc confrontation and creating small circles, and forcing others to pick sides. Major countries, in particular, should set an example in honoring equality, good faith and cooperation. They should not take their own standards as international standards, nor should they destabilize other countries under the pretext of "democracy."

Remaining dedicated to consultations on an equal footing to foster the broadest consensus on international matters. Global affairs should be discussed by all, the governance system should be built by all, and development outcomes should be shared by all. We must firmly uphold the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, coordinate relations among countries through institutional frameworks and international rules, and advance the rule of law in international relations. We should stay committed to peacefully resolving differences and disputes between countries through dialogue and consultation, resolving differences through consultation and replacing confrontation

^① Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, "Wang Yi at the United Nations Security Council High-Level Meeting 'Upholding the Purposes and Principles of the U.N. Charter and Strengthening the U.N.-Centered International System'," Portal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, May 27, 2026, https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/wjzb_673089/xghd_673097/202605/t20260527_11918428.shtml.

^② Wang Yi, "Reform and Improve Global Governance for a Better Future — Keynote Speech by Wang Yi at the Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance," Portal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, May 29, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjzb_673085/zzjg_673183/gjs_673893/gjzz_673897/lhg_684120/zyjh_684130/202605/t20260529_11920384.shtml.



Implementing the GGI: An Important Pillar for Advancing towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World

with cooperation. We must oppose the law of the jungle where the strong bully the weak, and resolutely resist bullying practices such as unilateral sanctions, long-arm jurisdiction, and abusive tariffs. It is essential to form stances and policies based on the merits of issues, making fair remarks and taking fair actions, and reject harming others' legitimate rights and interests for one's own benefit.

Adhering to strength through unity to form synergy for reforming the global governance system. Countries of the Global South are supported to seek strength through unity and make a collective voice, enhance policy coordination through platforms such as BRICS, the SCO, and the Group of Friends of Global Governance, and increase the representation and voice of developing countries in agenda-setting, rule-making and decision-making in international affairs. The global governance system should better reflect actual shifts in the international power landscape and rectify historical injustices against developing countries, especially those in Africa. We should oppose the monopoly of international affairs and rule development by a few countries, and oppose the obstruction to reforms of international institutions that ignore changes in the international landscape. Developed countries, in particular, should embrace the trend of democratization in international relations, and must not cling to vested interests or exclude developing countries from decision-making processes.

(iii) Adapting peacekeeping operations to the changing times and actively safeguarding world peace and regional stability

Directing peacekeeping mandates towards core tasks. Clear and achievable mandates with defined priorities should be formulated for peacekeeping operations, and timely adjustments should be made based on changing circumstances to prevent the unchecked expansion of "Christmas tree" mandates.

Strengthening multi-party coordination and cooperation. Peacekeeping missions must maintain constructive communication with the countries involved to secure mutual trust and cooperation. It is also important to engage with local populations to foster understanding and support for the mandates and methods of missions. While respecting the leading role of the countries involved, assistance should be provided to improve their capacity for independent development, enhancing the sense of gain and garnering support from their people. We should support closer coordination between the UN and regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and the League of Arab States

(LAS), so as to create greater synergy in mediating regional issues.^①

Improving the overall performance of peacekeeping operations. We should begin with careful planning, ensuring that troop deployments are scientific and reasonable and mission transition and exit strategies are clear and feasible. On the logistical front, it is necessary to actively broaden procurement channels to improve cost-effectiveness. At the financial level, financial discipline should be strictly enforced to eliminate fund wastage and ensure transparency and accountability. Active and prudent efforts should be made to leverage the enabling role of new technologies to boost the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

(iv) Forging international consensus on development as a priority and bringing benefits of global governance to all

Creating an environment for peaceful development. We must earnestly respect the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of all countries, stay committed to peacefully resolving differences and disputes among countries through dialogue and consultation, and call on and encourage all countries to pursue peaceful development, mutually beneficial cooperation and common prosperity. We should firmly uphold the international system with the UN at its core and the international order based on international law, and strive to create a generally stable international environment, providing favorable conditions for global development cooperation.

Pooling development resources widely. We must restore development to the heart of the global agenda and forge balanced, inclusive and win-win development partnerships. The UN should start planning for the post-2030 development agenda. Mandate mechanisms and resource commitments for development should be strengthened, and developed countries should earnestly deliver on their financing pledges. While deepening South-South cooperation, the international community needs to explore

^① Wang Yi, “Reform and Improve Global Governance for a Better Future — Keynote Speech by Wang Yi at the Meeting of the Group of Friends of Global Governance,” Portal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, May 29, 2026, https://www.mfa.gov.cn/wjb_673085/zzjg_673183/gjs_673893/gjzz_673897/lhg_684120/zyjh_684130/202605/t20260529_11920384.shtml.



innovative ways to expand financing channels, so as to help address unbalanced and insufficient development. We should uphold the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, and put in place a fair, reasonable and win-win global climate governance system. We should support the work of the UN Panel on Critical Energy Transition Minerals and deepen cooperation on critical mineral partnerships.

Boosting engines of innovative development. We should seize the opportunities of the new round of sci-tech revolution and industrial transformation to jointly cultivate future-oriented innovative development momentum. Adhering to the principles of openness, inclusiveness, mutual benefits and shared outcomes in international sci-tech cooperation, we advance the International Science and Technology Cooperation Initiative and strive to create a new pattern of broader, deeper, and higher-level open cooperation in sci-tech innovation. We actively participate in and steadily carry out international big science programs and big science projects, and establish more international research and cooperation platforms. Efforts should also be made to bridge the digital divide and intelligence divide between the Global North and South, ensuring that the achievements of innovative development truly benefit the whole world.

(v) Recalibrating international human rights governance and building a just, equitable and inclusive global human rights governance system

Staying true to the original mission and clarifying the true connotation of the human rights cause. We must reject the misguided notion of “human rights above sovereignty,” and make it clear that it is up to the people of each country to assess and improve their own human rights situation. We should adhere to a people-centered approach, take the interests of the people as the fundamental basis and ultimate goal, and continuously address their practical needs in areas such as livelihood protection, public security, and social equity. We should promote UN human rights mechanisms to perform their duties in an impartial and objective manner, and resist any use of human rights issues to impose unilateral sanctions or destabilize other countries, thereby safeguarding fairness in global human rights governance.

Pursuing inclusiveness and benefit for all and clarifying the goals of the human rights cause. The rights to subsistence and development should be regarded as the foremost basic human rights. Under the premise of safeguarding national sovereignty, security and dignity, both individual rights and collective rights should be considered, and

political, economic, social, cultural, environmental, and educational rights enhanced in a coordinated way. Efforts should continue to improve equal protection and special safeguard for specific groups such as women, children, the elderly, and the disabled, so that various rights support and complement each other.

Promoting exchange and mutual learning and clarifying the path to realizing the human rights cause. We must uphold independence and autonomy, and respect the right of all countries to independently choose their own paths of development in human rights. We should follow the principles of impartiality, objectivity, non-selectivity and non-politicization, advocate constructive dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect, while opposing imposing one's own model and preferences on others, and reject the politicization, instrumentalization and weaponization of human rights. We call for working together to build a global human rights governance system that is just, equitable and inclusive.

(vi) Advancing reform of economic and financial governance and promoting a universally beneficial and inclusive economic globalization

Strengthening macroeconomic policy coordination. The UN, the G20, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the IMF, the World Bank, and the BRICS among other mechanisms and platforms should bring their roles into full play to facilitate macroeconomic policy coordination among major economies, safeguard the stability and smooth operation of the global industrial and supply chains, and maintain the sound operation of the global financial system. They should work together to foster strong, sustainable, balanced and inclusive global economic growth.

Firmly defending the multilateral trading system. We should actively push forward WTO reform and restore normal operation of the WTO dispute settlement mechanism as soon as possible. We should adapt multilateral trade rules to the changing times to address long-standing unresolved issues, while actively exploring and formulating new rules for the future to enhance the authority, effectiveness and relevance of the multilateral trading system. It is also important to oppose the politicization of economic issues and artificial fragmentation of the global market, and reject protectionism disguised as green and low-carbon development.

Improving the global financial governance system. We should move forward with the



shareholding review of the World Bank expeditiously, and realize a meaningful quota realignment of the IMF as soon as possible, with greater voice and representation of developing countries, so as to better reflect the great transformation of the global economic landscape. We should promote more dialogue between the UN and newly established financial institutions such as the New Development Bank (NDB) and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), so that the voices and needs of the Global South are better heard. As main creditors, international financial institutions and commercial creditors should take part in debt reduction for developing countries. Financial risk monitoring, early warning and response systems should be improved, and cooperation in areas such as digital currencies and taxation strengthened to build a global financial safety net.

(vii) Establishing rules for AI governance and forging international consensus on AI-enabled growth

Creating a diverse, open and innovative ecosystem. Encourage the co-construction of international artificial intelligence open source communities, promote the sharing of General Large Models, Basic Algorithms, and Tool Components, and collaboratively formulate open source compliance systems and security guidelines. Support countries in conducting localized innovation based on open source models, and build an open, shared, secure, orderly, and collaboratively governed global artificial intelligence open source ecosystem. Launch the Intelligent Computing Power Inclusive Action, promote the interconnection of intelligent computing power facilities and provide inclusive intelligent computing services for developing countries. Implement the High-Quality Data Supply Action. Construct and operate Cross-Border Trusted Data Spaces in specific sectors to facilitate efficient, convenient, and secure cross-border data movement. Collaborate in building high-quality corpora and industry-specific high-quality datasets, and promote the co-construction and sharing of multilingual corpora.

Building consensus on AI standards and norms. We should promote dialogue among national standardization organizations and leverage international standardization bodies such as the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) to accelerate the development and revision of technical standards in key areas such as security, industry and ethics, in order to establish a scientific,

transparent and inclusive regulatory framework for AI. It is also necessary to actively eliminate algorithmic bias, balance technological advancement with risk prevention and social ethics, and enhance the inclusiveness and interoperability of the standardization system.

Promoting AI empowerment across all sectors. We should advance AI empowerment in fields such as industrial manufacturing, consumption, commerce and logistics, healthcare, education, agriculture, and poverty alleviation, and deepen AI applications in scenarios such as autonomous driving and smart cities to foster a rich, diverse and healthy ecosystem of AI application for good. We should promote development and sharing of intelligent infrastructure, carry out cooperation on cross-border AI application, and share best practices as part of efforts to jointly explore effective pathways to comprehensively empower the real economy with AI.

Enhancing AI security governance. Great attention should be given to various inherent and derivative risks posed by AI. Legal regulations, technical monitoring, risk warning, and emergency response systems should be established to maintain safety boundaries, prevent misuse and abuse, and ensure AI remains under human control at all times. Clear guardrails should be set regarding military applications and governance of AI. We should oppose the generalization of the concept of national security in AI to prioritize one country's security over others.

(viii) Strengthening governance in new frontiers such as cyberspace and addressing governance deficit in emerging fields

Consolidating the sovereign foundation of governance in new frontiers. We must take the purposes and principles of the UN Charter as the fundamental guidelines for promoting global governance in new frontiers, reject hegemonism and unilateralism, and oppose certain countries monopolizing discourse power and delineating spheres of influence in governance of new frontiers based on their technological advantages. We should strike a balance between the security concerns and development aspirations of all countries, and safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of all countries to autonomously govern their own cyberspace and peacefully explore and utilize outer space.

Improving the international regulatory system for new frontiers. Relying on the UN



as the main channel, we should promote multilateral negotiations and consultations in new frontiers such as cyberspace and outer space to build international consensus, refine codes of conduct, and fill regulatory gaps in governance of new frontiers. We should resist all kinds of dangerous acts of militarization and weaponization in new frontiers, and curb arms races, unilateral technology blockades, and other practices that undermine global strategic stability.

Deepening pragmatic international cooperation in new frontiers. We should advocate open and inclusive multilateral collaboration, establish regular dialogue and consultation mechanisms, and promote technology exchange and risk management. Countries are encouraged to carry out regular multilateral cooperation in areas such as cybersecurity, digital economy, and outer space exploration, promote inclusive sharing of achievements in new frontiers, and work together to prevent various security risks in emerging fields.

(ix) Promoting civilizational exchanges and mutual learning and drawing inspiration to tackle global challenges

Expanding global partnerships for inter-civilizational dialogue. The International Day for Dialogue among Civilizations on June 10 offers an opportunity to build a communication and dialogue platform that rises above ideological prejudices while overcoming misunderstandings and limited interactions. It is important to make good use of new technologies such as AI to empower civilizational exchanges, mutual learning, inheritance and innovation, enhance understanding and tolerance among different civilizations, and make sci-tech advancements a bridge for inter-civilizational dialogue.

Harnessing practical benefits of mutual learning among civilizations. We should fully utilize the governance wisdom embedded in various civilizations to support efforts in addressing global governance, development and trust deficits. Responding to shared global development challenges, we should promote the sharing of civilizational achievements among countries, empower global governance with exemplary civilizational experiences, and facilitate the integration of diverse civilizations as an important contributor to tackling global challenges.

Building an open and inclusive dialogue platform. We must firmly reject geopolitical

competition, bloc confrontation and ideological prejudice, and build a fair, open, and mutually beneficial platform for inter-civilizational dialogue. We support the UN in playing a significant role in inter-civilizational dialogue and further utilizing platforms such as the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Forum of Ancient Civilizations. By deepening cultural exchanges and inter-civilizational dialogue, mutual understanding and friendship among peoples worldwide can be enhanced, reinforcing the civilizational foundation for solidarity and cooperation within the international community.



Implementing the GGI: An Important Pillar for Advancing towards a More Just, Inclusive and Orderly World

07

Concluding Remarks

07 Concluding Remarks

The baton of history is passed from one generation to the next, moving forward without pause. The cause of human progress advances step by step in answering the questions posed by the times. The GGI grasps the general trend of the times that countries increasingly become communities of shared interests, responsibilities and futures. It identifies the correct direction for reforming the global governance system, injects fresh energy into sharing development opportunities, offers a new solution for jointly addressing challenges, and charts a new course for the world to navigate through times of turbulence and transformation.

The fruitful achievements of the GGI over the past year clearly demonstrate that principles of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits receive widespread support; upholding multilateralism is a universal consensus; and building a more just and equitable global governance system is a shared aspiration. China stands ready to work with all countries to continuously transform the grand blueprint of the GGI into a practical roadmap, a detailed plan, and a tangible reality, advancing global governance towards a more just and equitable direction, leading to a more just, inclusive and orderly world. Together, we will open up a bright future of a community with a shared future for humanity with the progress of civilization.



The English version is a translation from the Chinese version.



Printed on Recycled Paper



CHINA INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Website: <http://www.ciiis.org.cn>

Address: No.3,Toutiao,Taijichang,Beijing, China