

DIRECT DEMOCRACY & SORTITION ASSEMBLIES

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

DDSA-ARCH-IEA-001 | Edition 1.0

Institutional Ecosystem around Sortition Assemblies

Independent bodies · long-horizon planning · inter-body coordination · safeguards — the ecosystem that supports the SAs

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Version: 1.0

Author: Ian R. Graham

Document ID: DDSA-ARCH-IEA-001

CLASSIFICATION

Confidentiality: Public Domain

Distribution: Unrestricted — For civic, academic, and public use

USAGE NOTICE & PERMISSION

This document is published by Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies (DD&SA) as part of its open civic corpus. It may be freely shared, quoted, adapted, and built upon for non-commercial civic, educational, journalistic, and research purposes, provided that attribution is given to DD&SA and the document reference number is cited. Commercial reproduction or use in partisan political campaigning requires prior written consent. This document does not constitute legal advice. All constitutional proposals are subject to democratic ratification processes as defined within the DD&SA framework. © DD&SA — Ian R. Graham. All rights reserved under applicable intellectual property law.

"We inherit the lessons of the past, not its chains."

— DD&SA Founding Principle

dd-sa.org

A living document — subject to civic deliberation and democratic revision.

Contents

Preamble: Design Philosophy and High-Level Approach	5
PART I — PRINCIPLES AND OVERALL ARCHITECTURE	5
1. The Institutional Ecosystem: Purpose and Position	5
1.1 Why an Ecosystem Rather Than Isolated Bodies	5
1.2 The Ecosystem Map	6
1.3 Governing Principles for All Ecosystem Bodies	6
1.4 The Boundary Between Advice and Direction: A Worked Illustration	6
PART II — INDEPENDENT BODIES	6
2. The Civic Audit Authority	6
2.1 Mandate	6
2.2 Composition	6
2.3 Powers and Limits	7
2.4 Audit Processes	7
2.4.1 Annual Audit Programme	7
2.4.2 Special Audits	7
2.4.3 The Audit Cycle	8
2.5 Public Reporting	8
2.6 Accountability for the CAA Itself	8
3. The Civic Ethics Commission	8
3.1 Mandate	8
3.2 Composition	9
3.3 Advisory Opinion Process	9
3.4 Conflict-of-Interest Architecture	9
3.5 Systemic Ethics Monitoring	9
4. The Resident Ombudsman	10
4.1 Mandate	10
4.2 Composition	10
4.3 Complaint Intake and Triage	10
4.4 Investigation Protocol	11
4.5 Systemic Pattern Analysis	11
4.6 Accessibility Standards	11
5. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels	12
5.1 Architecture: A Panel System, Not a Single Body	12
5.2 Composition of Each Panel	12
5.3 Evidence Review Protocol	12

5.4 Accessible Summaries	13
5.5 Conflict-of-Interest Management for Expert Members	13
6. The Infrastructure Standards Board	13
6.1 Mandate	13
6.2 Composition	13
6.3 Standards Development Cycle	14
6.4 Relationship to Long-Horizon Planning	14

PART III — LONG-HORIZON PLANNING ARCHITECTURE 15

7. The 100-Year Planning Office	15
7.1 The Challenge of Long-Horizon Planning Without an Executive	15
7.2 Mandate	15
7.3 Composition	15
7.4 Planning Outputs and Their Use	15
7.5 Non-Directive Principle in Practice	15
8. Climate Resilience Framework	16
8.1 Purpose and Scope	16
8.2 The Five CRF Components	16
Component 1: The Civic Climate Risk Register	16
Component 2: Climate Embedding Requirements for SA Decisions	16
Component 3: Territorial Adaptation Plans	16
Component 4: Cross-Territory Climate Coordination	17
Component 5: Climate Emergency Protocol	17
9. Demographic Modelling Protocols	17
9.1 The Demographic Data Infrastructure	17
9.2 The Five Core Modelling Protocols	17
Protocol 1: Population Structure Projections	17
Protocol 2: Service Demand Modelling	18
Protocol 3: Equity Impact Assessment	18
Protocol 4: Care and Dependency Ratio Modelling	18
Protocol 5: Migration Scenario Integration	18
10. Infrastructure Lifecycle Management	19
10.1 The Lifecycle Model	19
10.2 The Infrastructure Lifecycle Register	19
10.3 Deferred Maintenance Protocol	19
10.4 Equity and Infrastructure	19

PART IV — INTER-BODY COORDINATION AND RELATIONSHIP TO SAs 20

11. Ecosystem Coordination Architecture	20
11.1 Why Coordination Matters	20

11.2 The Ecosystem Data Platform	20
11.3 The Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group	20
11.4 Joint Review Protocols	21
12. Relationship Between Independent Bodies and SAs	21
12.1 The Request and Response Protocol	21
12.2 How Advice Enters SA Deliberation	21
12.3 Resolving Conflicts Between Bodies	21
PART V — SAFEGUARDS, DRIFT PREVENTION, AND STRESS-TESTING	22
13. The Threat Model for the Institutional Ecosystem	22
14. Structural Safeguards	22
14.1 Preventing De Facto Executive Formation	22
14.2 Preventing Technocratic Capture	22
14.3 Preventing Transparency Erosion	22
14.4 The Five-Yearly Ecosystem Review Assembly	23
14.5 Resident-Initiated Reviews	23
15. Automatic Drift Indicators	23
16. Stress Tests	23
16.1 Stress Test: Major Climate Shock	23
Ecosystem Response	24
Assessment	24
16.2 Stress Test: Long-Term Misalignment Between Planning and Resident Preferences	24
Ecosystem Response	24
Assessment	25
16.3 Stress Test: Coordinated Capture Attempt	25
Ecosystem Response	25
Assessment	26
PART VI — DEFINITIONS AND GLOSSARY	26
17. Terms and Definitions	26

Preamble: Design Philosophy and High-Level Approach

Sortition Assemblies are the democratic heart of the Civic Commonwealth. They deliberate, decide, and bear accountability to the residents who constitute them. But a deliberative body cannot be effective in a vacuum. It requires accurate evidence, independent scrutiny of its decisions and the institutions that implement them, expert guidance on complex technical questions, protection of the residents it serves, and the long-horizon perspective that the democratic mandate of any single assembly term cannot by itself supply.

The institutional ecosystem defined in this document provides those functions. It does not govern. It does not replace. It serves — in the precise and demanding sense of that word: providing what SAs and residents need to make the democratic system work without substituting the ecosystem's judgement for the assembly's authority.

The central design tension in this framework is between competence and accountability. Expert bodies accumulate authority. Independent bodies develop institutional cultures that can insulate them from correction. Long-horizon planning creates commitments that constrain future choices. All of these tendencies, left unaddressed, produce a shadow government: an array of technical authorities whose decisions are effectively irreversible and whose personnel are effectively unaccountable. This framework is designed to prevent that outcome through four structural principles that run through every mechanism in every Part:

- **Advisory, not directive:** no independent body in this ecosystem has power to impose a decision, a standard, or a plan on any SA or any resident. All outputs — recommendations, findings, advice, standards, scenarios — are inputs to SA deliberation, not substitutes for it.
- **Transparent by default:** all work, methods, data, and findings of every body in the ecosystem are published on SCIP unless a narrow and time-limited exception applies. No body operates with closed committees or unpublished reasoning.
- **Accountable through sortition:** every body includes sortition-selected resident members who hold no professional stake in the body's findings, who ask the questions a resident would ask, and who publish their own assessment of the body's performance alongside its outputs.
- **Time-limited and renewable:** no appointment to any body in this ecosystem is permanent. Every mandate is time-limited, every appointment is renewable only through a fresh process, and every body is subject to periodic review that can restructure, merge, or dissolve it.

PART I — PRINCIPLES AND OVERALL ARCHITECTURE

1. The Institutional Ecosystem: Purpose and Position

1.1 Why an Ecosystem Rather Than Isolated Bodies

Prior governance systems accumulated independent bodies without design: audit offices, scientific advisory committees, ethics boards, planning commissions — each created in response to a specific problem, each developing its own mandate, culture, and constituency. The result was not an ecosystem but a thicket: overlapping, occasionally contradictory, often opaque, and subject to capture precisely because no one had overall accountability for the whole.

DD&SA builds its independent institutional architecture as a designed ecosystem from the outset. This means: defined relationships between bodies; shared infrastructure and data; coordinated review cycles; and a clear hierarchy of accountability that runs through SAs to residents — not

through any body to any other body. The ecosystem is a support system for sortition democracy, not a parallel governance structure that sortition democracy must negotiate with.

1.2 The Ecosystem Map

The following text-described map captures the architectural logic of the ecosystem. It is not a reporting hierarchy — no body reports to another body — but a map of information and mandate flows:

RESIDENTS ← → *SCIP (Public Data & Transparency Platform)* ← → *ALL BODIES*

RESIDENTS → [sortition selection] → *SA Members*

SA [decides] ← *Advice / Findings / Scenarios / Standards* ← [Independent Bodies]

SA [instructs] → *Civic Operations Service [implements]* → *residents [experience service]*

Independent Bodies: [Audit Authority] [Ethics Commission] [Resident Ombudsman]

[Scientific & Technical Advisory Panels] [Infrastructure Standards Board]

[100-Year Planning Office] [Long-Horizon Panel]

Inter-Body Coordination: [Ecosystem Coordination Platform] [Joint Review Protocols]

The map has three critical properties: residents are always at the outermost ring of accountability; SAs are always the decision node; and independent bodies are always positioned between evidence and decision, never between decision and implementation. The Civic Operations Service (defined in DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001) handles implementation; the ecosystem handles the knowledge infrastructure that makes good decisions possible.

1.3 Governing Principles for All Ecosystem Bodies

1.4 The Boundary Between Advice and Direction: A Worked Illustration

The Scientific & Technical Advisory Panel on Climate produces a Scenario Report recommending that no new coastal infrastructure be funded below two-metre elevation. The report is published on SCIP. The relevant Territorial SA deliberates on the report. It may adopt the recommendation in full, adopt it with modifications, reject it with published reasoning, or commission a further review. The Panel has no mechanism to enforce its recommendation, to block a contrary SA decision, or to impose costs for non-compliance. The SA is accountable to residents for its decision; the Panel is accountable to residents for the quality of its advice.

PART II — INDEPENDENT BODIES

2. The Civic Audit Authority

2.1 Mandate

The Civic Audit Authority (CAA) — defined in outline in DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001, Section 6 — is elaborated here in full ecosystem context. The CAA holds the broadest mandate of any body in the ecosystem: independent scrutiny of three distinct dimensions of civic system performance.

2.2 Composition

The CAA is constituted as follows:

- **Civic Audit Board (oversight):** Nine residents selected by sortition from the national eligible pool, serving two-year terms with a maximum of one renewal. The Board's role is oversight and accountability, not technical audit. It reviews annual audit programmes, receives and publishes sortition members' assessments, and has standing to refer concerns about the CAA itself to the Ethics Commission.
- **Professional Audit Directorate:** A permanent, professionally qualified audit staff under the leadership of a Civic Auditor-General, appointed by open competition through a process verified by the Civic Fraud and Integrity Service (DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001). The Auditor-General serves a seven-year non-renewable term. Professional staff serve standard five-year renewable appointments.
- **Specialist Audit Units:** Three standing units — the Financial Audit Unit, the Procedural Compliance Unit, and the Data Integrity Unit — each with dedicated professional staff and the ability to commission external specialist support where required.

2.3 Powers and Limits

The CAA holds the following specific powers:

- Unconditional access to all civic financial records, procedural records, and data systems held by any SA, the Civic Operations Service, or any body in the ecosystem.
- Authority to require any officer of any SA, the COS, or any ecosystem body to provide information, documents, and explanations in a timely manner.
- Authority to publish audit findings and recommendations on SCIP without prior approval from any SA, the COS, or any other body.
- Authority to flag a matter to the Civic Fraud and Integrity Service (CFIS) where audit findings suggest potential misappropriation.
- Authority to commission targeted special audits in response to resident petitions (five hundred signatures) or SA referrals.

The CAA explicitly does not hold:

- Any power to override, suspend, or modify an SA decision on the basis of audit findings.
- Any power to direct the COS in its operational activities.
- Any power to impose sanctions — findings are published, and accountability consequences flow from SA deliberation and the Civic Justice Architecture, not from the CAA itself.

2.4 Audit Processes

2.4.1 Annual Audit Programme

The Civic Audit Board approves an Annual Audit Programme at the start of each civic year, covering the full domain and territorial SA landscape using a risk-based prioritisation methodology. The Programme is published on SCIP before the civic year begins. Residents can see which bodies will be audited, to what depth, and on what timeline.

2.4.2 Special Audits

Special audits can be triggered by: a valid resident petition (five hundred signatures); an SA resolution; a referral from the Resident Ombudsman based on complaint patterns; a referral from the Ethics Commission; or the CAA's own professional judgment in response to SCIP data anomalies. Special audit reports are published within forty-five working days of initiation.

2.4.3 The Audit Cycle

- **Scope definition:** the relevant Specialist Unit defines the audit scope and methodology, published as an Audit Protocol on SCIP before work begins.
- **Evidence gathering:** the Unit reviews records, data, and documentation; interviews relevant COS officers and SA secretariat staff.
- **Preliminary findings:** a draft Preliminary Findings document is shared with the audited body for factual accuracy review — not for editorial modification.
- **Final report:** published on SCIP within the programme timeline, including the audited body's formal response.
- **Follow-up:** progress against recommendations is tracked and published quarterly until all recommendations are confirmed implemented or formally declined with reasoning.

2.5 Public Reporting

Every audit report includes a Plain-Language Summary (maximum two A4 pages) accessible to all residents. Every summary includes a Traffic Light Status (Green / Amber / Red) and a clear statement of what action, if any, the relevant SA is required to take. The CAA publishes an Annual State of Civic Governance Report — a consolidated assessment of audit findings across the whole system — within ninety days of each civic year end.

2.6 Accountability for the CAA Itself

The CAA is itself subject to annual independent review by a nine-member sortition-constituted Audit Oversight Panel, drawn from outside any current ecosystem body. The Panel reviews the CAA's own compliance with its published procedures, the quality of its audit methodology, and its responsiveness to resident and SA requests. The Panel's report is published alongside the CAA's annual report. Any resident may petition for a special review of the CAA with five hundred signatures.

3. The Civic Ethics Commission

3.1 Mandate

The Civic Ethics Commission (CEC) provides the ethical governance infrastructure of the DD&SA system. It is not a disciplinary body — it holds no prosecutorial authority. It is an advisory, interpretive, and early-warning institution whose purpose is to ensure that the ethical foundations of the Civic Commonwealth remain explicit, coherent, and resistant to drift.

The CEC's mandate has four dimensions:

- **Standards maintenance:** Publishing and periodically reviewing the Civic Ethics Standards — the published ethical framework governing conduct in all civic roles, from SA membership to Magisterial service to ecosystem body appointments.
- **Advisory opinions:** Issuing formal, published opinions on ethical questions referred by SAs, Magisters, ecosystem bodies, or residents. Advisory opinions are not binding, but they carry constitutional weight: any body that acts contrary to a published CEC opinion must document its reasoning and publish it.
- **Conflict-of-interest registry:** Maintaining and publishing the interests declarations of all individuals in civic roles across the ecosystem, including SA members, COS senior staff, and all ecosystem body members.

- **Systemic ethics monitoring:** Proactively scanning civic system behaviour for patterns that raise ethical concern — including patterns that no single complaint would identify.

3.2 Composition

- **Ethics Oversight Panel (sortition):** Seven residents sortition-selected for three-year terms, renewable once. Panel members receive structured induction into ethical reasoning methodology but are not required to have professional ethics credentials. Their role is civic accountability, not technical ethics expertise.
- **Professional Ethics Secretariat:** A small team of professional ethicists and researchers who provide technical support to the Panel, conduct systemic monitoring, and draft advisory opinions. The Ethics Director is appointed by open competition for a five-year non-renewable term.
- **External advisory pool:** A published roster of twelve ethicists drawn from academic and practice backgrounds, available to advise on specific matters requiring specialist input. Roster members serve three-year terms and are rotated. All declarations of interest are published.

3.3 Advisory Opinion Process

- **Referral:** any SA, Magister, ecosystem body, or resident (with supporting detail) may refer a question to the CEC for an advisory opinion.
- **Admissibility:** the Ethics Director assesses whether the question falls within the CEC's mandate within five working days. All admissibility decisions are published.
- **Research and consultation:** the Secretariat researches the question, consulting the external advisory pool where needed, and produces a draft opinion within thirty working days.
- **Oversight Panel review:** the draft is reviewed by the Ethics Oversight Panel, which may endorse, modify, or request revision. The Panel's deliberation is published.
- **Publication:** the final opinion is published on SCIP. Where a referring body acts contrary to the opinion, it must publish its reasoning within thirty days.

3.4 Conflict-of-Interest Architecture

The CEC maintains the Civic Interests Register — a SCIP-hosted, publicly searchable database of declared interests for all individuals in civic roles. The Register includes:

- Financial interests above a defined threshold (investments, significant contracts, property holdings relevant to civic decisions).
- Professional relationships and organisational memberships that might create a perception of partiality.
- Close personal relationships with parties to civic decisions.
- Prior advocacy positions on questions before an SA the individual serves on.

Declarations are made on appointment and updated annually, or within five working days of a material change. Failure to declare a known interest is an integrity breach under CJA-001 (Chapter 4.3). The CEC reviews declarations annually and publishes a compliance report.

3.5 Systemic Ethics Monitoring

The CEC's Secretariat conducts quarterly Systemic Ethics Scans using SCIP data, audit findings, Ombudsman complaint patterns, and open-source civic reporting to identify emerging ethical risks. Risks are classified as:

- **Emerging risk:** early indicators present; CEC issues a public advisory note.

- Active risk: pattern established; CEC issues a formal Systemic Ethics Alert, which requires a response from the relevant SA within thirty working days.
- Critical risk: active risk unaddressed; CEC refers to the Civic Audit Authority and to the relevant SA for a formal deliberation.

4. The Resident Ombudsman

4.1 Mandate

The Resident Ombudsman is the primary channel through which individual residents can raise concerns about civic service delivery, institutional conduct, and process failures that have directly affected them. Where the Civic Justice Architecture (CJA-001, DD&SA-ARCH-JRB-001) handles systemic harms and rule breaches, the Resident Ombudsman handles the everyday failures of service, communication, and procedure that do not reach the threshold for formal justice processes but which — if unaddressed — erode civic trust.

The Ombudsman's mandate covers:

- Individual complaints about failures of service delivery by the Civic Operations Service or any domain service unit.
- Complaints about process failures in SA decision-making that have directly affected a resident (procedural unfairness, failure to notify, inaccessible participation).
- Complaints about failures by any ecosystem body to meet its published service standards.
- Identification and referral of systemic patterns arising from the aggregation of individual complaints.

4.2 Composition

- **Resident Ombudsman (individual appointment):** A single named officer, appointed by open competition for a six-year non-renewable term, with a published role specification requiring: independence from all civic institutions; commitment to resident-centred service; demonstrated experience in complaint investigation and resolution.
- **Ombudsman Secretariat:** Professional investigation and casework staff under the Ombudsman's direction. Case officers handle individual complaints; a Systemic Analysis Unit aggregates patterns.
- **Ombudsman Oversight Panel (sortition):** Seven residents sortition-selected for two-year terms. The Panel reviews the Ombudsman's annual report, assesses accessibility and responsiveness, and has standing to raise concerns about the Ombudsman's conduct with the Ethics Commission.

4.3 Complaint Intake and Triage

The Ombudsman accepts complaints through every channel required for genuine accessibility:

- SDN digital portal — the primary channel, with translation and accessibility tools built in.
- In-person at every Civic Learning Hub (DD&SA-CFE-001), with trained reception staff.
- Telephone line, available in all languages spoken by more than one percent of the Commonwealth population.
- Written submission by post or in person.
- Through a Civic Advocate (CJA-001, Chapter 10) or through a guardian or appropriate adult.

Every complaint is acknowledged within three working days. Triage is completed within ten working days, and produces one of four outcomes:

4.4 Investigation Protocol

- Opening: the casework officer issues an Opening Notice to the complainant and the relevant institution, specifying what is under investigation and the expected timeline.
- Evidence gathering: the casework officer reviews records, requests information from the relevant institution (which has a binding obligation to respond within ten working days), and may interview parties.
- Preliminary findings: a Preliminary Findings Note is shared with the relevant institution for factual accuracy check — not for editorial modification.
- Resolution recommendation: the Ombudsman issues a Resolution Recommendation specifying what action the institution should take. This is not binding, but institutions that decline to follow a Resolution Recommendation must publish their reasoning within twenty working days.
- Escalation: where an institution consistently declines Resolution Recommendations, the Ombudsman refers the pattern to the relevant SA for a Civic Instruction and to the Audit Authority for procedural compliance audit.
- Closure: the complaint is closed when the recommended action is confirmed, when the institution's alternative response is accepted by the complainant, or when escalation has been completed.

4.5 Systemic Pattern Analysis

The Systemic Analysis Unit maintains a quarterly Systemic Complaints Register — a SCIP-published database of complaint categories, volumes, and resolution rates by institution and service area. Where any category exceeds a defined threshold volume, a Systemic Alert is issued. Systemic Alerts require:

- A formal response from the relevant SA or institution within thirty working days.
- An Audit Authority procedural audit within sixty working days.
- A published Systemic Investigation Report from the Ombudsman within ninety working days.

4.6 Accessibility Standards

The Ombudsman's services meet the following mandatory accessibility standards:

- All complaint materials are available in Easy Read format and in all languages spoken by more than one percent of the Commonwealth population.
- Every decision letter includes a plain-language explanation of the outcome, what was found, and what will happen next.
- No complaint is closed without the complainant being notified and given the opportunity to respond to the Preliminary Findings Note.
- Processing times are published weekly on SCIP. Any complaint that exceeds its target timeline is flagged to the Oversight Panel.

5. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels

5.1 Architecture: A Panel System, Not a Single Body

The DD&SA system does not maintain a single Scientific Advisory Council. The risks of a single council are well understood: it becomes a gatekeeper for what counts as legitimate expert input, it develops institutional preferences, and it is easier to capture than a distributed panel system. Instead, DD&SA maintains a Dynamic Panel Architecture: a framework through which specific panels are constituted for specific mandates, with defined lifetimes, and then dissolved on completion.

Three panel types exist within this architecture:

5.2 Composition of Each Panel

- **Expert members:** Four to eight domain specialists selected through a transparent criteria-based process administered by the Civic Formation Institute's technical staff. Selection criteria are published before recruitment. All applicants' qualifications and any declared interests are published. Appointment is for the panel's defined lifetime. No expert may serve on two concurrent panels in related domains.
- **Resident accountability members:** Three to five residents sortition-selected for the panel's lifetime. These members are not expected to have technical expertise. They are expected to ask the questions that an informed resident would ask, to ensure that panel outputs are accessible, and to publish an independent Resident Assessment alongside every panel output.
- **IES Epistemic Monitor:** A member of the Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES) attends all panel sessions in a monitoring role. The IES Monitor reviews the quality of evidence evaluation, challenges emerging consensus where the evidence does not support it, and produces a Methods Note published alongside every major output.

5.3 Evidence Review Protocol

- **Scope definition:** the panel agrees a published Scope Statement within ten working days of constitution, specifying the questions it will address, the evidence types it will consider, and the methods it will use.
- **Literature and evidence survey:** the panel conducts a systematic review of available evidence. All evidence sources are logged and published on SCIP as the panel's Evidence Register.
- **Scenario modelling:** where relevant, the panel develops a set of scenarios representing the range of plausible futures for the question under examination. Scenarios are not predictions; they are structured explorations of uncertainty. The methodology is published.
- **Draft findings:** a Draft Findings document is circulated for review by the IES Monitor, the resident accountability members, and the requesting SA. The IES Monitor's review is published alongside the draft.
- **Public consultation:** Draft Findings are published on SCIP for thirty days of public comment. Comments are logged and summarised; substantive comments that raise new evidence must be addressed in the final report.
- **Final output:** published on SCIP with full methodology, evidence register, scenario sets, and both the IES Monitor's Methods Note and the Resident Assessment.

5.4 Accessible Summaries

Every panel output includes a Plain-Language Summary (maximum four A4 pages) and a Visual Summary (charts, diagrams, or infographics produced by the panel's communications support). Summaries are reviewed by the resident accountability members for clarity and accuracy before publication. Where a resident member believes the summary misrepresents the panel's findings, they may publish a dissenting note alongside it.

5.5 Conflict-of-Interest Management for Expert Members

Expert members of all panels are subject to the following conflict-of-interest protocol, which goes beyond the standard CEC Interests Register requirements:

- Full disclosure of: funding sources for their research over the past five years; employment, consultancy, or advisory relationships with any organisation that has a material interest in the panel's subject matter; any prior public positions they have taken on the panel's subject.
- Where a material conflict exists in a specific matter before the panel, the expert member must recuse themselves from deliberation on that specific matter.
- Where a conflict is marginal, the IES Monitor determines whether recusal is necessary. The Monitor's determination is published.
- Rotating membership: no expert serves on consecutive panels in the same domain without a two-year gap.

6. The Infrastructure Standards Board

6.1 Mandate

The Infrastructure Standards Board (ISB) is responsible for developing, maintaining, and updating the technical standards that govern all physical and digital infrastructure in the Civic Commonwealth. Standards define the minimum acceptable levels of safety, accessibility, resilience, interoperability, and environmental performance that infrastructure must meet to be approved, funded, and operated within the civic system.

The ISB holds four specific mandates:

- **Safety standards:** Minimum structural, operational, and emergency safety requirements for all infrastructure categories.
- **Accessibility standards:** Requirements for physical and digital access for all residents regardless of disability, age, location, or technical capacity.
- **Resilience standards:** Performance requirements for infrastructure under stress conditions: extreme weather, demand peaks, cyber-attack, component failure.
- **Interoperability standards:** Technical requirements ensuring that systems built in different territories or at different times can communicate, connect, and operate together.

6.2 Composition

- **Technical Standards Council:** Twelve technical specialists across the major infrastructure domains (civil engineering, digital systems, energy networks, transport, water, health facilities, environmental infrastructure). Appointed by open competition for five-year renewable terms. All declarations of interest published.
- **Resident Oversight Panel (sortition):** Six residents sortition-selected for two-year non-renewable terms. The Panel's role is to ensure that standards serve residents' lived

experience — not only technical performance metrics.

- **Assembly Liaison Representatives:** One representative nominated by the relevant Domain Assembly for each major infrastructure category. Liaison Representatives do not vote on standards but provide SA perspective at draft stage. Their input is published.
- **ISB Secretariat:** Professional standards management staff maintaining the Standards Register, administering public consultations, and tracking implementation compliance.

6.3 Standards Development Cycle

- **Identification:** the ISB identifies a need for a new or revised standard through: technology development, failure pattern analysis, climate resilience requirements, or SA referral.
- **Scoping:** a published Scope Document defines what the standard will cover, who is affected, and the consultation timeline.
- **Technical drafting:** the Technical Standards Council produces a Draft Standard with full technical specification and the evidence basis for each requirement.
- **Resident review:** the Resident Oversight Panel reviews the Draft Standard for accessibility and plain-language clarity.
- **Public consultation:** sixty days of public comment on SCIP. Comments are published and addressed in the final standard.
- **Scientific Panel input:** the relevant Standing Domain Panel (Section 5.1) reviews the Draft Standard for technical adequacy against the current evidence base.
- **Final adoption:** the Technical Standards Council adopts the final standard by two-thirds majority. Dissenting positions are published. The standard is submitted to the relevant SA or NSA for formal receipt.
- **Implementation tracking:** the ISB publishes a quarterly Standards Implementation Register showing compliance status across all relevant infrastructure assets.

6.4 Relationship to Long-Horizon Planning

The ISB works closely with the 100-Year Planning Office (Part III, Section 7) to ensure that current standards anticipate long-horizon requirements. Specifically:

- All standards with significant climate or demographic implications are reviewed against the 100-Year Planning Office's current scenario set before adoption.
- The ISB sits on the Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group (Section 10.2).
- Any standard that would lock in infrastructure for more than thirty years requires a Long-Horizon Impact Assessment produced by the 100-Year Planning Office before adoption.

PART III — LONG-HORIZON PLANNING ARCHITECTURE

7. The 100-Year Planning Office

7.1 The Challenge of Long-Horizon Planning Without an Executive

Long-horizon planning in conventional governance systems is either executive-driven (a ministry or treasury sets fifty-year infrastructure plans) or largely absent (the electoral cycle creates a structural bias toward short-term decisions). Both failures are problems for the Civic Commonwealth. DD&SA eliminates the executive but cannot eliminate the need to think beyond the next assembly term. The 100-Year Planning Office is the institutional answer: a professional, transparent, non-directive body whose function is to extend the time horizon available to SA deliberation without controlling the choices that SAs make within it.

7.2 Mandate

The 100-Year Planning Office (100YPO) develops, maintains, and periodically updates long-horizon scenarios for the Civic Commonwealth across five planning domains:

7.3 Composition

- **100YPO Professional Staff:** An interdisciplinary team of planners, systems thinkers, modellers, and domain specialists. The team is led by a Chief Long-Horizon Planner appointed by open competition for a seven-year non-renewable term. Staff serve five-year renewable appointments.
- **Long-Horizon Panel (sortition oversight):** Twelve residents sortition-selected for three-year non-renewable terms. The Panel reviews all major 100YPO outputs, commissions special reports, and publishes its own Assessment Notes alongside 100YPO reports. Panel members receive a structured orientation in long-horizon planning methodology.
- **Advisory Network:** A standing network of domain specialists — climate scientists, demographers, infrastructure engineers, technology researchers — who provide input to specific planning domain reviews. Network members serve on a per-engagement basis, with full interest declarations published.

7.4 Planning Outputs and Their Use

7.5 Non-Directive Principle in Practice

The 100-Year Planning Office produces a Long-Horizon Impact Assessment for a proposed national transport corridor. The assessment identifies that under the Office's central scenario set, population distribution in 2080 will shift significantly northward, potentially reducing demand on the proposed corridor by forty percent while substantially under-serving the projected growth areas. The 100YPO does not recommend accepting or rejecting the proposal. It provides three scenario variants — high growth, moderate shift, low migration — with the demand implications of each. The relevant SA deliberates on the proposal with full access to the assessment. Whether it proceeds, modifies, or rejects the corridor is the SA's decision, not the 100YPO's.

8. Climate Resilience Framework

8.1 Purpose and Scope

The Climate Resilience Framework (CRF) establishes the architecture through which climate risk is assessed, planned for, and embedded in civic decision-making across all domains and territories. It is not a mitigation mandate — what the Civic Commonwealth does about climate change is decided by SAs on the basis of evidence and deliberation. It is an information and planning infrastructure: ensuring that SAs have the best available evidence about climate risks and that their decisions, whatever they are, have been made with that evidence in view.

8.2 The Five CRF Components

Component 1: The Civic Climate Risk Register

Maintained by the 100YPO in collaboration with the Scientific Panel on Climate, the Civic Climate Risk Register is a publicly accessible, continuously updated inventory of climate risks classified by:

- Risk type: flooding, coastal erosion, heat stress, drought, storm intensity, sea-level rise, wildfire, infrastructure freeze-thaw damage.
- Geographic scope: national, regional, local, or specific asset-level risks.
- Probability assessment: likelihood under three scenario pathways (current trajectory, moderate mitigation, strong mitigation).
- Impact severity: on residents, on services, on infrastructure, on the natural environment.
- Adaptive capacity: the ability of the affected territory or system to respond to or accommodate the risk.

The Register is reviewed and updated annually. Significant new risk identifications trigger an automatic referral to the affected SA and to the Infrastructure Standards Board.

Component 2: Climate Embedding Requirements for SA Decisions

Any SA decision that has material climate implications — defined by a published Climate Relevance Threshold — must include a Climate Alignment Statement in its decision record. The statement specifies:

- Which climate risks are relevant to the decision.
- How the decision addresses or accommodates those risks.
- Whether the decision is consistent with the Civic Commonwealth's published climate commitments.
- If it departs from those commitments, the reasoning.

The Audit Authority audits Climate Alignment Statement compliance annually. Where an SA has consistently failed to include required statements, the Audit Authority issues an Amber or Red audit finding.

Component 3: Territorial Adaptation Plans

Every Regional Civic Assembly produces a Territorial Adaptation Plan (TAP) every five years, reviewed and updated annually. The TAP is developed using the Civic Climate Risk Register and the CRF Scenario Set, and specifies:

- The climate risks of primary concern for the territory, based on the Register.
- The adaptation measures the Assembly plans to implement over the five-year period.

- The infrastructure investments, service changes, and planning decisions required.
- The monitoring indicators by which progress will be assessed.

TAPs are developed through a resident consultation process and published on SCIP. The 100YPO reviews TAPs for long-horizon coherence and publishes a summary analysis.

Component 4: Cross-Territory Climate Coordination

Climate risks do not respect territorial boundaries. The Climate Resilience Framework therefore includes a Cross-Territory Climate Coordination Protocol, managed by the 100YPO, through which:

- Shared climate risks (watershed flooding, coastal zones, shared energy systems) are jointly assessed and planned for by the relevant Territorial Assemblies through the inter-assembly coordination mechanisms of DD&SA-ARCH-IACF-001.
- The 100YPO publishes annual National Climate Coherence Assessments identifying cases where individual TAPs, taken together, leave systemic gaps — for example, where upstream flood management decisions in one territory increase risk in another.
- The Scientific Panel on Climate reviews the coherence of TAPs with the latest climate science and publishes an annual Cross-Territory Climate Adequacy Note.

Component 5: Climate Emergency Protocol

Where a declared Civic Emergency (under the Emergency Coordination Protocol of DD&SA-ARCH-IACF-001) has a climate cause or dimension, the Climate Emergency Protocol activates:

- The 100YPO provides real-time scenario support to the Emergency Coordination Council.
- The Scientific Panel on Climate is available for rapid advisory input within twenty-four hours of activation.
- The Civic Climate Risk Register is updated with emergency-grade data as it becomes available.
- Post-emergency, the 100YPO produces a Climate Event Analysis within ninety days, assessing what the event tells us about climate risk trajectories and what, if any, changes are indicated in the Risk Register or in TAPs.

9. Demographic Modelling Protocols

9.1 The Demographic Data Infrastructure

Demographic modelling in DD&SA is built on the Civic Resident Register (CRR) — the continuously maintained population register described in DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001, Section 3.2. The CRR provides the raw data; the 100YPO's Demographic Modelling Unit provides the projection methodology; and the Scientific Panel on Health Systems provides domain-specific demographic analysis for health, care, and disability services.

9.2 The Five Core Modelling Protocols

Protocol 1: Population Structure Projections

Annual five-year rolling projections and ten-year-horizon projections of population structure, disaggregated by:

- Age band (five-year cohorts).
- Geographic distribution (national, regional, local).
- Household composition.

- Projected migration flows (using three migration scenario variants: stable, moderate increase, significant increase).

Projections are published on SCIP as open data in machine-readable format. Every projection includes an explicit uncertainty range and the key assumptions driving it.

Protocol 2: Service Demand Modelling

Using population structure projections, the 100YPO produces Service Demand Models for each major civic service domain, specifying projected changes in demand over five, ten, and twenty-five year horizons. Models cover: primary health and care services; school and post-secondary education capacity; housing stock requirements; transport demand by mode and corridor; digital access and connectivity requirements; environmental and green space demand. Service Demand Models are produced every three years and updated annually for domains where demographic change is rapid.

Protocol 3: Equity Impact Assessment

Every Service Demand Model includes an Equity Impact Assessment: an analysis of whether projected demographic changes will affect the equal service standard per resident principle differentially across territories. Specifically, the Assessment identifies:

- Territories where population decline may threaten service viability under current allocation models.
- Territories where population growth will require significant service expansion.
- Age-structure shifts that disproportionately affect specific service demands in specific areas.

Equity Impact Assessments are reviewed by the Audit Authority for compliance with the Equal Cost Per Head principle (DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001, Section 3.1).

Protocol 4: Care and Dependency Ratio Modelling

The demographic ageing of the Civic Commonwealth creates a structural challenge for civic service planning: a rising ratio of residents requiring intensive care and support services relative to the working-age population providing and funding those services. The 100YPO maintains a Dependency Ratio Monitor, updated annually, tracking:

- The ratio of working-age residents to older residents requiring care support.
- The geographic distribution of this ratio (ageing rural areas versus younger urban areas).
- Projected workforce implications for health, care, and education services.
- Fiscal implications under the Civic Resource Allocation model.

Protocol 5: Migration Scenario Integration

The Civic Migration and Protection Architecture (DD&SA-POL-CMPA-001) governs the management of arrivals to the Civic Commonwealth. The 100YPO integrates the outputs of that architecture into demographic planning by:

- Maintaining three migration variant scenarios: stable (current flow levels), moderate increase (reflecting climate and geopolitical pressures), and significant increase (responding to major displacement events).
- Running all Service Demand Models and Infrastructure Lifecycle projections against all three variants.
- Providing the relevant Domain and Territorial Assemblies with scenario-specific capacity gap analyses when significant changes in migration flows are projected.

10. Infrastructure Lifecycle Management

10.1 The Lifecycle Model

Infrastructure in the Civic Commonwealth is managed across a defined six-stage lifecycle. The lifecycle model is used by the 100YPO, the Infrastructure Standards Board, the Audit Authority, and SAs to ensure that no stage of infrastructure management is treated as the responsibility of a different institution and forgotten.

10.2 The Infrastructure Lifecycle Register

The 100YPO maintains the Civic Infrastructure Lifecycle Register — a SCIP-hosted, publicly accessible database of every major infrastructure asset in the Civic Commonwealth, showing:

- Current lifecycle stage and transition date.
- Condition assessment score (updated annually).
- Projected end-of-life date under current maintenance regime.
- Outstanding maintenance obligations and their status.
- Compliance with current ISB standards.
- Any climate risk flags from the Civic Climate Risk Register.

The Register enables SAs, residents, and the Audit Authority to see, at any time, the whole picture of infrastructure condition and planned investment across the Commonwealth. It prevents the accumulation of deferred maintenance liabilities — a structural failure of prior systems in which asset condition deteriorated invisibly until crisis required emergency expenditure.

10.3 Deferred Maintenance Protocol

Any SA decision to defer scheduled maintenance on an infrastructure asset must be:

- Formally recorded on SCIP with the justification and the proposed revised maintenance timeline.
- Reviewed by the Infrastructure Standards Board within thirty days, which publishes a risk assessment of the deferral.
- Audited by the Audit Authority in its next scheduled audit of the relevant domain.

Where deferred maintenance accumulates beyond a defined threshold, the Audit Authority issues an Amber finding, and where it reaches a level that compromises safety or service standards, a Red finding that requires immediate SA response and a mandatory Upgrade/Retire review.

10.4 Equity and Infrastructure

The equal service standard per resident principle (DD&SA constitutional core) creates a specific infrastructure planning obligation: infrastructure condition and lifecycle investment must not systematically diverge between territories in ways that reflect historical wealth disparities rather than objective planning needs. The 100YPO produces an annual Infrastructure Equity Assessment reviewing whether maintenance investment, capital renewal, and upgrade decisions are equitably distributed across territories. Where systematic disparities are identified, the relevant SAs are required to respond within sixty days.

PART IV — INTER-BODY COORDINATION AND RELATIONSHIP TO SAs

11. Ecosystem Coordination Architecture

11.1 Why Coordination Matters

Independent bodies that operate in isolation from each other produce duplicated effort, conflicting advice, and missed connections between related findings. The Scientific Panel on Climate produces findings that the Infrastructure Standards Board needs to review its standards. The Resident Ombudsman identifies complaint patterns that the Civic Audit Authority needs to investigate. The 100-Year Planning Office's demographic projections require the Ethics Commission's advice on equity implications. Without coordination, each body works with an incomplete picture.

The ecosystem coordination architecture creates the connective tissue between bodies without creating a hierarchy. Coordination is lateral, not vertical. No body has authority over another. What exists is a set of defined protocols through which bodies share data, trigger joint work, and resolve analytical conflicts — always on the basis of transparency and published reasoning.

11.2 The Ecosystem Data Platform

All bodies in the ecosystem share the National Open-Data Spine (NODS) as their common data infrastructure. Every body's published outputs, working documents, evidence registers, and methods notes are published on SCIP in a standardised, machine-readable format. This means that any body seeking data produced by another body accesses it from the same platform that any resident accesses — there are no privileged data feeds between ecosystem bodies, and no data is shared between bodies that is not also accessible to the public.

The Civic Data Assembly (DD&SA-ARCH-COA-001, Section 10.3) is responsible for ensuring that the data standards used by ecosystem bodies are consistent and interoperable. Where a body's data format is incompatible with NODS standards, the Civic Data Assembly issues a Data Format Alignment Notice requiring correction within ninety days.

11.3 The Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group

The Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group (LHPCG) is a standing coordination mechanism — not a governance body — through which the five bodies most directly engaged in long-horizon planning interact:

- The 100-Year Planning Office.
- The Infrastructure Standards Board.
- The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels (represented by the current chairs of Standing Domain Panels).
- The Civic Data Assembly.
- The Resident Ombudsman's Systemic Analysis Unit.

The LHPCG meets quarterly. Its meetings are open to observation and are published in full on SCIP. It has no decision-making authority. Its function is: to share emerging findings before they are finalised; to identify cross-cutting issues that require joint work; and to flag coordination needs to the relevant SAs.

11.4 Joint Review Protocols

Where an issue requires input from more than one body in a structured way, a Joint Review is convened. A Joint Review is not a merger of bodies; it is a defined collaborative process. The protocol is:

- **Trigger:** Any body may propose a Joint Review to any other body (or bodies) by publishing a Joint Review Proposal on SCIP specifying the question, the proposed participants, and the intended output.
- **Agreement:** Proposed bodies have ten working days to confirm participation. If a body declines, it publishes its reasoning. Resident petition (five hundred signatures) can require a body to participate in a Joint Review on a matter within its mandate.
- **Scope definition:** Participating bodies agree a Joint Review Scope Document within fifteen working days of agreement, published on SCIP.
- **Joint work:** Bodies contribute their specific domain inputs to the joint analysis. No body's input overrides another's; conflicting findings are presented alongside each other, not resolved by any participant.
- **Conflict note:** Where bodies reach materially different conclusions on the same question, a Conflict Note is produced setting out both positions and the basis for each.
- **Output:** A Joint Review Report is published on SCIP. The Report presents the area of agreement, any conflict notes, and the implications for SA deliberation. It does not tell SAs what to decide.

12. Relationship Between Independent Bodies and SAs

12.1 The Request and Response Protocol

The primary formal channel between SAs and independent bodies is the Request and Response Protocol. Either party may initiate:

12.2 How Advice Enters SA Deliberation

Independent body outputs do not automatically become agenda items; SAs control their own deliberative agenda. What the protocol above ensures is that body outputs are formally acknowledged and that SAs cannot ignore them silently. The formal acknowledgement requirement means that if a relevant SA chooses not to engage with a Scientific Panel recommendation, it must say so — publicly and on the record. This creates accountability without direction.

Where an SA's decision record explicitly departs from a body's published advice, the relevant body may publish a Post-Decision Technical Note on SCIP noting the departure and its assessment of the implications. This is not an appeal or a challenge; it is a transparency mechanism. Residents can see both the SA's decision and the body's assessment of it. Future reviews can assess whether the decision proved well-founded.

12.3 Resolving Conflicts Between Bodies

Where two bodies produce materially conflicting advice on the same question for the same SA, the following protocol applies:

- **Joint Conflict Review:** The bodies produce a Joint Conflict Report specifying where their analyses diverge, why, and what the key factual or methodological questions are that explain the difference.

- **IES review:** The Independent Epistemic Secretariat reviews the conflicting analyses and produces an Epistemic Assessment indicating which analysis it considers better-grounded, with full reasoning. The IES assessment is not binding; it is expert guidance.
- **Presentation to SA:** Both analyses, the Joint Conflict Report, and the IES Epistemic Assessment are all formally presented to the relevant SA in the same deliberative session. The SA is required to explain which analysis it found more persuasive and why.
- **Publication:** all materials are published on SCIP. Future panels in related domains are required to review the Conflict Report as part of their scope definition.

PART V — SAFEGUARDS, DRIFT PREVENTION, AND STRESS-TESTING

13. The Threat Model for the Institutional Ecosystem

The institutional ecosystem is vulnerable to three families of threat, each requiring a distinct set of structural safeguards:

14. Structural Safeguards

14.1 Preventing De Facto Executive Formation

- All body outputs must include multiple options where choice is involved — single-recommendation outputs are a structural violation, flagged by the Audit Authority.
- Post-Decision Technical Notes (Section 12.2) create transparency when SA decisions depart from advice — but they also prevent bodies from issuing advice framed to foreclose alternatives.
- The Ethics Commission's mandate explicitly includes monitoring for de facto executive behaviour by ecosystem bodies.
- The five-yearly Ecosystem Review Assembly (Section 14.4) specifically assesses whether any body has developed de facto directive authority and has power to recommend restructuring.

14.2 Preventing Technocratic Capture

- The Dynamic Panel Architecture (Section 5.1) prevents any single expert community from permanently controlling a domain's advisory input.
- Mandatory conflict-of-interest disclosure (Section 5.5) makes funding relationships and professional affiliations visible.
- IES Epistemic Monitors attend all panel sessions and have standing to challenge methodological choices and emerging consensus.
- Resident accountability members on every panel have standing to publish dissenting notes without requiring expert consensus.
- The public consultation requirement for all major outputs (thirty to sixty days, with published responses to substantive comments) opens technical conclusions to external challenge.
- Expert pool rotation requirements prevent long-term institutional affiliations from forming.

14.3 Preventing Transparency Erosion

- The SCIP Publication Compliance Log (Section 1.3) tracks whether each body is meeting its publication obligations. Gaps trigger automatic review.

- The Resident Accountability Panel members on each body specifically assess accessibility and plain-language quality in their published assessments.
- The Resident Ombudsman receives complaints about body accessibility and publishes accessibility metrics in its systemic analysis.
- The Audit Authority's data integrity function includes audit of SCIP publication compliance as a standard element of its annual programme.

14.4 The Five-Yearly Ecosystem Review Assembly

Every five years, the Civic Formation Assembly constitutes an Ecosystem Review Assembly (ERA) — a sortition-constituted body of thirty residents specifically tasked with conducting a comprehensive review of the whole institutional ecosystem. The ERA is constituted separately from any standing body and includes no current members of any ecosystem body.

The ERA's mandate covers:

- Assessment of whether each body is fulfilling its mandate effectively and without overreach.
- Assessment of whether the ecosystem as a whole serves SA deliberation effectively or has developed structural biases.
- Assessment of whether the transparency architecture is functioning as designed.
- Assessment of whether the inter-body coordination mechanisms are working.
- Recommendations for restructuring, merger, dissolution, or creation of new bodies.

The ERA is supported by the IES, which provides an independent methodological framework for the review. The ERA's report is published in full on SCIP and presented to the NSA for formal deliberation. NSA decisions on ERA recommendations are published within ninety days of receipt.

14.5 Resident-Initiated Reviews

Any resident may trigger a targeted review of any ecosystem body through the SCIP petition mechanism with five hundred signatures. The petition must specify the concern. A valid petition triggers:

- A formal response from the body within twenty working days.
- If the concern is not resolved by the response: a Resident Review Panel of nine residents sortition-selected from outside the relevant body's staff pool, with findings published within sixty working days.
- Where the Resident Review Panel finds a substantive breach: referral to the Audit Authority, the Ethics Commission, or — if the concern is severe — to the ERA by early convening.

15. Automatic Drift Indicators

16. Stress Tests

16.1 Stress Test: Major Climate Shock

Scenario: A severe coastal flooding event affecting three regional territories causes widespread infrastructure damage, displaces forty thousand residents, and simultaneously triggers a national reassessment of coastal infrastructure planning standards. Multiple bodies have competing urgent priorities. The 100YPO's coastal infrastructure scenarios are suddenly under intense public scrutiny. The Infrastructure Standards Board's coastal resilience standards are challenged as inadequate.

Ecosystem Response

- The Emergency Coordination Protocol (DD&SA-ARCH-IACF-001) is activated for the immediate response.
- The 100YPO activates its Climate Emergency Protocol, providing real-time scenario support to the Emergency Coordination Council.
- The Scientific Panel on Climate convenes an emergency session within forty-eight hours, producing an urgent Technical Assessment of the event's relationship to projected climate scenarios.
- The ISB convenes a Standards Emergency Review within seventy-two hours to assess whether the flooding has exposed failures in current coastal standards.
- The Resident Ombudsman opens a dedicated complaint channel for displaced residents, with a commitment to acknowledge all complaints within twenty-four hours.
- The Civic Audit Authority prepares a pre-audit assessment of the capital expenditure implications for inclusion in emergency planning.
- The Ethics Commission monitors the emergency decision-making process for procedural compliance and conflict-of-interest risks — emergency conditions are a historically elevated risk period for both.
- Within ninety days: the 100YPO publishes a Climate Event Analysis, the ISB publishes a Standards Review with proposed revisions, and the CAA publishes a preliminary expenditure audit. All are presented to the affected Territorial Assemblies and to the NSA in a joint briefing session.

Assessment

The ecosystem's distributed design means that no single body is overwhelmed. The 100YPO focuses on planning context, the ISB on standards, the CAA on fiscal oversight, and the Ombudsman on resident welfare. Coordination through the LHPCG and the shared SCIP platform ensures that each body's emergency work is visible to and usable by the others. Crucially, SAs retain decision authority throughout: the ecosystem provides the evidence and analysis that allows emergency decisions to be made well, but it does not make those decisions itself.

16.2 Stress Test: Long-Term Misalignment Between Planning and Resident Preferences

Scenario: The 100-Year Planning Office has, over fifteen years, consistently recommended northward population dispersal strategies, based on climate modelling and resource distribution projections. Multiple Territorial Assemblies have adopted TAPs aligned with this recommendation. But resident surveys and Ombudsman complaint data increasingly suggest that residents do not want to move northward, and that social capital loss in communities affected by dispersal is severe. The planning evidence and lived resident experience are in growing tension.

Ecosystem Response

- The Resident Ombudsman's Systemic Analysis Unit publishes a Systemic Pattern Report on the dispersal-related complaints, flagging the divergence between planning outputs and resident experience.
- The Ethics Commission reviews whether the dispersal planning framework adequately weighs resident agency and community social capital against resource efficiency projections.
- The Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group convenes a joint review. The 100YPO is required to produce a Planning Assumptions Review, specifically examining whether its population

dispersal scenarios have adequately incorporated resident preference data.

- The Resident Accountability Panel members of the 100YPO's Long-Horizon Panel publish a formal Resident Assessment challenging the adequacy of the planning process.
- The NSA deliberates on the full set of materials and issues a Planning Direction — not a mandate to the 100YPO, but a formal statement of the SA's values and priorities that the 100YPO is required to reflect in its next major Outlook.
- The ERA, at its next five-yearly review, specifically examines whether the 100YPO's methodology gives adequate weight to resident-expressed preferences versus technical optimisation.

Assessment

The stress test reveals how the ecosystem self-corrects when it drifts toward technical optimisation at the expense of resident agency. The Ombudsman surfaces the divergence from lived experience. The Ethics Commission provides the normative framework. The Resident Accountability Panel exercises its specific accountability function. And the SA — not the planning office — ultimately sets the values that planning must respect.

16.3 Stress Test: Coordinated Capture Attempt

Scenario: A major infrastructure sector with significant interests in forthcoming civic capital allocation has, over three years, systematically cultivated relationships with technical staff across two ecosystem bodies (the Infrastructure Standards Board and the Scientific Panel on Infrastructure). Several expert members of these bodies have recently moved into consultancy roles with sector-linked organisations. Audit data suggests that standards revisions in the past two years have consistently favoured the sector's preferred technical approaches without compelling independent evidence.

Ecosystem Response

- The IES Epistemic Monitors, who have attended all relevant ISB and Panel sessions, flag the methodological pattern to the Ethics Commission through the standard Systemic Ethics Monitoring channel.
- The Ethics Commission's Secretariat reviews the interests declarations of the flagged expert members and identifies two cases where declarations were not updated following the consultancy appointments.
- The Ethics Commission issues a Systemic Ethics Alert to the ISB and the relevant Scientific Panel, triggering a mandatory Standards Review of the revisions made in the past two years.
- The Civic Audit Authority commissions a special audit of the standards revision process, assessing whether proper procedures were followed and whether the evidence base for each revision was adequate.
- The Resident Review Assembly (triggered by a resident petition organised in response to media coverage) reviews the body composition and appointment processes.
- The failing members are required to recuse themselves from all ongoing work pending Ethics Commission review of the undisclosed interests.
- Standards revisions found to have inadequate evidence bases are referred back to the ISB for re-review with a fresh expert panel composed under enhanced conflict-of-interest controls.
- The ERA's next five-year review specifically examines whether the expert pool rotation requirements for the affected bodies are adequate.

Assessment

The capture attempt is detected and addressed through the ecosystem's layered safeguards: IES Epistemic Monitors provide real-time inside-view scrutiny; interest declaration requirements create forensic accountability; the Ethics Commission has both monitoring and alerting functions; and the Audit Authority provides evidence-independent procedural review. No single safeguard would have been sufficient; the combination makes sustained capture extremely difficult to achieve undetected.

PART VI — DEFINITIONS AND GLOSSARY

17. Terms and Definitions

All terms in this glossary are consistent with DD&SA constitutional vocabulary established in DD&SA-ARCH-001, the Constitutional Grammar Document, and prior DD&SA corpus documents.

Advisory, not directive: The governing principle that no ecosystem body may impose a decision, standard, or plan on any SA or resident. All outputs are inputs to SA deliberation.

Annual Audit Programme: The published annual programme of audits conducted by the Civic Audit Authority, approved by the Civic Audit Board and published on SCIP before the civic year begins.

Annual State of Civic Governance Report: The consolidated annual assessment of audit findings across the whole civic system, published by the CAA within ninety days of each civic year end.

Civic Audit Authority (CAA): The standing independent body with mandate to conduct financial, procedural, and data integrity audits across the DD&SA system.

Civic Climate Risk Register: The 100YPO's continuously updated inventory of climate risks classified by type, geographic scope, probability, severity, and adaptive capacity.

Civic Ethics Commission (CEC): The standing independent body maintaining ethical standards, issuing advisory opinions, managing the Interests Register, and conducting systemic ethics monitoring.

Civic Infrastructure Lifecycle Register: The 100YPO's SCIP-hosted database of every major infrastructure asset, showing lifecycle stage, condition, compliance, and climate risk flags.

Civic Interests Register: The CEC-maintained, SCIP-hosted public database of declared interests for all individuals in civic roles across the ecosystem.

Climate Alignment Statement: A required component of SA decision records for decisions with material climate implications, specifying the climate risks considered and the decision's relationship to the Civic Commonwealth's climate commitments.

Climate Relevance Threshold: The published criteria used to determine whether an SA decision has material climate implications requiring a Climate Alignment Statement.

Conflict Note: A Joint Review document produced where participating bodies reach materially different conclusions, presenting both positions and the basis for each.

Dependency Ratio Monitor: The 100YPO's annual tracking instrument measuring the ratio of working-age to care-dependent residents and its geographic distribution.

Dynamic Panel Architecture: The ISB's framework for constituting time-limited expert panels with defined lifetimes rather than maintaining a single standing advisory council.

Ecosystem Coordination Platform: The SCIP-based shared data and information infrastructure through which all ecosystem bodies share outputs, evidence, and working documents.

Ecosystem Review Assembly (ERA): A sortition-constituted body of thirty residents, constituted every five years, with mandate to conduct a comprehensive review of the whole institutional ecosystem.

IES Epistemic Monitor: An Independent Epistemic Secretariat member attending all Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel sessions to review evidence quality and challenge emerging consensus.

Infrastructure Equity Assessment: The 100YPO's annual review of whether maintenance investment and capital renewal decisions are equitably distributed across territories.

Infrastructure Standards Board (ISB): The standing independent body with mandate to develop, maintain, and update technical standards for all physical and digital infrastructure.

Joint Conflict Report: The document produced when two bodies reach materially conflicting advice on the same question, specifying the divergences and their methodological basis.

Joint Review: A defined collaborative process through which two or more bodies produce a coordinated analysis of a cross-cutting question, following the Joint Review Protocol.

Long-Horizon Impact Assessment: A 100YPO assessment required for SA decisions with implications beyond thirty years or for major capital projects, published alongside the SA decision record.

Long-Horizon Panel: The sortition-constituted oversight body of twelve residents reviewing all major 100YPO outputs and publishing its own Assessment Notes.

Long-Horizon Planning Coordination Group (LHPCG): The standing quarterly coordination mechanism linking the five bodies most directly engaged in long-horizon planning.

Ombudsman Oversight Panel: The sortition-constituted oversight body of seven residents reviewing the Resident Ombudsman's annual performance and accessibility.

100-Year Planning Office (100YPO): The standing independent body developing and maintaining long-horizon scenarios for the Civic Commonwealth across five planning domains.

Planning Alignment Alert: A 100YPO alert to the NSA where more than thirty percent of major SA capital decisions in a year have been made without a Long-Horizon Impact Assessment.

Post-Decision Technical Note: A body's published note on SCIP where an SA's decision departs from the body's published advice, noting the departure and the body's assessment of its implications.

Resident Accountability Panel Members: Sortition-selected resident members of any ecosystem body, whose specific role is civic accountability rather than technical expertise.

Resident Ombudsman: The standing independent officer with mandate to receive and investigate individual resident complaints about civic service delivery, institutional conduct, and process failures.

Resolution Recommendation: The Resident Ombudsman's recommended action for an institution following investigation of a complaint.

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels: Time-limited expert panels constituted under the Dynamic Panel Architecture to provide independent, evidence-based advice to SAs on complex technical questions.

Service Demand Models: 100YPO projections of changes in demand for each major civic service domain over five, ten, and twenty-five year horizons, based on demographic projections.

Standards Emergency Review: An ISB expedited review of relevant standards triggered by an event that may have exposed inadequacy in current standards.

Systemic Complaints Register: The Resident Ombudsman's SCIP-published quarterly database of complaint categories, volumes, and resolution rates.

Systemic Ethics Alert: A formal CEC notice to a specific body or SA where an active systemic ethics risk has been identified, requiring a response within thirty working days.

Systemic Ethics Scan: The CEC Secretariat's quarterly proactive review of civic system behaviour for ethical risk patterns.

Territorial Adaptation Plan (TAP): A Regional Civic Assembly's five-yearly plan specifying climate risks and adaptation measures for its territory, developed using the Civic Climate Risk Register.

Urgent Advisory Notice: A body's formal notice to a specific SA where an urgent risk has been identified requiring extraordinary deliberation within ten working days.

— END OF FRAMEWORK —

DD&SA-ARCH-IEA-001 | Version 1.0 | April 2026

Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles

— END OF DOCUMENT —