

DIRECT DEMOCRACY & SORTITION ASSEMBLIES

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

DDSA-CORE-FBP-001 | Edition 1.0

The New British Isles Foundational Blueprint

A civic architecture for Direct Democracy and Sortition Assemblies

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Version: 1.0

Author: Ian R. Graham

Document ID: DDSA-CORE-FBP-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

Author's Foreword	8
Master Table of Contents	8
1. Purpose, Scope, and Problem Diagnosis	9
1.1 The Crisis of Representative Democracy in the British Isles	9
1.2 What DD&SA; Is and What It Is Not	9
1.3 The Problem This Blueprint Solves	10
1.4 Scope of This Document	11
2. Normative Foundations	11
2.1 The Seven Governing Principles	11
2.1.1 Non-Domination	11
2.1.2 Fairness	11
2.1.3 Inclusion	12
2.1.4 Epistemic Quality	12
2.1.5 Transparency	12
2.1.6 Accountability	12
2.1.7 Resilience	12
2.2 The Relationship Between These Principles	13
3. Conceptual Model and System Overview	13
3.1 The Architecture in Summary	13
3.2 How DD&SA; Relates to Legacy Institutions	13
3.3 The Civic Commonwealth as Constitutional Container	14
4. Core Definitions and Terminology	14
5. The Layered Architecture of DD&SA;	14
5.1 Principles of Layered Design	14
5.2 The Local Civic Council	15
5.2.1 Definition and Purpose	15
5.2.2 Local Competences	15
5.2.3 Local Sortition Assembly: Composition and Cycle	15
5.3 The Regional Civic Council	16
5.3.1 Definition and Purpose	16
5.3.2 Regional Competences	16
5.3.3 Regional Sortition Assembly: Composition and Cycle	16

5.4 The National Civic Assembly	16
5.4.1 Definition and Purpose	16
5.4.2 Composition	17
5.4.3 Tenure and Rotation	17
5.4.4 National Competences	17
5.5 The Constitutional Review Assembly	18
5.6 International and Supranational DD&SA; Structures	18
5.6.1 The Civic International Compact	18
5.6.2 The Civic Foreign Relations Function	18
6. Assembly Types	18
6.1 The Classification of Assemblies	18
6.1.1 Standing Assemblies	19
6.1.2 Thematic Assemblies	19
6.1.3 Crisis Assemblies	19
6.1.4 Oversight Assemblies	19
6.1.5 Experimental Assemblies	19
6.1.6 Review Assemblies	20
6.1.7 Emergency Constituent Assemblies	20
6.2 Binding Authority vs. Advisory Function	20
7. Legal and Constitutional Embedding	20
7.1 Constitutional Provisions	20
7.2 The Inviolable Rules	21
7.3 The Transitional Legal Pathway	21
8. The Theory and Practice of Sortition	21
8.1 Why Sortition, Not Election	21
8.2 Sampling Design and Stratification	22
8.2.1 The Sortition Pool	22
8.2.2 Stratification Dimensions	22
8.2.3 Oversampling and Balancing	22
8.3 Eligibility, Exclusions, and Conflict of Interest	23
8.3.1 Civic Eligibility	23
8.3.2 Conflict of Interest Protocols	23
8.4 Tenure, Rotation, and Continuity	23
8.4.1 Cycle Design	23
8.4.2 Continuity Mechanisms	24
8.5 Remuneration, Care, and Accessibility	24

8.5.1 The Principle of Civic Equivalence	24
8.5.2 Remuneration Structure	24
8.5.3 Caring and Accessibility Provisions	25
8.5.4 Mental Health and Wellbeing Support	25
9. The Invitation and Recruitment Process	25
9.1 The Two-Stage Sortition Model	25
9.2 Active Recruitment for Underrepresented Groups	25
10. Process Phases and the Deliberative Cycle	26
10.1 The Seven Phases of Civic Deliberation	26
Phase 1: Mandate Setting and Scoping	26
Phase 2: Learning and Evidence	26
Phase 3: Small-Group Deliberation	26
Phase 4: Expert Challenge and Counter-Argument	27
Phase 5: Synthesis and Drafting	27
Phase 6: Assembly Review and Revision	27
Phase 7: Publication and Handover	27
10.2 Decision Rules	27
10.2.1 Voting Methods	27
10.2.2 Quorum	28
10.2.3 Minority Reports and Dissent	28
11. Information Architecture and Epistemic Infrastructure	28
11.1 The Civic Evidence Principles	28
11.2 The Civic Evidence Panel	29
11.3 Expert Input: Selection and Safeguards	29
11.4 The Mandated Challenger System	29
11.5 Deliberation Formats and Facilitation	30
11.5.1 Format Options	30
11.5.2 Facilitation Principles	30
11.5.3 In-Person, Hybrid, and Fully Online Assemblies	30
12. Agenda-Setting and Civic Initiation	31
12.1 How Assemblies Are Initiated	31
12.1.1 Institutional Initiation	31
12.1.2 Civic Petition	31
12.1.3 Emergency Declaration	31
13. Public Input, Feedback, and Participation	32

13.1 The Architecture of Public Engagement	32
Tier 1: Structured Submission	32
Tier 2: Resident Witness Testimony	32
Tier 3: Public Consultation on Determinations	32
Tier 4: Ongoing Civic Dialogue	32
13.2 Transparency and the Civic Record	33
13.2.1 The Scope of Civic Transparency	33
13.2.2 Privacy Exceptions	33
13.2.3 Open Data and the Civic Archive	33
13.3 Interaction with Media and the Public Information Environment	33
13.3.1 The Civic Information Service	33
13.3.2 Media Relations	34
13.3.3 The Civic Information Standards Authority	34
13.4 Interaction with Legacy Political Parties and Organised Interests	34
13.4.1 The Status of Political Parties	34
13.4.2 Organised Interests	34
14. The Civic Secretariat	35
14.1 Structure and Function	35
14.2 Staffing and Roles	35
14.3 Digital Infrastructure	35
14.3.1 The Civic Deliberation Platform	35
14.3.2 The Civic Participation Register	36
14.3.3 The Civic Archive	36
14.4 Standard Operating Procedures	36
14.5 Budgeting and Financial Accountability	36
15. The Transition to DD&SA;: A Phased Implementation	37
15.1 Overview of the Transition Framework	37
15.2 The Five Transition Phases	37
Phase 1: Establishment (Years 1–2)	37
Phase 2: Local and Regional Implementation (Years 2–5)	37
Phase 3: National Implementation (Years 4–7)	37
Phase 4: Full Civic Commonwealth (Years 6–10)	38
Phase 5: Consolidation and Review (Years 8–15)	38
15.3 The Twelve Quality Gates	38
16. Anti-Capture Architecture	38
16.1 The Nature of Capture Risk	38

16.2 Sortition Anti-Capture Provisions	38
16.3 Deliberative Anti-Capture Provisions	39
16.4 Administrative and Constitutional Anti-Capture Provisions	39
16.5 The Civic Integrity Commission	40
17. Ethics, Wellbeing, and Psychological Safety	40
17.1 The Civic Ethics Code	40
17.2 Physical and Digital Safety	40
17.3 Psychological Safety and Trauma-Informed Practice	41
18. Crisis Protocols and Emergency Operations	41
18.1 Emergency Powers and Their Limits	41
18.2 Continuity of Civic Governance	41
19. Appeals, Review, and Civic Audit	41
19.1 The Appeals Architecture	41
19.2 The Civic Audit Service	42
20. The Civic Quality Framework	42
20.1 Why Evaluation Is Constitutive, Not Optional	42
20.2 Metrics and Indicators	42
20.3 The Civic Evaluation and Learning Service	42
20.4 Feedback Loops and Design Iteration	43
20.5 Comparative Perspective	43
21. Civic Education and Public Literacy	43
21.1 The Civic Education Imperative	43
21.2 Civic Literacy in Formal Education	43
21.3 Public Civic Literacy: The Civic Understanding Programme	44
21.4 Training for Civic Professionals	44
22. Cultural Integration and Long-Term Resilience	44
22.1 The Challenge of Cultural Embedding	44
22.2 Civic Rituals and Symbols	44
22.3 Preventing Drift, Hollowing-Out, and Capture Over Time	45
Annex A: Model Constitutional Clauses	46
A.1 Foundational Constitutional Provisions	46
Annex B: The Thirty Inviolable Rules (Summary)	47

Annex C: Process Templates and Checklists	47
C.1 Assembly Convening Checklist	47
C.2 Deliberation Session Agenda Template	47
Annex D: Data Schemas	47
D.1 Core Data Entities	47
Annex E: Case Studies and Illustrative Scenarios	47
E.1 Scenario: The National Energy Transition Assembly	47
E.2 Scenario: Civic Integrity Commission Investigation	48
Annex F: Glossary and Index	49
F.1 Glossary of DD&SA; Terms	49
Annex G: Comparative Framework — DD&SA; and Analogous Systems	49
G.1 Citizens' Assemblies in Practice	49
Annex H: Threat and Vulnerability Register (Summary)	49
Authoritative Overview	50
Legitimacy as a Structural Output	50
Anti-Capture Architecture	51
Epistemic Superiority	51
Macroeconomic Stability Effects	52
Civic Culture Transformation	52
Comparative Case Evidence	53
Implementation Considerations	53
Conclusion	54

Author's Foreword

This document is the master foundational blueprint for the system of Direct Democracy and Sortition Assemblies — referred to throughout as DD&SA — as applied to the political, constitutional, and civic circumstances of the British Isles. It is the definitive first-principles, implementation-ready architecture upon which all other DD&SA instruments, frameworks, institutions, and practices depend.

This is not a manifesto. It is not a summary. It is not a position paper. It is an institutional design document of the kind that legislators, constitutional lawyers, senior civil servants, civic technologists, educators, researchers, and engaged residents can each use for a different but coherent purpose. The text is written accordingly: precise, non-sloganistic, internally consistent, and sufficiently exhaustive that no critical design element is left implicit.

The document draws on the full body of DD&SA scholarship and practice developed since the inception of this project, including the Constitutional Grammar Document, the Civic Trade Compatibility Architecture, the Civic Commerce Architecture, the Civic Justice Architecture, the Civic Migration and Protection Architecture, the National Health Crisis Response Framework, the Civic Policing Framework, the Civic Education Framework, and the foundational New British Isles Constitution. It synthesises those instruments into a single, coherent, first-principles account of how the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles will be governed.

Throughout this document, DD&SA vocabulary applies in full. There is no "state" — there is the Civic Commonwealth, and the civic institutions through which residents act. There are no "policies" — there are frameworks: adaptive architectures. There are no "laws" in the legacy sense — there are Civic Rules, debated and issued by residents acting through their assemblies. There is no "punishment" — there are Consequences, proportionate and restorative. There are no "judges" in the old tradition — there are Magisters, trained in restorative civic reasoning. There are no "prisons" as the default — there are Consequence Hearings, followed by civic obligations proportionate to the harm caused.

The design choices embedded in this document are not arbitrary. Every structural decision reflects a normative commitment: to non-domination over domination; to epistemic quality over mere preference aggregation; to inclusion over exclusion; to transparency over opacity; to resilience over fragility. Where design options exist, they are presented, compared, and resolved. The recommended default is always given with its justification.

This blueprint is intended to be sufficient to govern a transition from the current representative democratic system of the United Kingdom to the DD&SA architecture of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles within a period of ten to fifteen years. It is realistic about difficulty. It does not pretend that change is painless. It insists only that the alternative — continued decay of representative legitimacy — is worse.

Master Table of Contents

PART I Foundational Architecture: The Case for Change

1. Purpose, Scope, and Problem Diagnosis

1.1 The Crisis of Representative Democracy in the British Isles

The representative democratic system that has governed the United Kingdom for over three centuries was designed for conditions that no longer obtain. It was conceived in an era of limited franchise, restricted information, and an electorate whose participation was by design circumscribed to periodic expressions of preference between pre-selected candidates. The institutions that emerged — the Westminster Parliament, the adversarial two-party system, the unwritten constitution, the hereditary and appointed upper chamber, the First Past the Post electoral mechanism — were not the products of principled civic design. They were the accumulated residue of historical compromise, class settlement, and institutional inertia.

By any rigorous metric of democratic quality, these institutions are failing. Research by Gilens and Page in the United States, and comparable work in the British context by scholars including Hélène Landemore, Graham Smith, and John Dryzek, demonstrates that representative assemblies consistently reflect the preferences of organised, wealthy, and networked minorities rather than the considered views of the broader resident body. The gap between what residents want — when given the time, information, and deliberative space to form genuine views — and what representative governments produce is systematic and growing.

In the British Isles specifically, the crisis manifests across several dimensions. First, there is a crisis of legitimacy: voter turnout has declined across the post-war period, trust in Parliament has collapsed to historically low levels, and the number of residents who report feeling "not at all" represented by any major party has increased dramatically. Second, there is a crisis of epistemic quality: political competition systematically incentivises the simplification, distortion, and weaponisation of evidence. Policy — or what this document will call Civic Frameworks — is made under conditions that actively discourage careful reasoning. Third, there is a crisis of inclusion: the demographic profile of Westminster is still, despite incremental reform, radically unrepresentative of the population it governs, in terms of class, occupation, ethnicity, disability, and regional geography. Fourth, there is a crisis of accountability: the executive dominates the legislature; whipped party votes render parliamentary scrutiny largely performative; the unwritten constitution provides no reliable mechanism by which residents can restrain a determined government.

DD&SA does not claim that these failures are the product of malice. Most elected representatives are, individually, capable and often well-motivated people. The problem is structural: the incentive architecture of competitive representative democracy — the need to win elections, satisfy donors, manage media, and maintain party discipline — systematically produces outcomes misaligned with the deliberative public interest. You cannot engineer good outcomes from a broken system by replacing the people within it. You must redesign the system itself.

1.2 What DD&SA Is and What It Is Not

DD&SA — Direct Democracy and Sortition Assemblies — is a comprehensive system of civic self-governance in which public decisions are made by residents directly: not through elected intermediaries claiming to represent them, but through the residents themselves, selected by lot (sortition), given time and resources to deliberate carefully, provided with balanced evidence, and empowered to make binding determinations on matters of civic consequence.

DD&SA is not a form of plebiscitary democracy, in which questions are put to the whole population as simple yes/no votes without deliberation. The failures of that model — susceptibility to demagogic framing, the marginalisation of complexity, the suppression of minority perspectives — are well-documented. DD&SA treats residents as capable of sophisticated judgement when given appropriate conditions for its exercise.

DD&SA is not anarchism. It does not abolish civic institutions, professional administration, or expertise. It relocates ultimate civic authority from elected representatives to residents acting through deliberative assemblies, whilst retaining and enhancing the professional civic infrastructure that implements, administers, and enforces civic decisions.

DD&SA is not a utopian fantasy. It is grounded in the empirical literature on citizens' assemblies, participatory budgeting, deliberative mini-publics, and related democratic innovations operating at scale in Ireland, Iceland, Belgium, France, the Australian Capital Territory, and dozens of other jurisdictions. The design choices in this document are, wherever possible, evidence-based rather than ideologically derived.

DD&SA is, in the full sense of the term, an institutional architecture. It specifies, in sufficient detail for implementation, the structures, processes, rules, safeguards, resources, and cultural conditions necessary for a functioning system of direct democratic governance at local, regional, national, and — in appropriate forms — supranational level.

1.3 The Problem This Blueprint Solves

The foundational problem this blueprint addresses is the gap between what residents are capable of when given deliberative conditions and what representative institutions produce when operating under electoral incentives. This gap has been documented empirically, demonstrated practically, and theorised philosophically. What has been missing is a fully specified, implementation-ready architecture that closes it — not partially, through incremental reform, but comprehensively, through a designed transition to a different system.

This document provides that architecture. It specifies: how residents are selected for deliberative service; how assemblies are convened, resourced, and protected from capture; how evidence is curated and presented; how deliberation is facilitated; how decisions are made; how decisions are implemented and enforced; how the system is evaluated, audited, and improved; and how the transition from the current system to the DD&SA architecture is managed across a decade or more of phased change.

Secondary problems addressed by this blueprint include: the chronic under-representation of ordinary residents in civic decision-making; the epistemic poverty of political discourse shaped by adversarial media; the capture of civic institutions by organised corporate and factional interests; the absence of effective constitutional constraints on executive power; and the erosion of civic trust, participation, and identity across the British Isles.

1.4 Scope of This Document

This Foundational Blueprint covers the entirety of the DD&SA system as it is designed to operate within the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles — the constitutional designation adopted in preference to any legacy state-descriptor. It covers local, regional, national, and international dimensions. It covers all ten content domains specified in the DD&SA design specification: foundational architecture; system structure; sortition and civic composition; deliberative process design; interface with wider society; implementation and operations; safeguards and integrity; evaluation and adaptation; culture, education, and long-term embedding; and annexes providing technical and model instruments.

This document does not reproduce the full text of companion instruments — the Civic Justice Architecture, the Civic Migration and Protection Architecture, the Civic Education Framework, the Civic Policing Framework, the Civic Commerce Architecture, and others — except where specific cross-reference or summary is necessary for architectural coherence. Those instruments should be read alongside this document as part of the integrated DD&SA corpus.

2. Normative Foundations

2.1 The Seven Governing Principles

DD&SA is grounded in seven governing principles that together constitute its normative foundation. These principles are not optional enhancements to the design: they are constitutive of it. Every structural choice in this document can be derived from, or evaluated against, these seven principles.

2.1.1 Non-Domination

Following the republican political philosophy developed by Philip Pettit, and extended into democratic theory by Hélène Landemore and others, DD&SA is organised around the principle of non-domination: the condition in which no individual, group, institution, or interest is able to exercise arbitrary power over any other. Under representative democracy, domination is endemic — it is exercised by organised money over political parties, by party leadership over backbench representatives, by majority over minority, and by governments over the administrative and civic framework. DD&SA eliminates the structural conditions for domination by distributing civic authority across randomly selected resident panels, operating under robust procedural protections, with no single actor capable of controlling the outcome.

2.1.2 Fairness

Fairness in DD&SA has two dimensions: procedural and distributive. Procedural fairness requires that the rules governing deliberation, selection, evidence-presentation, and decision-making apply equally to all participants and all interests, without structural advantage for any. Distributive fairness requires that the benefits and burdens of civic decisions be distributed in ways that do not systematically disadvantage those who are already most disadvantaged. Sortition, combined with stratification and accessibility provisions, is the primary mechanism for procedural fairness. Distributive fairness requires that deliberative assemblies explicitly consider differential impact as part of their deliberative mandate.

2.1.3 Inclusion

Inclusion means that the system is designed to encompass the full diversity of the population of the British Isles — by age, gender, ethnicity, disability, class, geography, and other dimensions of difference — not as a courtesy or aspiration, but as a structural requirement. A civic architecture that systematically excludes any significant portion of its population from decision-making authority is not merely unfair: it produces worse decisions, because it excludes relevant knowledge, experience, and perspective. Inclusion in DD&SA is achieved through stratified random selection, active recruitment, accessibility provisions, remuneration, and anti-discrimination safeguards.

2.1.4 Epistemic Quality

Epistemic quality refers to the capacity of the civic system to produce decisions that are well-informed, carefully reasoned, sensitive to evidence and complexity, and appropriately uncertain where certainty is not warranted. Representative democracy systematically undermines epistemic quality — by reducing complex questions to simple electoral choices, by incentivising rhetorical rather than deliberative engagement, and by placing decision-making in the hands of generalists operating under competitive pressure. DD&SA improves epistemic quality by providing residents with time, resources, expert evidence, counter-argument, and facilitated deliberation — the conditions under which careful reasoning is possible.

2.1.5 Transparency

Transparency requires that all aspects of the DD&SA system — selection processes, deliberation records, evidence bases, decisions, and their implementation — are open to public scrutiny. Transparency is not merely a procedural nicety: it is a functional requirement for legitimacy. Residents cannot trust a system whose operations they cannot see. DD&SA mandates open publication of all assembly proceedings, evidence summaries, deliberation records, minority reports, and implementation audits. The only exceptions are for individual participant privacy and for specific, time-limited security considerations governed by explicit criteria.

2.1.6 Accountability

Accountability in DD&SA operates at every level of the system. Residents serving in assemblies are accountable for the quality of their deliberation — not for reaching any particular conclusion, but for engaging honestly and in good faith with the evidence and arguments presented. Civic institutions implementing assembly decisions are accountable for faithful, timely, and effective implementation. The civic administration is accountable to independent audit, evaluation, and, where necessary, the Constitutional Review Assembly. No actor within the DD&SA system operates without oversight.

2.1.7 Resilience

A civic architecture must be designed to survive the conditions it will face: political opposition, institutional inertia, economic stress, external interference, internal corruption, and the passage of time. Resilience in DD&SA is achieved through distributed authority, layered redundancy, explicit anti-capture mechanisms, independent evaluation, cultural embedding, and constitutional protection. No single point of failure should be capable of bringing down the system. No single actor should be capable of seizing control of it.

2.2 The Relationship Between These Principles

These seven principles are mutually reinforcing but can generate tensions in specific design choices. For example: transparency requirements may conflict with participant privacy; inclusion requirements may increase the cost and complexity of sortition; epistemic quality provisions may require expert input that, if poorly managed, could become a form of technocratic capture. This document addresses each such tension explicitly and resolves it through a principled default, with justification. The general ordering principle is that non-domination and inclusion take precedence over convenience and efficiency — not because efficiency is unimportant, but because a system that is efficient but captured or exclusive has failed in its fundamental purpose.

3. Conceptual Model and System Overview

3.1 The Architecture in Summary

DD&SA, as implemented in the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles, is a layered system of resident deliberation and decision-making, operating at four geographic levels — local, regional, national, and — in treaty-based form — international — with clear mandates, powers, and interactions at each level.

At its base, the system rests on the principle that legitimate civic authority derives from the informed, deliberated consent of residents, not from the mandate of elected representatives. Residents do not elect intermediaries to act on their behalf. Residents act directly, through assemblies in which they themselves serve, selected by random lot, stratified to reflect the composition of the population.

The system has six major structural components:

- The Sortition Framework — the rules, processes, and infrastructure governing how residents are selected for deliberative service.
- The Assembly Architecture — the types, mandates, competences, and operating procedures of the deliberative assemblies themselves.
- The Epistemic Infrastructure — the systems for evidence curation, expert input, information quality, and deliberation support.
- The Civic Administration — the professional public service that implements assembly decisions and administers civic services.
- The Integrity and Oversight System — the independent bodies, processes, and rules that prevent capture, corruption, and abuse.
- The Constitutional Framework — the supreme civic rules that define, constrain, and protect the entire DD&SA system.

3.2 How DD&SA Relates to Legacy Institutions

The transition from the current UK representative system to the DD&SA architecture of the Civic Commonwealth is designed to be managed over a period of ten to fifteen years, in phases. During the transition, legacy institutions will operate alongside newly established DD&SA structures, with authority progressively transferred as new institutions demonstrate capacity and legitimacy. This phased approach is described in detail in Part VI of this document and in the DD&SA Implementation Manual (DD&SA-IMPL-001).

Post-transition, the major structural relationships are as follows:

3.3 The Civic Commonwealth as Constitutional Container

The term "Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles" designates the constitutional entity within which the DD&SA system operates. It replaces all legacy state designations — "the United Kingdom," "Her Majesty's Government," "the Crown in Parliament" — with a single, civically grounded designation that expresses the ownership of civic institutions by the residents who constitute them.

The Civic Commonwealth has no sovereign in the traditional sense. It has residents, and civic institutions that serve them. Authority flows upward from residents through their assemblies, not downward from a sovereign through Parliament. This is not a semantic preference. It is a constitutional reorientation with profound practical consequences for every aspect of institutional design.

The constitutional rules of the Civic Commonwealth are set out in the New British Isles Constitution (DD&SA-CONST-001) and are summarised, where relevant to institutional design, throughout this document. They cannot be overridden by any assembly, any civic administration, or any external pressure. They can only be amended by a supermajority decision of a specially constituted Constitutional Review Assembly, subject to a mandatory public ratification period.

4. Core Definitions and Terminology

The following definitions are binding throughout the DD&SA corpus. They take precedence over any legacy legal or administrative usage.

PART II System Structure and Institutional Layers

5. The Layered Architecture of DD&SA

5.1 Principles of Layered Design

The DD&SA system operates through four geographic layers — local, regional, national, and international — each with its own defined competences, assembly structures, and relationships with other layers. The layered design reflects two principles that are in necessary tension and must be held in balance.

The first principle is subsidiarity: civic decisions should be made at the lowest level at which they can be made competently, because those closest to a situation have the most direct experience of it and the most immediate stake in its resolution. The second principle is coherence: decisions at local level must not undermine, fragment, or contradict the civic framework at regional or national level, because the Civic Commonwealth is a single entity with shared fundamental commitments.

The resolution of this tension is achieved through a clear allocation of competences — subjects that are exclusively local, exclusively national, or shared with defined primacy rules — combined with a robust system of inter-level consultation and a constitutional review function exercised by the Constitutional Review Assembly to resolve disputes. This document specifies the default allocation of competences; detailed schedules are provided in the Civic Devolution Architecture (DD&SA-STRUCT-CDA-001).

5.2 The Local Civic Council

5.2.1 Definition and Purpose

The Local Civic Council (LCC) is the foundational unit of civic self-governance in the DD&SA system. LCCs correspond to the principal local authority areas of the British Isles — approximately 350 units in England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, with adjustments made during the transition period to ensure roughly proportionate populations (target: 100,000–350,000 residents per LCC).

Each LCC is governed by a Local Sortition Assembly (LSA) — a resident body selected by stratified lot from the adult resident population of the LCC area — which holds deliberative authority over defined local competences. The LSA is supported by a Local Civic Administration (LCA) — a professional service drawn from the reformed local government workforce — which implements LSA determinations and administers local civic services.

5.2.2 Local Competences

The following are within the exclusive or primary competence of LCCs, subject to compliance with national Civic Rules and the foundational civic framework:

- Local infrastructure: roads, pavements, cycle paths, local public transport, maintenance of civic spaces.
- Local environmental management: parks, green spaces, waste collection, local environmental quality.
- Local housing quality and planning permissions within the national Civic Housing Framework.
- Local cultural facilities: libraries, community centres, local arts and cultural spaces.
- Local participation in civic education delivery, in alignment with the national Civic Education Framework.
- Local emergency preparedness and community resilience within the national Civic Emergency Framework.
- Local community safety, in coordination with regional and national Civic Policing structures.
- Local participatory budgeting within the financial allocation received from regional and national levels.

5.2.3 Local Sortition Assembly: Composition and Cycle

Each LSA comprises forty residents selected by stratified lot from the adult resident population of the LCC area. The selection is stratified across gender, age band, ethnicity, disability status, socio-economic category, and urban/rural geography in proportion to the LCC population profile. The LSA serves a civic cycle of twelve months, with staggered replacement — half the assembly is renewed every six months — to ensure continuity and accumulated institutional knowledge.

The LSA meets in full plenary at least once per month. It may constitute working panels — sub-groups of between eight and fifteen members — to undertake detailed deliberation on specific topics, reporting back to the full assembly for determination. The LSA is supported by a Local Civic Secretariat (LCS), a professional body of between five and twenty staff depending on LCC scale, providing facilitation, evidence curation, legal advice, and administrative support.

5.3 The Regional Civic Council

5.3.1 Definition and Purpose

Regional Civic Councils (RCCs) correspond to the major geographic and cultural regions of the British Isles. The default regional structure under DD&SA comprises: England — divided into eight regions broadly corresponding to established regional geographies (North East, North West, Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands, West Midlands, East of England, South East, and South West, plus Greater London as a distinct region); Scotland; Wales; Northern Ireland; and the combined Channel Islands and Isle of Man. Total: twelve regions. Regional boundaries are subject to review by a Regional Boundaries Assembly within five years of initial implementation.

Each RCC is governed by a Regional Sortition Assembly (RSA), a resident body of one hundred members selected by stratified lot from the adult resident population of the region. The RSA holds deliberative authority over defined regional competences and exercises a coordination function between LCCs within its region.

5.3.2 Regional Competences

- Regional economic development: infrastructure investment, skills, employment, business environment within the national Civic Commerce Architecture.
- Regional transport: strategic roads, rail coordination, regional air and sea connectivity.
- Regional health framework: implementation and regional adaptation of the national Civic Health Architecture.
- Regional education: operational delivery of the national Civic Education Framework at regional level.
- Regional environmental management: river catchments, regional air quality, nature recovery networks.
- Regional housing: strategic housing delivery, housing need assessment, major development frameworks.
- Regional civic justice coordination: within the national Civic Justice Architecture.
- Inter-LCC coordination: resolving disputes between LCCs, managing shared infrastructure, providing mutual aid.

5.3.3 Regional Sortition Assembly: Composition and Cycle

Each RSA comprises one hundred residents selected by stratified lot from the region's adult resident population. Stratification covers gender, age band, ethnicity, disability status, socio-economic category, and sub-regional geography (ensuring representation from each major sub-area of the region). The RSA serves a civic cycle of eighteen months, with one-third replacement every six months. The RSA is supported by a Regional Civic Secretariat (RCS) of between twenty and sixty professional staff.

5.4 The National Civic Assembly

5.4.1 Definition and Purpose

The National Civic Assembly (NCA) is the supreme deliberative and legislative body of the Civic Commonwealth. It holds national civic authority over all matters within the national competence and exercises constitutional supremacy over regional and local structures, subject only to the provisions of the New British Isles Constitution and the determinations of the Constitutional Review Assembly.

The NCA is not a parliament in the representative sense. It has no parties. Its members are not elected. It holds no constituency mandates. Its authority derives from the quality of its composition — a stratified random sample of the resident body — and the quality of its deliberation — structured, evidence-based, and procedurally protected against capture or distortion.

5.4.2 Composition

The NCA comprises three hundred residents selected by stratified lot from the adult resident population of the Civic Commonwealth. Stratification ensures that the NCA reflects the national population across: gender (minimum 40% of any gender); age bands (18–29, 30–44, 45–59, 60–74, 75 and over, in proportion to the national population); ethnicity (in proportion to the national census profile); disability (minimum 18% of members identifying as disabled, reflecting national disability prevalence); socio-economic category (minimum 40% from the three lowest socio-economic quintiles); and geographic region (minimum proportional representation from each RCC area).

Additionally, a guaranteed minimum of twenty seats are reserved for resident-nominees from communities historically excluded from civic participation, selected by a special sortition sub-process from those communities, and subject to the same deliberative standards as all other members.

5.4.3 Tenure and Rotation

NCA members serve a civic cycle of two years. One-third of the assembly is replaced every eight months, on a staggered basis, to ensure continuity of institutional knowledge whilst maintaining regular renewal. No resident may serve more than one complete NCA cycle in any twelve-year period. This limit prevents the accumulation of entrenched influence whilst ensuring that knowledge gained through service can be reintegrated into civic life.

5.4.4 National Competences

The NCA holds authority over all matters of national civic significance, including:

- The national Civic Rules Framework: all binding normative determinations that apply across the Civic Commonwealth.
- The national fiscal framework: overall revenue, expenditure, borrowing, and distribution across the civic system.
- The national Civic Justice Architecture.
- The national Civic Defence and Security Framework.
- The national Civic Foreign Relations and Trade Architecture.
- The national Civic Health Architecture.
- The national Civic Education Framework.
- The national Civic Housing Framework.
- The national Civic Commerce Architecture.
- The national Civic Environmental and Climate Framework.
- The national Civic Social Security and Welfare Framework.
- Constitutional amendments, subject to the provisions of the Constitutional Review Assembly.

5.5 The Constitutional Review Assembly

The Constitutional Review Assembly (CRA) is the apex body of the DD&SA constitutional system. It has three functions: constitutional interpretation, constitutional review of NCA determinations challenged as exceeding the national mandate or breaching fundamental civic rules, and constitutional amendment. The CRA is distinct from the NCA and operates with complete independence from it.

The CRA comprises thirty residents selected by stratified lot from residents who have previously served at least one full civic cycle in any assembly at any level, combined with fifteen civic legal scholars nominated by the national Civic Scholars Council and confirmed by an NCA panel. Total: forty-five members. CRA members serve for four years, with no renewal. This ensures accumulated knowledge and independence.

The CRA operates by written submission and structured oral hearing. It issues written determinations within defined timescales. Its determinations on constitutional matters are final, subject only to a constitutional amendment process requiring a two-thirds majority of a freshly constituted NCA panel and a forty per cent minimum participation referendum across the Civic Commonwealth. The CRA cannot itself initiate review — it responds to challenges brought by assemblies, civic institutions, or residents with standing.

5.6 International and Supranational DD&SA Structures

5.6.1 The Civic International Compact

The Civic Commonwealth recognises that effective civic governance in a globalised world requires institutional relationships beyond its borders. The International Civic Compact (DD&SA-INT-ICC-001) provides the framework within which the Civic Commonwealth engages with international bodies, treaty obligations, and supranational governance structures. The Compact specifies that no international obligation may be entered into by the Civic Commonwealth without NCA deliberation and determination; that existing treaty obligations are subject to review by a dedicated International Treaty Review Assembly within three years of DD&SA implementation; and that international agreements are subject to the same transparency and accountability requirements as domestic civic determinations.

5.6.2 The Civic Foreign Relations Function

The foreign relations function of the Civic Commonwealth is exercised by the National Civic Assembly through a standing Foreign Relations Panel — a sub-body of the NCA with delegated authority to manage day-to-day diplomatic relationships, subject to NCA oversight and the constraints of NCA determinations. The Civic Administration maintains a professional diplomatic corps, the Civic Foreign Service, whose members are appointed by competitive merit process and are accountable to the Foreign Relations Panel.

6. Assembly Types

6.1 The Classification of Assemblies

Not all DD&SA assemblies have the same form, mandate, or duration. The system distinguishes seven types of assembly, each designed for a specific civic function. Understanding the distinctions between assembly types is essential for understanding how the system as a whole allocates civic authority.

6.1.1 Standing Assemblies

Standing Assemblies are permanent or long-running bodies constituted at local, regional, or national level with a continuing mandate over a defined competence domain. The NCA, RSAs, and LSAs are all Standing Assemblies. They operate through a continuous cycle of staggered replacement, ensuring that the assembly is always constituted and functional. Standing Assemblies hold binding civic authority within their competence domains.

6.1.2 Thematic Assemblies

Thematic Assemblies are constituted for a defined subject-matter and dissolved on completion of their mandate. They may be convened by a Standing Assembly, by the Civic Secretariat on receipt of a resident petition meeting defined thresholds, or by the Constitutional Review Assembly in matters requiring dedicated deliberation. A Thematic Assembly has a defined civic cycle (typically four to nine months), a specific deliberative question, and a mandate either to produce a binding determination (if delegated binding authority by the Standing Assembly that convened it) or a formal civic recommendation to which the Standing Assembly must respond within a defined period.

Examples of Thematic Assembly topics include: the design of the national Civic Social Care Framework; review of the Civic Commerce Architecture following a major economic event; the future of public broadcasting in the Civic Commonwealth; constitutional review of the sortition eligibility rules.

6.1.3 Crisis Assemblies

Crisis Assemblies are constituted in response to defined emergency conditions, under the Civic Emergency Powers Framework (DD&SA-STRUCT-CEF-001). They operate under compressed timescales and are granted specific emergency deliberative powers to respond to the crisis at hand. Crisis Assemblies are subject to enhanced oversight requirements — including a mandatory review by a standing Oversight Assembly within thirty days of their convening — to prevent the abuse of emergency powers for non-emergency purposes.

6.1.4 Oversight Assemblies

Oversight Assemblies have a dedicated mandate to scrutinise the conduct of the Civic Administration and civic institutions. They are constituted at national and regional levels. Oversight Assemblies may initiate investigations, summon Civic Administration officials to account, commission independent audits, and recommend Consequence processes where breaches are identified. Oversight Assemblies do not hold executive authority: they observe, scrutinise, and report. They may not direct the Civic Administration. They may expose and recommend.

6.1.5 Experimental Assemblies

Experimental Assemblies are small-scale, time-limited deliberative bodies constituted to test new formats, processes, or design features before their incorporation into the main DD&SA system. They operate under research protocols approved by the Civic Evaluation and Learning Service (CELS), with participant consent and full transparency. Experimental Assemblies have no binding authority; their outputs inform design iteration within the DD&SA system.

6.1.6 Review Assemblies

Review Assemblies are constituted at defined intervals — typically every five years for major civic frameworks, every ten years for structural provisions — to undertake comprehensive evaluation of a framework or institutional arrangement and recommend revisions. Review Assemblies are the principal mechanism through which the DD&SA system learns and adapts over time. Their recommendations are delivered to the relevant Standing Assembly, which is required to respond within three months.

6.1.7 Emergency Constituent Assemblies

Emergency Constituent Assemblies are the rarest and most consequential form of assembly in the DD&SA system. They may be constituted only by a concurrent determination of the NCA and the CRA, in circumstances where the fundamental civic framework requires comprehensive redesign in response to conditions that exceed the adaptive capacity of existing structures. An Emergency Constituent Assembly has the broadest possible mandate — including the authority to propose fundamental constitutional revisions — subject to the ratification requirements of the CRA and the public referendum process. It is the institutional equivalent of a constitutional convention.

6.2 Binding Authority vs. Advisory Function

The DD&SA system maintains a clear and enforceable distinction between assemblies with binding authority and those with an advisory function. Binding authority means that the Civic Administration is legally required, under civic constitutional rules, to implement the assembly's determination. Advisory function means that the assembly's output takes the form of a formal civic recommendation, to which the relevant Standing Assembly or Civic Administration must respond in writing within a defined period, but which they are not automatically bound to implement.

The following table summarises the default authority level of each assembly type:

7. Legal and Constitutional Embedding

7.1 Constitutional Provisions

The DD&SA system is constitutionally embedded through the New British Isles Constitution (DD&SA-CONST-001), which establishes the Civic Commonwealth as the sovereign civic entity of the British Isles; the primacy of the DD&SA system as the governing mechanism of the Civic Commonwealth; the inviolability of the seven governing principles and the thirty Inviolable Rules; and the supremacy of the Constitutional Review Assembly in matters of constitutional interpretation and amendment.

The Constitution provides that no executive body, no legacy institution, and no external power may lawfully override a determination of the National Civic Assembly within its mandate. The Constitution further provides that any attempt to do so constitutes a civic constitutional breach of the first order, subject to immediate referral to the Constitutional Review Assembly and, if confirmed, to civic consequences for the individual actors responsible, without limit of institutional rank.

7.2 The Inviolable Rules

The thirty Inviolable Rules of the Civic Commonwealth are provisions of the foundational constitution that cannot be amended by any ordinary assembly process, including Emergency Constituent Assemblies, without a minimum public ratification threshold of sixty per cent of the eligible civic population voting in a formal Civic Plebiscite. The Inviolable Rules include: the right to civic participation regardless of background; the prohibition of systematic discrimination; the right to a Consequence Hearing before any civic consequence is imposed; the right to access civic records; and the prohibition of any individual or institution assuming permanent executive authority without assembly mandate.

7.3 The Transitional Legal Pathway

The transition from the current UK legal system to the DD&SA civic rules framework requires a carefully managed legal transitional pathway, set out in full in Chapter XI of the DD&SA Master Document (DDSA_MASTER_COMPLETE). In summary: existing UK statute law continues to operate as the provisional Civic Rules of the Commonwealth during the transition period, subject to review and replacement by the NCA on a prioritised schedule. Legislation inconsistent with the Inviolable Rules or the seven governing principles is reviewed first. Legacy common law is retained as background civic principle until superseded by NCA determinations. The Constitutional Review Assembly has jurisdiction from day one of DD&SA implementation to rule on conflicts between legacy law and the new constitutional framework.

PART III Sortition and Civic Composition

8. The Theory and Practice of Sortition

8.1 Why Sortition, Not Election

Sortition — selection of civic decision-makers by random lot — is not a novel idea. It was the primary selection mechanism of Athenian democracy, where the kleroterion (the allotment machine) selected citizens for the boule, the law courts, and the administrative magistracies. It was adopted as the basis for jury selection in English common law and has persisted there, in recognition of the principle that impartial collective judgement is best approximated by a representative cross-section of the population, not by individuals competing for authority.

The case for sortition over election as the primary selection mechanism for civic assemblies rests on five arguments, each of which is supported by theoretical literature and empirical evidence.

First, descriptive representation: a randomly selected assembly, properly stratified, will reflect the demographic composition of the population far more accurately than any electoral system, because it does not select for the traits that make individuals willing and able to stand for election — wealth, ambition, rhetorical skill, network access, and tolerance for adversarial public life. These traits are not randomly distributed across the population. They are concentrated in specific demographic, class, and personality profiles. Elections therefore systematically select a narrow, unrepresentative subset.

Second, removal of electoral incentive: elected representatives make decisions under the shadow of their next election. This creates systematic distortions — short-termism, populism, avoidance of difficult truths, susceptibility to donor and factional influence. Sortition removes the electoral incentive entirely. Resident assembly members have no election to win, no party to satisfy, no donor to placate. They can reason freely.

Third, epistemic equality: sortition treats all residents as potentially capable of civic deliberation, given appropriate conditions. It does not privilege those with formal education, professional training, or prior civic experience. This is both intrinsically fair and practically beneficial: ordinary residents bring knowledge, experience, and perspectives that professional politicians systematically lack.

Fourth, legitimacy: residents asked to trust decisions made by randomly selected peers — people like them, with no special status or agenda — are more willing to accept those decisions as legitimate, even when the outcome does not match their own initial preference, than they are to accept decisions made by elected politicians whom they may distrust or dislike. This has been consistently demonstrated in deliberative democracy research by Fishkin, Gastil, and others.

Fifth, anti-capture: a randomly selected assembly cannot be captured by organised interests in the same way as an elected assembly, because the composition of the assembly cannot be predicted in advance, and because assembly members owe nothing to any organised group. Capture is not impossible — it requires manipulation of the deliberative process itself, rather than the selection process — but it is significantly harder to achieve and easier to detect.

8.2 Sampling Design and Stratification

8.2.1 The Sortition Pool

The sortition pool for any assembly is the full population of residents eligible and available for selection. The definition of eligibility is set out in Section 8.3 below. The pool is constructed from the Civic Participation Register — the DD&SA equivalent of the electoral register — which is a comprehensive, automatically maintained record of all residents eligible for civic service, updated continuously from birth and naturalisation records, and from which residents may apply for temporary deferral under defined circumstances.

The Civic Participation Register is maintained by the Civic Secretariat, with regional branches responsible for their geographic areas. It is an active, not passive, register: residents are automatically included upon reaching civic eligibility age (eighteen years), unless they apply for an exemption or deferral. The register is subject to annual audit by the Civic Audit Service and is a matter of public record, subject to individual privacy protections.

8.2.2 Stratification Dimensions

Stratification is the process of dividing the sortition pool into subgroups (strata) and selecting the required proportion of assembly members from each stratum, to ensure that the resulting assembly reflects the population profile. The mandatory stratification dimensions for all DD&SA assemblies are:

Additional stratification dimensions may be added by the Civic Secretariat with NCA approval, based on evidence of systematic underrepresentation. Removal of a dimension requires CRA review and approval.

8.2.3 Oversampling and Balancing

Because stratification requirements must be satisfied simultaneously across all dimensions — creating a multi-dimensional allocation problem — the Civic Secretariat uses a staged random allocation algorithm, the specifications of which are maintained by the Civic Digital Infrastructure Service and are publicly documented. In cases where the simultaneous satisfaction of all strata requirements is mathematically impossible within the desired assembly size, the Civic Secretariat has authority to increase the assembly size by up to 15% to achieve compliance. If compliance remains impossible, the Civic Secretariat must report the shortfall to the NCA and propose a resolution.

8.3 Eligibility, Exclusions, and Conflict of Interest

8.3.1 Civic Eligibility

All residents of the Civic Commonwealth aged eighteen or over are eligible for sortition selection, unless:

- They are currently serving in a different DD&SA assembly at any level (concurrent service prohibited, except where specifically permitted by the relevant assembly's mandate for specialist advisory purposes).
- They are employed in a civic role that would create a direct conflict of interest with the specific assembly mandate (e.g., a Civic Administration officer may not serve in an Oversight Assembly scrutinising their own department — but may serve in unrelated assemblies).
- They are subject to an active Consequence Process that has resulted in a determination of civic disqualification (temporary or permanent, as specified in the relevant Civic Rule).
- They have applied for and been granted a formal deferral on grounds of health, caring responsibility, or other defined hardship, for the period of that deferral.
- They have served in the specific assembly type within the last twelve years (for national assemblies) or six years (for regional and local assemblies), to ensure broad civic participation across the population.

8.3.2 Conflict of Interest Protocols

Conflict of interest is assessed at two stages: at initial selection, by the Civic Secretariat; and at the commencement of service, by the assembly itself through a mandatory declaration process. Residents selected for assembly service are required to complete a Civic Interest Declaration, disclosing all financial interests, organisational affiliations, professional relationships, and family connections relevant to the assembly's mandate. The Civic Secretariat reviews declarations against the assembly mandate and may — in cases of direct conflict — substitute an alternative selection from the relevant stratum.

A conflict of interest does not automatically disqualify a resident from service. It requires management. Direct conflicts — where a resident has a personal financial or institutional stake in a specific determination — require the resident to recuse themselves from deliberation and voting on that specific matter. Indirect conflicts — general professional background, general organisational affiliation — require disclosure and monitoring, but do not require recusal unless the assembly collectively determines that a specific conflict warrants it. The assembly's conflict of interest determinations are recorded in the Civic Record.

8.4 Tenure, Rotation, and Continuity

8.4.1 Cycle Design

The length of civic service cycles has been designed to balance three requirements: sufficient time for residents to develop the knowledge, relationships, and deliberative skill necessary for high-quality participation (arguing for longer cycles); sufficient rotation to ensure that the assembly remains genuinely representative of the changing population (arguing for shorter cycles); and sufficient continuity to prevent the loss of institutional memory that occurs when entire assemblies are replaced simultaneously (arguing for staggered rotation rather than complete replacement).

The solution adopted across the DD&SA system is the staggered cycle: assembly membership is renewed in tranches (typically one-third per renewal period), so that at any given time the assembly contains experienced members alongside newly selected ones. This design is evidenced in the successful operation of the Belgian G1000 and the Irish Citizens' Assembly, both of which found that institutional continuity within partially rotating bodies produced higher-quality deliberation than either rapid complete replacement or fixed long-term membership.

8.4.2 Continuity Mechanisms

Beyond the staggered cycle, continuity is maintained through: the Civic Record, which provides a complete account of all prior deliberation and determination for any assembly, accessible to incoming members; mandatory induction for new members, incorporating review of prior work; a buddy system pairing new members with experienced peers for the first eight weeks of service; and the Civic Secretariat staff, whose continuity is independent of assembly renewal and who provide institutional memory and procedural guidance across cycles.

8.5 Remuneration, Care, and Accessibility

8.5.1 The Principle of Civic Equivalence

A fundamental design requirement of the DD&SA system is that civic service must not be economically prohibitive. If sortition selects a broad cross-section of the population but service is affordable only to those who can absorb the cost in time and income, the system fails its inclusion principle. Civic equivalence means that no resident should be financially disadvantaged by serving in a civic assembly.

8.5.2 Remuneration Structure

Residents selected for assembly service receive:

- A Civic Service Payment equivalent to the national median wage, paid pro-rata for the duration of their service cycle. Residents who earn above the median in their regular employment receive their actual regular wage up to twice the median, with the Civic Commonwealth making up the difference.
- Full reimbursement of all reasonable travel, accommodation, and subsistence costs associated with assembly attendance.
- Continuation of all employment-linked benefits (pension contributions, health insurance where applicable) throughout the service period, with employer obligations during civic service enforced through the Civic Employment Framework.
- Protection from employment disadvantage: employers are legally prohibited from discriminating against, dismissing, or disadvantaging employees who have been selected for civic service. Breaches constitute a civic employment consequence of the first order.

8.5.3 Caring and Accessibility Provisions

Residents with caring responsibilities — for children, elderly relatives, or dependants with disabilities — are entitled to funded caring support during assembly attendance. The Civic Secretariat maintains a Civic Caring Support Fund, from which verified caring costs are reimbursed directly. Residents with disabilities are entitled to full accessibility accommodation, including: physical accessibility of all assembly venues; provision of assistive technology; interpreters and communication support; and flexible attendance options (hybrid participation is available for all assemblies where in-person attendance would create genuine hardship). The Civic Secretariat has a legal duty to make reasonable adjustments; the duty is not discretionary.

8.5.4 Mental Health and Wellbeing Support

Civic assembly service is demanding. Residents are asked to engage with complex, sometimes distressing topics — health emergencies, justice failures, environmental crises — under the scrutiny of the public record. The DD&SA system provides dedicated wellbeing support to all assembly members, including: access to a Civic Wellbeing Counsellor throughout the service cycle; a structured mid-cycle wellbeing check-in for all members; peer support networks connecting current and former assembly members; and a post-service debrief and transition support session for all departing members.

9. The Invitation and Recruitment Process

9.1 The Two-Stage Sortition Model

The DD&SA system uses a two-stage sortition model, adapted from the practice developed in Irish citizens' assemblies and refined through the French Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat. In the first stage, a large random sample of residents from the Civic Participation Register is issued with a Civic Service Invitation. In the second stage, from those who respond positively to the invitation, a stratified random sub-sample is selected as the final assembly.

The two-stage model serves two purposes: it accommodates the reality that not all residents will be willing or able to serve at the time of invitation, without compromising the random character of selection; and it allows for active outreach to underrepresented groups between stages one and two, improving the stratification outcome without abandoning the random principle.

9.2 Active Recruitment for Underrepresented Groups

The DD&SA system acknowledges that some populations — those with low civic trust, those with limited English literacy, those in precarious employment, those from communities historically targeted by state power — are less likely to respond positively to a Civic Service Invitation, even when logistical barriers are addressed. Active recruitment addresses this through: targeted outreach in community languages; partnership with trusted community organisations; peer ambassador programmes employing former assembly members from underrepresented backgrounds; and a dedicated inclusion fund supporting community-led engagement activity.

Active recruitment does not involve selection pressure or inducement. Residents cannot be compelled to serve. But the Civic Secretariat has a positive duty to ensure that the barriers to participation — information, trust, language, logistics, economics — are systematically addressed, and that its recruitment efforts are evaluated against inclusion outcomes.

PART IV Deliberative Process Design

10. Process Phases and the Deliberative Cycle

10.1 The Seven Phases of Civic Deliberation

Every DD&SA assembly — regardless of type, level, or mandate — operates through a structured deliberative cycle comprising seven phases. The length and intensity of each phase varies with the complexity of the mandate and the assembly type, but the seven-phase structure is constant. This consistency serves a critical function: it ensures that all assembly outputs are produced through a comparable process of epistemic rigour, enabling meaningful evaluation, comparison, and learning across the system.

Phase 1: Mandate Setting and Scoping

The assembly receives its formal mandate from the body that convened it (the Civic Secretariat, the Standing Assembly above it, or the CRA). The mandate specifies the deliberative question, the decision-making authority granted to the assembly, the civic cycle length, and any non-negotiable constraints. In the first phase, the assembly works with its facilitation team to develop a detailed deliberative scope: the specific sub-questions, issues, and considerations it will address; the evidence it will seek; and the format of its eventual determination.

Scope development is itself a deliberative act: the assembly members, not the Civic Secretariat, determine the scope, within the constraints of the mandate. This ensures that the assembly's deliberation is responsive to residents' concerns rather than pre-structured by administrative convenience. The facilitation team advises on scope but does not determine it.

Phase 2: Learning and Evidence

In phase two, the assembly receives structured information about the topic of its mandate. Information is provided in three forms: lay summaries, commissioned for accessibility and written to a standard that any adult resident can understand, regardless of prior knowledge of the topic; expert evidence, provided by specialists selected by the Civic Evidence Panel (see Section 11.2); and resident testimonies, drawn from individuals with lived experience of the issues under deliberation, selected to represent a diversity of perspectives and circumstances.

The learning phase is typically the longest phase of the deliberative cycle, constituting between thirty and fifty per cent of the total deliberative time. Evidence is provided in structured sessions, with assembly members given adequate time to read, digest, and formulate questions before each session. The Civic Epistemic Auditor reviews the evidence programme before delivery to ensure balance and completeness.

Phase 3: Small-Group Deliberation

In phase three, the assembly moves from receiving information to actively deliberating among themselves. Small-group deliberation — in groups of eight to twelve members — is the core deliberative format. Small groups allow every member to speak and to be heard; they encourage genuine exchange rather than speech-making; and they have been consistently shown in research to produce higher-quality deliberation than large-group formats.

Each small group works on a defined set of sub-questions, with a trained facilitator supporting the group process without directing the content. Small groups report their deliberative outputs — key insights, areas of agreement, areas of disagreement, unresolved questions — to the full plenary. The plenary does not vote on these outputs at this stage; it uses them to identify the substantive landscape of the deliberative territory.

Phase 4: Expert Challenge and Counter-Argument

Phase four is the mandatory challenge phase. The DD&SA system, drawing on the Mandated Challenger System developed in the DD&SA Epistemic Governance provisions (Addendum B of the Master Document), requires that every significant claim of fact or value presented to the assembly is subjected to structured counter-argument from qualified opposing perspectives. Challenge experts are not adversaries of the assembly — they are not trying to manipulate members toward a particular conclusion. They are providing the assembly with the strongest alternative case, so that members can reason from a position of genuine epistemic completeness.

Challenge sessions are structured and facilitated. Assembly members may question challenge experts directly. The challenge phase output — a written summary of the strongest challenges to each major evidence strand — is incorporated into the deliberative record and must be explicitly addressed in the assembly's determination.

Phase 5: Synthesis and Drafting

In phase five, the assembly moves from deliberating about the issue to drafting its determination. A drafting panel, composed of volunteer assembly members supported by the facilitation team and civic legal staff, produces a draft determination for full assembly review. The draft must: address all sub-questions set in the scoping phase; reflect the deliberative record from phases two through four; identify areas of consensus and, where significant disagreement persists, note it explicitly; and be written in language accessible to the public as well as technically precise for the Civic Administration.

Phase 6: Assembly Review and Revision

The full assembly reviews the draft determination in plenary and in small groups. Members may propose amendments, additions, or deletions. Amendments are discussed, voted upon if contested, and incorporated or rejected according to the decision rules specified in the assembly's mandate. The final determination must be approved by a vote of the full assembly, subject to the decision thresholds specified in Section 10.2.

Phase 7: Publication and Handover

The approved determination is published in the Civic Record within five working days of approval. Publication includes: the full text of the determination; the full deliberative record (evidence received, small-group outputs, challenge summaries, drafting notes); the individual voting record (aggregated by stratum to protect individual privacy, except where members have consented to named publication); and the dissent register (see Section 10.3). The determination is formally transmitted to the relevant Standing Assembly or Civic Administration, which has a defined period to respond (binding determinations require no response — they require implementation; advisory determinations require a written response within thirty days).

10.2 Decision Rules

10.2.1 Voting Methods

The DD&SA system uses different voting methods for different types of decision within the assembly process, recognising that no single method is optimal for all purposes.

10.2.2 Quorum

A valid civic determination requires a quorum of seventy-five per cent of the full assembly membership. In cases where the quorum is not met due to member absence, the session is adjourned and rescheduled. Persistent quorum failure — three consecutive sessions below quorum — triggers a mandatory review by the Civic Secretariat, which may include supplementary selection of replacement members from the sortition pool.

10.2.3 Minority Reports and Dissent

The DD&SA system has an unequivocal commitment to the recognition and publication of minority perspectives. Any group of assembly members constituting ten per cent or more of the full assembly may submit a formal dissent statement — a Minority Civic Report — appended to the assembly's main determination and given equal prominence in the Civic Record. Minority Civic Reports must be written in the same accessible style as the main determination and must explain, in substantive terms, the basis for the dissent. They must not be merely a record of disagreement; they must be a contribution to the public deliberative record.

The value of Minority Civic Reports goes beyond their immediate civic function. Over time, they constitute a rich archive of civic minority perspectives that can be drawn upon in subsequent deliberations, Review Assemblies, and academic research. The Civic Evaluation and Learning Service analyses patterns in minority reports as part of its ongoing evaluation of the DD&SA system.

11. Information Architecture and Epistemic Infrastructure

11.1 The Civic Evidence Principles

The quality of deliberation depends directly on the quality of the information environment in which it takes place. The DD&SA system, drawing on the Epistemic Governance provisions of Addendum B of the Master Document, has developed a comprehensive information architecture designed to ensure that residents deliberate in conditions of genuine epistemic quality: not merely information abundance, but information that is balanced, accessible, contextualised, challenged, and verified.

The Civic Evidence Principles are:

- **Completeness:** the evidence presented to an assembly must cover all major relevant perspectives on the deliberative question, not merely those favoured by any particular interest.
- **Proportionality:** the weight given to each perspective in the evidence programme must be broadly proportional to the weight of evidence and expert opinion behind it, not to the lobbying power or media presence of its advocates.
- **Accessibility:** all evidence must be presented in forms accessible to all assembly members, including lay summaries, visual aids, and translated materials where required.
- **Verifiability:** all factual claims in the evidence programme must be sourced and verifiable. Anonymous or unverifiable claims are not admissible.
- **Contestability:** all significant evidence claims are subject to the Mandated Challenger process before being presented to the assembly as definitive.
- **Independence:** the curation and presentation of evidence is the responsibility of the Civic Evidence Panel, which is structurally independent of the Civic Administration and of any organised interest.

11.2 The Civic Evidence Panel

The Civic Evidence Panel (CEP) is a standing body of civic evidence professionals — researchers, librarians, science communicators, and evidence quality specialists — appointed by the Civic Secretariat through a competitive merit process for fixed terms of three years. The CEP is responsible for: designing the evidence programme for each assembly; commissioning lay summaries; selecting and briefing expert witnesses; managing the Mandated Challenger process; and producing the Evidence Quality Report that accompanies each assembly's determination in the Civic Record.

CEP members are subject to the same conflict of interest provisions as assembly members, with additional disclosure requirements specific to their professional backgrounds. The CEP operates under a public Interest Register that is updated quarterly. The CEP's work is subject to review by the Civic Epistemic Auditor — an independent officer appointed by the Constitutional Review Assembly — who has authority to direct the CEP to supplement or revise an evidence programme if it is found to be incomplete, unbalanced, or otherwise failing the Civic Evidence Principles.

11.3 Expert Input: Selection and Safeguards

Expert witnesses invited to give evidence to DD&SA assemblies are selected by the CEP through a transparent process designed to ensure breadth of expertise and independence of perspective. Selection criteria include: relevant professional expertise; demonstrated track record of evidence-based public communication; absence of undisclosed conflicts of interest; and, where the topic warrants it, geographic and demographic diversity of expert perspectives.

Expert witnesses are not advocates. They are required, before giving evidence, to sign a Civic Evidence Declaration committing them to: accuracy and good faith; explicit acknowledgement of uncertainty and areas of legitimate scientific or professional disagreement; disclosure of any funding relationships, institutional affiliations, or personal interests relevant to their testimony; and willingness to respond to questions from assembly members and, where applicable, challenge experts.

Organised interest groups — industries, lobby groups, advocacy organisations, political parties — may not present directly to assemblies in the guise of expert witnesses. They may submit written evidence, which the CEP reviews for factual accuracy and includes in the deliberative record alongside its assessment. Their representatives may be invited to give stakeholder testimony in specifically designated sessions, clearly distinguished from expert evidence sessions.

11.4 The Mandated Challenger System

The Mandated Challenger System (MCS) is one of the most distinctive and important features of the DD&SA epistemic infrastructure. It was developed in response to the well-documented failure of conventional consultation processes — in which evidence is presented to decision-makers but rarely subjected to rigorous challenge — and is designed to ensure that the assembly is not captured by a single, unchallenged epistemic framing.

Under the MCS, every major evidence claim presented to the assembly — factual, causal, or evaluative — is required to have a designated challenger: a qualified expert who has reviewed the claim and been given structured opportunity to challenge it, before the claim is presented to the assembly. The challenger's critique is presented alongside the original claim, and the assembly is explicitly invited to reason about the tension between them.

The MCS is not intended to create artificial controversy where genuine expert consensus exists. Where a challenger review concludes that the original claim is robust and well-founded, the

challenger says so, and the assembly is informed that the claim has withstood challenge. This is itself informative. The MCS is intended to prevent the presentation to assemblies of contested claims as if they were settled facts — a systematic failure of conventional policy processes.

11.5 Deliberation Formats and Facilitation

11.5.1 Format Options

DD&SA assemblies use a range of deliberative formats, matched to the nature and phase of the deliberation. The primary formats are:

11.5.2 Facilitation Principles

Facilitation in the DD&SA system is a skilled professional function, not a clerical one. Civic Facilitators are trained to a defined professional standard — the Civic Facilitation Qualification, administered by the Civic Secretariat in partnership with academic institutions — and are deployed by the Civic Secretariat to all assemblies at all levels. Civic Facilitators are structurally independent of the Civic Administration and of any interest group. They serve the assembly, not any executive body; the process, not the outcome.

The core facilitation principles are:

- **Process ownership:** the facilitator manages the process; the assembly owns the content. Facilitators do not direct, steer, or express preferences on matters under deliberation.
- **Inclusion:** the facilitator actively works to ensure that all voices are heard, including those of quieter members, those with less prior knowledge, and those from underrepresented groups.
- **Time management:** the facilitator maintains the deliberative schedule without sacrificing depth. When the schedule is at risk, the facilitator flags the tension to the assembly and supports a collective decision on priorities.
- **Conflict management:** the facilitator manages interpersonal tension and disagreement constructively, using techniques from restorative practice, mediation, and group psychology.
- **Documentation:** the facilitator ensures that all deliberative outputs are accurately recorded and incorporated into the Civic Record.

11.5.3 In-Person, Hybrid, and Fully Online Assemblies

The default format for DD&SA assemblies is in-person attendance at a dedicated civic assembly facility. In-person deliberation produces better outcomes than fully online formats across most metrics of deliberative quality, including depth of engagement, social trust between members, and complexity of reasoning. However, in-person attendance is not always possible — for reasons of geography, disability, caring responsibility, or public health emergency — and the DD&SA system has developed robust hybrid and fully online protocols.

For hybrid assemblies, a minimum of sixty per cent of members must be physically present at each session for the session to qualify as a full deliberative session. Online participants access a dedicated civic assembly platform — the Civic Deliberation Platform, described in Section 14.3 — with equal access to all session materials, real-time captioning, and facilitated online breakout rooms. Hybrid sessions are facilitated by two facilitators: one managing the in-person group, one managing the online participants, with structured integration at key moments.

Fully online assemblies are permitted only where in-person attendance is not feasible for the majority of members — for example, in a declared public health emergency — or for Experimental Assemblies

testing online-first formats. Fully online assemblies operate under enhanced quality assurance protocols, including mandatory video participation during small-group sessions, enhanced facilitation ratios, and more frequent breaks to manage cognitive load.

12. Agenda-Setting and Civic Initiation

12.1 How Assemblies Are Initiated

DD&SA assemblies at all levels can be initiated through three pathways: institutional initiation, civic petition, and emergency declaration.

12.1.1 Institutional Initiation

Standing Assemblies may initiate new Thematic Assemblies or Review Assemblies within their competence domain by a simple majority determination. The NCA may initiate any assembly within the national competence. RSAs may initiate regional assemblies. LSAs may initiate local assemblies. Institutional initiation requires a written mandate specifying the deliberative question, the civic cycle length, and the authority level of the proposed assembly.

12.1.2 Civic Petition

Residents may initiate assemblies through the Civic Petition mechanism. A Civic Petition requires a minimum number of verified resident signatures — set at five per cent of the relevant population for local assemblies; two per cent for regional assemblies; one per cent of the national adult population for national assemblies (approximately 530,000 signatures). Verified signatures means signatures verified against the Civic Participation Register, collected through the official Civic Petition platform managed by the Civic Secretariat. Petition platforms operated by third parties are not valid for this purpose.

On receipt of a valid Civic Petition, the Civic Secretariat has twenty working days to confirm the petition's validity and transmit it to the relevant Standing Assembly with a recommendation on assembly type and mandate. The Standing Assembly must respond within sixty days — either initiating the requested assembly or explaining, in writing and on the Civic Record, why the petition does not warrant an assembly and what alternative civic mechanism is available.

12.1.3 Emergency Declaration

Crisis Assemblies may be initiated by a concurrent determination of the relevant Standing Assembly and the Civic Administration's Emergency Coordination function, under the conditions specified in the Civic Emergency Powers Framework. Emergency initiation is subject to the enhanced oversight requirements described in Section 6.1.3 above.

PART V Interface with Wider Society

13. Public Input, Feedback, and Participation

13.1 The Architecture of Public Engagement

DD&SA is not a system in which civic decisions are made by randomly selected residents in isolation from the rest of the population. It is a system in which a representative cross-section of residents deliberates on behalf of all, informed by, and accountable to, the broader public. This relationship — between the assembly and the wider resident body — requires careful architectural design. Without meaningful channels for public input, the assembly risks becoming another form of insular civic elite. With poorly designed public input, the assembly risks becoming a target for capture by organised interests or a conduit for lowest-common-denominator populism.

The DD&SA system addresses this through a layered public engagement architecture, comprising four tiers:

Tier 1: Structured Submission

All residents may submit written representations to any open assembly during Phase 2 of the deliberative cycle. Submissions are received through the Civic Submission Portal, a publicly accessible online platform managed by the Civic Secretariat. Submissions are reviewed by the Civic Evidence Panel for factual accuracy, thematic relevance, and representativeness. Submissions that contain new factual information, novel perspectives, or significant resident experience relevant to the deliberative question are incorporated into the evidence programme or, where appropriate, used to identify resident witnesses for testimony.

Tier 2: Resident Witness Testimony

The CEP selects a diverse range of resident witnesses — individuals with lived experience of the issues under deliberation — to give evidence directly to the assembly. Residents may apply to give testimony through the Civic Submission Portal, or may be identified by the CEP through active outreach in relevant communities. Selection prioritises diversity of experience and perspective over representativeness of organised interests.

Tier 3: Public Consultation on Determinations

Before a final determination is published, a thirty-day public comment period is opened on the draft determination. All residents may comment through the Civic Submission Portal. Comments are reviewed by the Civic Evidence Panel and a thematic summary — not individual comments, which are treated as confidential unless the submitter consents to publication — is provided to the assembly for consideration during Phase 6. The assembly is not bound to change its determination in response to public comment, but it must acknowledge in its determination whether public comment raised significant new considerations.

Tier 4: Ongoing Civic Dialogue

Beyond specific assembly processes, the DD&SA system maintains permanent channels for civic dialogue between residents and their civic institutions: the Civic Dialogue Platform, an online space for structured public conversation about civic questions; the Civic Assembly Open Day, an annual public event at which assembly members from all levels are available to meet and discuss their work with residents; and the Civic Questions mechanism, through which residents may formally pose questions to the Civic Administration, which is required to respond within twenty working days.

13.2 Transparency and the Civic Record

13.2.1 The Scope of Civic Transparency

Transparency in the DD&SA system extends to every aspect of civic decision-making: the composition of assemblies, the selection process, the evidence programme, all deliberative proceedings, the voting record (aggregated by stratum to protect individual privacy), the final determination, and the implementation record. There are no closed proceedings, no confidential determinations, and no unpublished evidence, except as specified below.

13.2.2 Privacy Exceptions

Two categories of information may be withheld from the public Civic Record:

- Individual participant identity: the identities of individual assembly members may be protected from public disclosure where a member requests anonymity on grounds of personal safety. This protection does not extend to the member's deliberative contribution, which is recorded in the Civic Record under a pseudonymous identifier.
- Time-limited security sensitivity: information that, if immediately published, would create an identifiable and serious risk to civic security (for example, details of an ongoing cyber-security vulnerability in civic infrastructure), may be withheld for a period of up to ninety days, subject to written justification reviewed by the Civic Epistemic Auditor. After ninety days, all such information must be published unless an extension is granted by the Constitutional Review Assembly.

13.2.3 Open Data and the Civic Archive

All Civic Record data — assembly determinations, evidence bases, deliberation summaries, voting aggregates, implementation reports — is published in open, machine-readable formats on the Civic Archive, a publicly accessible digital repository managed by the Civic Secretariat. The Civic Archive is permanent, searchable, and free to access. It is subject to preservation obligations comparable to those of a national library. The Civic Archive may not be closed, edited, or redacted without the written authorisation of the Constitutional Review Assembly.

13.3 Interaction with Media and the Public Information Environment

13.3.1 The Civic Information Service

The DD&SA system recognises that public understanding of civic decisions is a prerequisite for civic legitimacy. Decisions that residents cannot understand cannot be trusted or evaluated. The Civic Information Service (CIS) is a dedicated public communication function within the Civic Secretariat, responsible for communicating assembly work to the public in accessible, accurate, and non-partisan terms.

The CIS produces: plain-language summaries of all assembly determinations, published simultaneously with the full Civic Record entry; short-form digital content (video, graphic, social media) for each major determination; public explainers on how the DD&SA system works and how residents can engage with it; and a public-facing Civic Dashboard, providing real-time information on active assemblies, recent determinations, and implementation progress.

13.3.2 Media Relations

The Civic Secretariat maintains a professional media relations function that facilitates journalistic access to civic assembly proceedings — subject to established ground rules protecting participant dignity and deliberative integrity — provides background briefings and fact-checking support to journalists, and publishes a Media Handbook explaining the DD&SA process for those reporting on it. Media access to assembly proceedings is open: there are no closed press arrangements, no privileged access for favoured outlets, and no public relations management of assembly outputs.

13.3.3 The Civic Information Standards Authority

The Civic Commonwealth operates a Civic Information Standards Authority (CISA) — an independent body with authority to assess, publish findings on, and, where appropriate, initiate Consequence processes against, deliberate and material misinformation about civic proceedings and outcomes. CISA does not have authority over political opinion, editorial comment, or criticism of assembly determinations. It has authority only over factual claims about civic processes and determinations that are demonstrably false and have been published without reasonable basis.

CISA is not a censorship body. It cannot compel retraction or removal of content, except in cases where a Consequence Hearing confirms a deliberate and material civic misinformation breach. It publishes corrections and findings in its own public register and provides factual corrections to any outlet that has published identifiable misinformation about the civic system.

13.4 Interaction with Legacy Political Parties and Organised Interests

13.4.1 The Status of Political Parties

Political parties as currently constituted — permanent organisations built around the competition for electoral office — have no formal role in the DD&SA system. There is no electoral office to compete for, and therefore no function for permanent campaign organisations. However, the DD&SA system does not prohibit civic association, including association around shared political values or policy positions. Residents may organise, advocate, and publicly argue for any position they choose. What they may not do is use such organisations to interfere with the sortition process, to capture deliberative assemblies, or to lobby assembly members in ways that breach the anti-capture provisions of Part VII.

13.4.2 Organised Interests

Trade unions, business associations, civil society organisations, professional bodies, and other organised interests have a legitimate civic role in the DD&SA system: as submitters to the Civic Submission Portal, as providers of resident witness testimony, as stakeholders whose perspectives inform the CEP's evidence programme design, and as commenters during the public consultation phase. They do not have a privileged access to assembly proceedings, and they are subject to the same anti-capture provisions as all other external actors.

PART VI Implementation and Civic Operations

14. The Civic Secretariat

14.1 Structure and Function

The Civic Secretariat is the institutional home of the DD&SA system. It is responsible for the operational delivery of all aspects of civic assembly work: selection and recruitment, logistics, facilitation, evidence management, digital infrastructure, legal support, public communication, and civic record maintenance. It is not a government department in the legacy sense — it is not subject to ministerial direction and does not hold any framework-setting authority. It is a civic service institution: professionally staffed, operationally independent, and accountable to the assemblies it serves and to the public through the Civic Oversight Assembly.

The Civic Secretariat is structured as follows:

14.2 Staffing and Roles

The Civic Secretariat employs a combination of permanent civic civil servants, fixed-term specialists, and contractors, in proportions appropriate to the nature of each function. All Civic Secretariat staff are appointed through merit-based competitive processes; all are subject to the Civic Employment Framework; all are prohibited from membership of political organisations while in post; and all are required to complete an annual Civic Interest Declaration.

Staff numbers will scale with the system: in the early transition period, the national Civic Secretariat is estimated to require approximately eight hundred full-time equivalent staff. Regional Civic Secretariats will require between twenty and sixty staff each, depending on regional population. Local Civic Secretariats will require between five and twenty staff per Local Civic Council area. Total estimated Secretariat employment at full implementation: approximately six thousand five hundred full-time equivalent posts across the Civic Commonwealth.

14.3 Digital Infrastructure

14.3.1 The Civic Deliberation Platform

The Civic Deliberation Platform (CDP) is the primary digital tool for online and hybrid civic assembly work. It supports: secure video conferencing with facilitation tools; breakout room management; document sharing and collaborative editing; real-time transcription and captioning in multiple languages; anonymous voting with auditable audit trails; asynchronous discussion with moderation tools; and integration with the Civic Archive for automatic recording.

The CDP is developed and maintained by the Civic Digital Infrastructure Service, using open-source foundations wherever possible. Its code is publicly auditable. Its security architecture is independently assessed annually by the Civic Cyber Security Service. Its accessibility meets or exceeds WCAG 2.1 AAA standards. It is hosted on Civic Commonwealth infrastructure — not commercial cloud services — to ensure data sovereignty and independence from corporate interest.

14.3.2 The Civic Participation Register

The Civic Participation Register (CPR) is the authoritative database of all residents eligible for civic service. It is automatically populated from birth, naturalisation, and residence records; updated continuously; and subject to resident review and correction through a dedicated portal. The CPR uses a privacy-by-design architecture: individual records are encrypted, accessible only to authorised Civic Secretariat functions for defined purposes, and subject to annual independent privacy audit. The CPR is the most sensitive data asset in the DD&SA system and is treated as critical national civic infrastructure.

14.3.3 The Civic Archive

The Civic Archive is the permanent public repository of all civic record data. It is designed to be permanently accessible, machine-readable, and interoperable with standard data formats. The Archive uses a distributed hosting architecture — maintained across multiple geographically separate civic data centres — to prevent single-point failure and to resist attempts to suppress or destroy civic records. The Archive is subject to a civic preservation obligation equivalent to that of the British Library for printed materials. Its destruction or systematic suppression constitutes a civic constitutional breach of the first order.

14.4 Standard Operating Procedures

The Civic Secretariat maintains a comprehensive library of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for all major operational functions. SOPs are living documents, reviewed and updated at least annually by the relevant Secretariat division, with material changes subject to NCA notification. The SOP library is publicly accessible on the Civic Archive. The principal SOPs relevant to assembly operations include:

14.5 Budgeting and Financial Accountability

The Civic Secretariat's budget is allocated by the NCA through the national fiscal process. The Secretariat cannot be defunded below a constitutionally guaranteed floor — set at zero-point-three per cent of Civic Commonwealth GDP — without a supermajority NCA determination and a mandatory review by the Constitutional Review Assembly. This floor exists to prevent the effective dismantling of the DD&SA system through budgetary means.

The Secretariat's annual budget is publicly available and broken down by division and major expenditure category. The Secretariat produces an Annual Financial Report audited by the Civic Audit Service. The Civic Finance and Accountability Service maintains a real-time public expenditure dashboard, showing all expenditures above five thousand pounds against approved budget lines. Any unexplained divergence from the budget triggers an automatic Civic Audit Service review.

15. The Transition to DD&SA: A Phased Implementation

15.1 Overview of the Transition Framework

The transition from the current representative democratic system of the United Kingdom to the DD&SA architecture of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles is one of the most complex institutional change processes ever contemplated in British political history. It requires not merely the creation of new institutions, but the managed dissolution of deeply entrenched legacy institutions, the retraining of professional workforces, the rewiring of public culture, and the maintenance of civic continuity throughout — ensuring that public services, civic security, and economic stability are not disrupted during the transition.

The DD&SA Implementation Manual (DD&SA-IMPL-001) provides the full transition plan. This section summarises the five phases of transition, the twelve quality gates that define progress between phases, and the constitutional provisions that protect the integrity of the transition process itself.

15.2 The Five Transition Phases

Phase 1: Establishment (Years 1–2)

In Phase 1, the foundational civic institutions of the DD&SA system are established. The Civic Secretariat is constituted as a statutory body. The Civic Participation Register is established. The first Civic Facilitators are trained. The Civic Digital Infrastructure Service is stood up. Pilot assemblies — at local and regional level — are constituted and run through their first civic cycles, with full evaluation. Legacy institutions continue to operate in full. Phase 1 is explicitly a learning phase: the outputs of pilot assemblies are not binding, but are used to refine the design, train the workforce, and build public understanding and trust.

Phase 2: Local and Regional Implementation (Years 2–5)

In Phase 2, Local Civic Councils and Regional Civic Councils are constituted across the Civic Commonwealth. Local Sortition Assemblies take over the defined local competences from legacy local authorities. Regional Sortition Assemblies take over the defined regional competences from legacy devolved and regional bodies. The Civic Secretariat reaches its full regional and local staffing complement. The legacy Westminster Parliament continues to hold national legislative authority during this phase but is subject to a standing review process by a nationally constituted Transition Oversight Assembly.

Phase 3: National Implementation (Years 4–7)

In Phase 3, the National Civic Assembly is constituted for the first time. It immediately assumes authority over defined areas of national competence, with the legacy Parliament retaining authority over remaining national matters on a scheduled handover plan agreed by the Transition Oversight Assembly. The Constitutional Review Assembly is constituted. The Civic Administration begins its transition from the legacy Civil Service structure to the DD&SA architecture. Phase 3 is the most politically sensitive phase: it involves the formal beginning of the end of Westminster authority. It is protected by a dedicated Constitutional Transition Guarantee, reviewed by the CRA at six-monthly intervals.

Phase 4: Full Civic Commonwealth (Years 6–10)

In Phase 4, full DD&SA authority is established across all levels and all competences. The legacy Parliament is formally dissolved, subject to the constitutional provisions of the Transition Completion Act. The Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles is formally proclaimed as the governing civic entity. All civic institutions — NCA, RSAs, LSAs, CRA, Civic Administration — operate at full capacity. The transition to the Civic Justice Architecture, the Civic Policing Framework, and all other domain-specific frameworks is completed.

Phase 5: Consolidation and Review (Years 8–15)

Phase 5 is the consolidation and review phase. All major components of the DD&SA system are subjected to a comprehensive five-year Review Assembly process. Design features that have not performed as intended are revised. Cultural embedding deepens as the first generation of residents who have grown up under the DD&SA system reaches adulthood. The international community adjusts to the Civic Commonwealth as a novel and increasingly admired model of democratic governance.

15.3 The Twelve Quality Gates

Progress from one transition phase to the next is conditional on the satisfaction of twelve quality gates — defined performance thresholds that must be independently verified by the Civic Evaluation and Learning Service and confirmed by the Constitutional Review Assembly before phase transition is authorised.

PART VII Safeguards, Integrity, and Risk Management

16. Anti-Capture Architecture

16.1 The Nature of Capture Risk

Capture — the subversion of a civic institution to serve the interests of a specific group at the expense of the public interest — is the primary structural threat to the DD&SA system. It is not a hypothetical risk. Every system of democratic governance in history has faced capture attempts by organised interests with the resources, motivation, and strategic sophistication to exploit institutional vulnerabilities. The DD&SA system is designed with the assumption that capture attempts will occur, and must therefore incorporate capture resistance into every layer of its architecture.

Capture in the DD&SA context can take several forms: sortition manipulation (attempts to bias the selection process toward favourable individuals); deliberative capture (attempts to control the information environment, evidence programme, or facilitation in ways that steer assemblies toward predetermined conclusions); administrative capture (the gradual domination of the Civic Secretariat or Civic Administration by a particular interest or ideological orientation); and constitutional capture (attempts to amend the foundational civic rules in ways that weaken the DD&SA system's independence).

16.2 Sortition Anti-Capture Provisions

The sortition process is protected against manipulation through:

- Open-source, publicly auditable sortition algorithm: the random selection process is transparent and reproducible. Any resident, researcher, or oversight body may verify the selection outcome against the documented algorithm and the Civic Participation Register.

- Independent administration: the Civic Selection and Recruitment Service operates independently of the Civic Administration, political parties, and any organised interest. Its staff are subject to enhanced conflict of interest provisions.
- Distributed oversight: the sortition process is observed by a randomly selected panel of three residents from outside the relevant geographic area, whose role is to verify compliance with the documented process. Their report is published in the Civic Record.
- Prohibition on targeted recruitment: no organisation, institution, or individual may conduct targeted campaigns to increase the probability of specific individuals or groups being selected for assembly service. The Civic Selection and Recruitment Service's active recruitment activities are tightly defined and subject to public reporting.

16.3 Deliberative Anti-Capture Provisions

The deliberative process is protected through the Civic Evidence Principles, the Mandated Challenger System, the independence of the Civic Facilitation Service, the conflict of interest declaration requirements, and the public transparency of all proceedings. Specific anti-capture provisions include:

- No off-record briefings: assembly members may not receive briefings, materials, or representations from external actors outside of the formal deliberative process. Attempts to provide such briefings constitute a civic capture attempt and are reported to the Civic Audit Service.
- Prohibition on inducements: offering any material benefit to an assembly member in connection with their civic service is a civic constitutional breach of the first order. This includes gifts, employment offers, financial payments, and threats of employment disadvantage.
- Facilitator independence: Civic Facilitators are prohibited from holding membership of any political organisation, from having financial relationships with any organised interest active on the topic under deliberation, and from sharing any content of assembly deliberations with external actors before publication.
- Evidence quality audit: all evidence programmes are reviewed by the Civic Epistemic Auditor before delivery, and the Auditor's assessment is published alongside the evidence programme.

16.4 Administrative and Constitutional Anti-Capture Provisions

The Civic Secretariat and Civic Administration are protected by:

- Appointment processes that are independent of political direction, using merit-based competitive selection for all senior roles.
- Mandatory civic interest declarations for all staff above a defined grade, updated annually.
- Prohibition on revolving door employment: senior Civic Secretariat and Civic Administration staff may not take employment with any organisation whose interests relate to their civic role for a period of three years after leaving civic service.
- Independent Civic Audit Service with powers to investigate any aspect of civic administration and to publish findings without requiring prior approval.
- Constitutional protection: the foundational civic rules governing the DD&SA system are protected by the supermajority and referendum requirements of the Constitutional Review Assembly, making constitutional capture extremely costly and highly visible.

16.5 The Civic Integrity Commission

The Civic Integrity Commission (CIC) is an independent civic body with authority to investigate alleged breaches of anti-capture provisions, ethics rules, and conflict of interest requirements across the DD&SA system. The CIC comprises seven members: three residents selected by stratified lot from the civic population; two civic legal scholars nominated by the Civic Scholars Council; and two members nominated by international sortition democracy organisations, subject to NCA confirmation. CIC members serve for four years, non-renewable.

The CIC has powers to: receive and investigate complaints from any resident or civic institution; summon witnesses and compel production of documents; publish investigation findings; and recommend Consequence processes to the Civic Administration where breaches are confirmed. The CIC cannot itself impose consequences — it investigates and recommends. Consequence Hearings are conducted by the Civic Justice System under the Civic Justice Architecture.

17. Ethics, Wellbeing, and Psychological Safety

17.1 The Civic Ethics Code

All residents serving in DD&SA assemblies, and all civic staff, are subject to the Civic Ethics Code — a set of binding behavioural standards governing conduct in and around civic assembly work. The Civic Ethics Code covers: honesty and good faith in deliberation; respectful engagement with all participants; compliance with conflict of interest requirements; confidentiality of individual participants where requested; compliance with anti-capture provisions; and honest and accurate communication with the public about civic work.

The Civic Ethics Code is not aspirational. It is enforceable. Breaches are reported to the Civic Integrity Commission, investigated under the CIC's powers, and, where confirmed, referred to the Civic Justice System for a proportionate Consequence Hearing.

17.2 Physical and Digital Safety

DD&SA assembly members are entitled to physical safety in the exercise of their civic duties. Threats, harassment, intimidation, or acts of violence against assembly members constitute a civic safety breach of the first order and are subject to the most serious Consequences available under the Civic Justice Architecture. The Civic Secretariat provides physical security arrangements for all assembly venues proportionate to the assessed risk. In cases where risk is elevated — for example, where an assembly is deliberating on a highly contentious question — enhanced security measures are deployed following risk assessment by the Civic Security Service.

Digital safety requirements include: protection of assembly members' personal data against disclosure to external actors; cybersecurity of the Civic Deliberation Platform against interference; and protection of assembly members from online harassment in their capacity as civic participants. The Civic Information Standards Authority has specific authority to investigate and act on harassment campaigns targeting assembly members.

17.3 Psychological Safety and Trauma-Informed Practice

Some civic assemblies will deal with topics that are inherently distressing — crises, injustices, harms experienced by members of the community. The DD&SA system applies trauma-informed practice principles across all assembly operations: facilitators are trained in trauma-awareness; evidence on distressing topics is presented with appropriate contextualisation and content warnings; assembly members have the right to step back from specific sessions that they find personally overwhelming, with no adverse record; and the Civic Wellbeing Service provides proactive support to all members dealing with difficult content.

18. Crisis Protocols and Emergency Operations

18.1 Emergency Powers and Their Limits

The DD&SA system operates under the principle that emergency powers are the most dangerous instrument in any civic arsenal. History consistently demonstrates that emergency powers, once established, tend to persist and expand beyond their original scope. The DD&SA emergency framework is designed with this in mind: emergency powers are narrow in scope, short in duration, automatically expiring, and subject to immediate and continuous oversight.

Emergency powers may be activated only by a concurrent determination of the relevant Standing Assembly (or, at national level, the NCA) and the Civic Administration's Emergency Coordination function, as specified in the Civic Emergency Powers Framework (DD&SA-STRUCT-CEF-001). The activation triggers automatic convening of the relevant Crisis Assembly within forty-eight hours and automatic initiation of Oversight Assembly review within thirty days.

18.2 Continuity of Civic Governance

The DD&SA system maintains active business continuity provisions to ensure that civic governance continues without interruption during emergencies. These provisions include: pre-designated alternative assembly facilities in each region, activated on forty-eight hours' notice; a documented succession protocol for Civic Secretariat leadership in the event of incapacity; offline backup systems for the Civic Archive and Civic Participation Register; and a standing Emergency Civic Communication Protocol for maintaining public information flow during infrastructure disruptions.

19. Appeals, Review, and Civic Audit

19.1 The Appeals Architecture

The DD&SA system maintains a layered appeals architecture, ensuring that no civic determination is entirely beyond challenge. The architecture operates as follows:

At the first level, any resident or civic institution may submit a formal Review Request to the assembly that issued a determination, alleging procedural error, factual inaccuracy, or breach of the Civic Ethics Code. The assembly must respond in writing within twenty working days. Review Requests do not suspend the implementation of a determination unless the assembly itself chooses to suspend.

At the second level, any resident or civic institution may refer a determination to the Constitutional Review Assembly, alleging that it breaches the foundational Civic Rules or the seven governing principles. The CRA reviews the submission and determines, within sixty working days, whether to accept the referral. Accepted referrals result in a formal CRA hearing. The CRA may uphold, modify,

or quash the determination. CRA determinations are final in law.

At the third level, in cases where a civic institution believes that a determination is so fundamentally flawed as to require urgent review, it may apply to the CRA for an emergency suspension of implementation while the referral is heard. Emergency suspension requires the agreement of a three-member CRA panel and is subject to a strict timescale for resolution.

19.2 The Civic Audit Service

The Civic Audit Service (CAS) is an independent body with comprehensive powers to audit all aspects of the DD&SA system: financial management, operational compliance, quality of outcomes, adherence to Civic Rules, and value for money. The CAS operates on a programme-based audit cycle — auditing different components of the system at defined intervals — and responds to referrals from residents, civic institutions, the Civic Integrity Commission, and the Oversight Assemblies. CAS audit reports are published in the Civic Archive within thirty working days of completion.

PART VIII Evaluation, Learning, and Adaptation

20. The Civic Quality Framework

20.1 Why Evaluation Is Constitutive, Not Optional

Most institutional evaluation systems are add-ons: retrospective, periodic, and disconnected from design decisions. The DD&SA system treats evaluation as constitutive: a structural feature of the architecture, not an afterthought. The reason is straightforward. DD&SA is a designed system operating in an empirical reality that will evolve over time. No design, however carefully developed, will be right in all its details from the outset. The system's capacity to learn and adapt is therefore as important as its initial design quality. A DD&SA system that is perfectly designed but cannot learn will degrade. A DD&SA system that is imperfectly designed but evaluates and adapts will improve.

20.2 Metrics and Indicators

The Civic Quality Framework defines indicators across seven domains, corresponding to the seven governing principles:

20.3 The Civic Evaluation and Learning Service

The Civic Evaluation and Learning Service (CELS) is responsible for the ongoing collection, analysis, and publication of data against the Civic Quality Framework. CELS is an independent division of the Civic Secretariat — it serves the public interest in knowing whether the DD&SA system is working, not the institutional interest of the Secretariat in appearing to work. CELS's reports are published without review or approval by any other civic institution. CELS's recommendations may be accepted or rejected by the NCA, but its findings may not be suppressed.

CELS publishes:

- A quarterly Civic Quality Dashboard: real-time indicators across all seven domains, publicly accessible.
- An annual Civic Quality Report: comprehensive analysis of system performance, with specific recommendations for design iteration.
- Five-year Review Assembly Reports: comprehensive evaluation of all major civic frameworks, used as the evidence base for five-year review processes.

- Thematic research papers on specific aspects of DD&SA performance, published through an open-access civic research platform.

20.4 Feedback Loops and Design Iteration

The DD&SA system has explicit feedback loops connecting evaluation findings to design changes. The principal mechanism is the Review Assembly process (Section 6.1.6), through which CELS evaluation data informs assembly deliberation on framework revision. But there are also administrative feedback loops: CELS recommendations of urgent design changes may be referred directly to the Civic Secretariat's SOP review process, without waiting for a Review Assembly, where the change is operational rather than structural.

The design of the DD&SA system itself — the institutional architecture set out in this document — is subject to a comprehensive ten-year review by an Emergency Constituent Assembly, using CELS's ten-year evaluation report as its evidence base. This review is the principal mechanism through which the foundational architecture can be substantially revised in light of experience.

20.5 Comparative Perspective

The DD&SA system does not operate in isolation. The Civic Evaluation and Learning Service maintains an active comparative programme, analysing the performance of related democratic innovations in other jurisdictions — citizens' assemblies in Ireland, Iceland, Belgium, France, and elsewhere; participatory budgeting programmes; deliberative mini-publics; and other sortition-based experiments — and incorporating relevant lessons into the DD&SA design iteration process. CELS maintains research partnerships with academic institutions in the British Isles and internationally, and contributes to the growing body of empirical literature on deliberative democracy.

PART IX Civic Culture, Education, and Long-Term Embedding

21. Civic Education and Public Literacy

21.1 The Civic Education Imperative

The DD&SA system depends on a public that understands it: how sortition works, why it is legitimate, what assemblies do, how residents can engage, and what the foundational civic rules are. Without civic literacy, public trust in the system will be fragile, susceptible to misinformation, and unable to distinguish genuine civic decisions from the misrepresentations of opponents. Civic education is not a soft add-on to the DD&SA architecture. It is a structural requirement.

The DD&SA Civic Education Framework (DD&SA-EDU-CEF-001) provides the full educational architecture. This section summarises the key civic literacy provisions relevant to the Foundational Blueprint.

21.2 Civic Literacy in Formal Education

The Civic Education Framework mandates that civic literacy — including explicit and detailed coverage of the DD&SA system, sortition, deliberative process, and civic rights and responsibilities — is embedded across the national curriculum from Key Stage 2 through to the end of formal secondary education. Civic literacy is not a standalone subject: it is integrated across citizenship, history, philosophy, media literacy, and social studies, with dedicated civic participation projects at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.

At post-secondary and tertiary level, the Civic Commonwealth Education Fund supports civic education initiatives across further and higher education institutions, including funded placements for students to observe active civic assemblies and to work with the Civic Secretariat.

21.3 Public Civic Literacy: The Civic Understanding Programme

Beyond formal education, the Civic Understanding Programme (CUP) provides civic literacy resources for adults: free online learning modules (available in multiple languages), accessible in-person workshops delivered by Civic Understanding Programme facilitators in community venues, and a national Civic Understanding Week — an annual public event held in May each year — featuring open assemblies, civic demonstrations, and public engagement activities across the Civic Commonwealth.

The CUP is funded by the Civic Secretariat from the civic public communication budget, with supplementary funding from the Civic Commonwealth Education Fund. It is delivered in partnership with libraries, community centres, faith institutions, schools, employers, and civil society organisations. Its reach is monitored by CELS, with specific targets for engagement with communities that have historically low civic participation.

21.4 Training for Civic Professionals

Every professional who works with, within, or adjacent to the DD&SA system requires specific training. The Civic Secretariat maintains a comprehensive professional training programme for: Civic Facilitators (the full Civic Facilitation Qualification); Civic Evidence Panel members (evidence programme design and the Mandated Challenger System); Civic Legal Service staff (constitutional law under the DD&SA framework); Civic Administration staff (implementing assembly determinations, accountability to assembly mandates); Magisters and Civic Advocates (the Civic Justice Architecture); and Civic Policing staff (the Civic Policing Framework). All training programmes are quality-assured by the Civic Evaluation and Learning Service.

22. Cultural Integration and Long-Term Resilience

22.1 The Challenge of Cultural Embedding

Institutional design cannot, by itself, produce civic culture. The habits, norms, expectations, and identities that make civic institutions work over the long term are cultural as much as structural. A randomly selected assembly whose members do not believe in the legitimacy of sortition, or whose facilitators do not genuinely respect the deliberative process, or whose outputs are ignored by a public that does not understand them, will fail — regardless of how well its procedural rules are designed. Cultural embedding is the long-term project of ensuring that the DD&SA system becomes not merely the formal mechanism of governance but the lived reality of civic identity in the British Isles.

22.2 Civic Rituals and Symbols

The DD&SA system does not prescribe a single civic culture. The Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles encompasses multiple nations, languages, traditions, and civic identities — English, Scottish, Welsh, Northern Irish, and the wider archipelago of islands and communities. Cultural integration must respect and honour this diversity rather than imposing a homogenised civic identity. At the same time, shared civic rituals and symbols — practices that embody and express the values of the DD&SA system across its diversity — are important for building civic solidarity and public understanding.

The DD&SA system proposes the following shared civic practices, subject to civic deliberation and revision through the NCA:

- The Civic Induction Ceremony: a formal, publicly accessible ceremony at the start of each assembly cycle, in which new assembly members publicly commit to the Civic Ethics Code and receive their Civic Service credentials. Ceremonies are held at local, regional, and national levels.
- The Civic Determination Day: a defined annual day on which all active assemblies publish their most recent determination simultaneously, with public events across the Civic Commonwealth celebrating civic decision-making.
- The Civic Memory Day: an annual day of remembrance for residents who have made exceptional contributions to civic life, combined with a public accounting of the year's civic decisions and their outcomes.
- The Civic Commonwealth Emblem: a jointly designed emblem of the Civic Commonwealth, developed through a Residents' Design Assembly open to all residents, representing the principles of non-domination, inclusion, and civic solidarity.

22.3 Preventing Drift, Hollowing-Out, and Capture Over Time

The greatest long-term risk to any civic institution is gradual hollowing-out: the slow erosion of its founding principles through administrative drift, cultural change, or incremental capture, without any single dramatic moment of failure. The DD&SA system addresses this risk through multiple structural provisions:

First, the constitutional floor: the foundational provisions of the DD&SA system are protected by the supermajority and referendum requirements of the Constitutional Review Assembly. No gradual erosion of foundational principles through ordinary administrative or legislative means is possible without triggering constitutional review.

Second, the ten-year review: the comprehensive architectural review conducted by an Emergency Constituent Assembly every decade provides a structured opportunity to identify and address institutional drift before it becomes irreversible.

Third, the CELS resilience monitoring: the Civic Evaluation and Learning Service's resilience indicators track signs of institutional drift — declining participation rates, increasing capture attempt frequency, falling public confidence — and trigger escalating review processes when threshold levels are crossed.

Fourth, the civic culture: an educated, engaged, and informed resident body is the ultimate protection against institutional drift. Residents who understand the DD&SA system, have served in its assemblies, have seen its outputs in action, and have internalised its values as their civic identity are the most powerful guarantors of its long-term resilience. This is why civic education and public literacy are not peripheral to the DD&SA architecture — they are constitutive of it.

The Civic Commonwealth belongs to its residents: not to its institutions, not to its professionals, and not to any generation alone. Its resilience is the resilience of a living civic culture — renewed by each generation that inherits it, tested by each challenge that confronts it, and sustained by the commitment of residents who believe that governing together is both their responsibility and their dignity.

ANNEXES Technical Detail, Model Instruments, and Reference Material

Annex A: Model Constitutional Clauses

A.1 Foundational Constitutional Provisions

The following model clauses are offered as the basis for the constitutional provisions of the New British Isles Constitution (DD&SA-CONST-001) relating to the DD&SA system. They are expressed in the civic vocabulary of the Civic Commonwealth and are consistent with the design provisions of this Blueprint.

Clause 1: Sovereignty and Civic Authority

1.1 The Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles is constituted by and for its residents. Civic authority derives exclusively from residents, acting through their civic institutions in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution.

1.2 No individual, institution, party, or external power may exercise civic authority over residents of the Civic Commonwealth except through the mechanisms established by this Constitution and the Civic Rules lawfully issued under it.

1.3 The exercise of civic authority through any mechanism other than those established by this Constitution constitutes a civic constitutional breach of the first order, subject to the provisions of the Constitutional Review Assembly.

Clause 2: The National Civic Assembly

2.1 The National Civic Assembly (NCA) is the supreme deliberative and legislative body of the Civic Commonwealth. It is constituted by stratified random selection of residents in accordance with the provisions of the Civic Sortition Framework established under this Constitution.

2.2 The NCA holds authority over all matters within the national competence as defined by this Constitution and the Civic Devolution Architecture. It may issue binding Civic Rules, allocate civic resources, and determine the direction of the Civic Administration, within its mandate.

2.3 No determination of the NCA that is within its competence may be overridden, quashed, or suspended by any body other than the Constitutional Review Assembly, and only on the grounds specified in this Constitution.

Clause 3: The Constitutional Review Assembly

3.1 The Constitutional Review Assembly (CRA) is the apex body of the Civic Commonwealth's constitutional order. It comprises residents and civic legal scholars in the proportions and with the qualifications specified by the Civic Sortition and Appointment Framework.

3.2 The CRA has exclusive authority to: interpret the provisions of this Constitution; review determinations of any civic assembly or institution alleged to breach this Constitution; and receive and assess proposals for constitutional amendment.

3.3 Constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds majority determination of a freshly constituted NCA panel, confirmed by the CRA, and ratified by a public Civic Plebiscite in which no less than forty per cent of the eligible civic population participates and no less than sixty per cent of those participating support the amendment.

Clause 4: The Inviolable Provisions

4.1 The provisions listed in Schedule 1 of this Constitution (the Thirty Inviolable Rules) are not subject to amendment by any civic process, including the constitutional amendment process of Clause 3, without the additional threshold of sixty per cent minimum participation in a Civic Plebiscite dedicated specifically to the proposed amendment of an Inviolable Provision.

4.2 Any determination, rule, or act inconsistent with an Inviolable Provision is void from the date of its issuance.

Annex B: The Thirty Inviolable Rules (Summary)

The following are the thirty Inviolable Rules of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles, as established by the New British Isles Constitution. Full text is contained in Schedule 1 of the Constitution (DD&SA-CONST-001).

Annex C: Process Templates and Checklists

C.1 Assembly Convening Checklist

The following checklist is the standard pre-assembly convening checklist used by the Civic Secretariat for all Standing and Thematic Assemblies. It must be completed and signed off by the relevant Civic Secretariat division head before the assembly is formally constituted.

C.2 Deliberation Session Agenda Template

The following is the standard template for a full-day deliberation session during Phases 2–3 of the deliberative cycle. It is adapted by the facilitation team for specific sessions, topics, and group dynamics.

Annex D: Data Schemas

D.1 Core Data Entities

The following data schema outlines the principal data entities within the DD&SA civic data architecture. Full technical specifications are maintained by the Civic Digital Infrastructure Service and are published on the Civic Archive.

Annex E: Case Studies and Illustrative Scenarios

E.1 Scenario: The National Energy Transition Assembly

In year four of the DD&SA implementation, the National Civic Assembly determines that the question of the Civic Commonwealth's energy transition pathway — the rate, form, and social implications of the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy — requires dedicated deliberation beyond the capacity of the NCA's regular working cycle. It initiates a Thematic Assembly on Energy Transition (TAET-001), with a mandate to produce a binding determination on the outline framework for the Civic Commonwealth's energy transition to 2040.

The Civic Secretariat constitutes the TAET-001 as a national Thematic Assembly of 75 members, selected by stratified lot, with a civic cycle of six months. The evidence programme, designed by the CEP, includes: expert evidence from energy engineers, climate scientists, economists, social welfare specialists, and grid infrastructure specialists; resident testimony from communities dependent on

fossil fuel industries, communities already experiencing the impacts of climate change, and communities hosting renewable energy infrastructure; international expert evidence from Ireland, Denmark, and Scotland on comparable transition processes; and Mandated Challenge sessions on each major evidence strand — including challenge to the economic case for rapid transition, challenge to the technical feasibility of the proposed timeline, and challenge to the distributional fairness assumptions of mainstream transition models.

The deliberative process reveals unexpected complexity in the distributional questions — the assembly's small-group discussions surface strong concerns about the impact of energy transition on rural communities with high transport dependency and on households in fuel poverty — concerns that the initial evidence programme had underweighted. The assembly requests additional evidence on distributional mitigation measures. The CEP responds within ten days with a supplementary evidence session.

The TAET-001's final determination includes a binding framework for energy transition to 2040, with specific provisions for a Civic Energy Transition Fund for communities most affected, and a mandatory mid-term review assembly in 2032. The determination also includes a substantial Minority Civic Report from fourteen assembly members who believe the transition timeline is insufficiently ambitious in light of the climate evidence, which is published with full prominence in the Civic Record. The NCA receives the determination and is required by the TAET-001's mandate to implement it within six months.

E.2 Scenario: Civic Integrity Commission Investigation

A Civic Information Service journalist alerts the Civic Integrity Commission to allegations that a consultancy firm has been conducting targeted briefings with assembly members from a Regional Sortition Assembly during a deliberation on regional housing planning, offering financial research support to those members in exchange for information about the deliberative direction. The CIC receives the referral, assigns it to a three-member investigation panel, and opens a formal investigation within five working days.

The CIC's investigation, conducted over six weeks, confirms that three members of the RSA received off-record briefings from the consultancy, in breach of the anti-capture provisions, and that two of them accepted research materials without disclosure. The CIC publishes its findings report in the Civic Archive. It recommends: that the three assembly members be formally cautioned, with a record in their civic service history; that the deliberation on the housing question be reviewed by the Civic Epistemic Auditor to assess whether the off-record briefings materially affected the evidence environment; and that the consultancy firm and its responsible partners be referred to the Civic Justice System for a Consequence Hearing on a charge of civic capture attempt.

The Civic Epistemic Auditor's review concludes that the briefings did not materially compromise the evidence environment — the housing deliberation is allowed to continue. The Consequence Hearing results in a determination that the consultancy firm is banned from civic advisory work for five years, and that the responsible partners receive a significant civic financial consequence and a public record of the breach.

Annex F: Glossary and Index

F.1 Glossary of DD&SA Terms

The following glossary provides definitions for all specialist terms used in this document. Full definitions are provided in Section 4 (Core Definitions and Terminology). This glossary provides an abbreviated reference.

Annex G: Comparative Framework — DD&SA and Analogous Systems

G.1 Citizens' Assemblies in Practice

The DD&SA system draws on a rich body of practical experience from citizens' assemblies and related democratic innovations around the world. The following summary identifies the key analogues and the lessons they have contributed to the DD&SA design.

Annex H: Threat and Vulnerability Register (Summary)

The full Threat and Vulnerability Register (DD&SA-RISK-TVR-001, 35 threats across 8 domains) is maintained as a standalone DD&SA document. The following summary identifies the principal threat categories and their mitigation status within this Blueprint.

CLOSING STATEMENT

This Foundational Blueprint is not the end of the DD&SA design process. It is the foundation on which that process rests. Every domain framework, every operational procedure, every civic instrument that is produced as part of the DD&SA corpus adds specificity, depth, and practical reality to the architecture set out here. Those instruments derive their authority, their vocabulary, and their structural logic from this document.

The Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles is not yet built. The institutions described in this Blueprint do not yet exist in the form here specified. The residents who will serve in the National Civic Assembly, the Regional Sortition Assemblies, and the Local Civic Councils have not yet been selected. The Civic Secretariat has not yet been constituted. The Civic Archive does not yet hold the first determination of the first civilian-selected assembly to govern a nation.

But the design is ready. The normative foundations are established. The institutional architecture is specified. The safeguards are designed. The transition pathway is planned. The cultural embedding is begun. What remains is the act of will — collective, civic, and sustained — by which residents of the British Isles decide that they are capable of governing themselves and choose to begin.

We do not turn time back; we move forward with the wisdom its patterns reveal.

In other words, the past can't be changed, but its lessons can guide every step we take from here.

Ian R. Graham BA (Hons)

Surrey Heath — April 2026

Document Reference: DD&SA-CORE-FBP-001

DD&SA Benefits: Extended Institutional Analysis

Authoritative Overview

Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies (DD&SA) represent a structural reconfiguration of governance designed to resolve systemic failures inherent in representative democratic systems. This document extends the benefits analysis into a policy-grade, institutionally defensible format aligned with the architectural standards of the Foundational Blueprint.

Legitimacy as a Structural Output

Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement. Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement. Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement. Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement. Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement. Legitimacy within DD&SA is not campaign-derived but structurally produced through representativeness and deliberative integrity. Stratified sortition ensures demographic fidelity, while transparent deliberation ensures epistemic credibility. This produces durable acceptance of outcomes even under disagreement.

Anti-Capture Architecture

DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional. DD&SA embeds anti-capture mechanisms at the selection, deliberation, and implementation layers. Randomised selection prevents pre-targeting; mandated challenge processes prevent narrative dominance; transparency ensures post-hoc accountability. Capture shifts from systemic to exceptional.

Epistemic Superiority

Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest. Unlike adversarial political systems, DD&SA prioritises epistemic quality through structured evidence intake, expert challenge, and iterative deliberation. This produces decisions that are measurably more coherent, less volatile, and more aligned with long-term public interest.

Macroeconomic Stability Effects

Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains. Policy volatility under electoral cycles imposes hidden economic costs. DD&SA reduces abrupt policy reversals, improves investment predictability, and enhances long-term planning capacity across infrastructure, energy, and industrial strategy domains.

Civic Culture Transformation

DD&SA transforms residents from passive recipients into active participants in governance. Over time, this produces a civic culture characterised by responsibility, literacy, and resilience against manipulation.

Comparative Case Evidence

Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust. Empirical grounding is drawn from Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, Ostbelgien's permanent citizens' council, and OECD deliberative practice reviews. These demonstrate improved decision legitimacy, policy durability, and public trust.

Implementation Considerations

Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline. Transition requires phased institutional build-out, legal continuity frameworks, and administrative capacity expansion. Risks include bureaucratic resistance, cultural inertia, and mis-sequencing. These are manageable with proper design discipline.

Conclusion

DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system. DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system. DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system. DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system. DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system. DD&SA is not a marginal reform but a systemic replacement architecture. Its benefits are not theoretical—they are structurally embedded outcomes of its design principles. Properly implemented, it offers a resilient, legitimate, and high-functioning civic system.

— END OF DOCUMENT —