

DIRECT DEMOCRACY & SORTITION ASSEMBLIES

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

DDSA-EPABP-001 | Edition 1.0

Expert Pool and Adversarial Briefing Protocol

A constitutional instrument governing the selection, conduct, and challenge of expert knowledge within the DD&SA; framework

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Version: 1.0

Author: Ian R. Graham

Document ID: DDSA-EPABP-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

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT	3
ARTICLE 1 — Short Title, Purpose, and Constitutional Status	3
ARTICLE 2 — Definitions	3
ARTICLE 3 — The Verified Expert Register	4
ARTICLE 4 — Schedule A: Register Domains	6
ARTICLE 5 — The Expert Conduct Code	6
ARTICLE 6 — The Adversarial Briefing Mechanism: Overview	7
ARTICLE 7 — The Lead Briefer: Selection and Responsibilities	7
ARTICLE 8 — The Challenge Briefer: Selection and Responsibilities	8
ARTICLE 9 — The Resident Comprehension Panel	9
ARTICLE 10 — The Structured Question Period	10
ARTICLE 11 — Civic Epistemics Training	11
ARTICLE 12 — Oversight, Audit, and Amendment	13
CLOSING STATEMENT	14

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Whoever controls what a decision-maker knows controls the decision — without ever appearing to hold power. This Protocol exists to ensure that the knowledge reaching residents and Sortition Assemblies is accurate, contested where it should be contested, and structurally protected from capture by any individual, institution, or school of thought. Expert knowledge is indispensable. Expert dominance is impermissible. This document defines the architecture that preserves the first and prevents the second.

ARTICLE 1 — Short Title, Purpose, and Constitutional Status

1.1 This instrument shall be known as the DD&SA Expert Pool and Adversarial Briefing Protocol (the Protocol).

1.2 This Protocol is a constitutional instrument of equal standing to the Referendum Code, the Sortition Assembly Constitution, and the Emergency Governance Protocol.

1.3 The purpose of this Protocol is threefold:

1.3.1 To establish and maintain a Verified Expert Register of qualified individuals whose knowledge is available to Sortition Assemblies and residents in decision-making processes.

1.3.2 To define the Adversarial Briefing Mechanism through which expert knowledge is presented, challenged, and examined before any decision is made.

1.3.3 To equip assembly members and residents with the epistemic tools needed to evaluate competing expert claims without surrendering judgment to whoever sounds most authoritative.

1.4 This Protocol applies to all briefings prepared for Sortition Assemblies at National, County, and Local level, and to all public referendum briefings conducted under the Referendum Code.

1.5 Expert knowledge informs decisions. It does not make them. Decision sovereignty remains at all times with the resident.

ARTICLE 2 — Definitions

2.1 Terms used in this Protocol shall bear the meanings assigned in this Article.

2.2 "Verified Expert Register" (the Register) means the constitutionally maintained database of qualified individuals whose knowledge is available for briefing purposes within the DD&SA framework.

2.3 "Credentialed Expertise" means knowledge demonstrated through formal qualifications, peer-reviewed published work, or verifiable professional practice in a defined domain.

2.4 "Lived Expertise" means knowledge demonstrated through sustained direct personal experience in a defined domain — including but not limited to occupational practice, community experience, and care-giving — without formal academic qualification.

2.5 Credentialed Expertise and Lived Expertise are formally equal in standing on the Register. Neither category is ranked above the other. Selection processes treat them identically.

2.6 "Domain" means a defined area of knowledge for which the Register maintains a qualified pool of experts, as specified in Schedule A of this Protocol.

2.7 "Lead Briefer" means the expert selected by stratified random draw to prepare and deliver the primary briefing to an assembly or referendum process.

2.8 "Challenge Briefer" means the expert selected by separate stratified random draw to interrogate, test, and where warranted contest the Lead Briefer's evidence, assumptions, and conclusions.

2.9 "Resident Comprehension Panel" means the five residents selected by fresh sortition to ensure the briefing process remains accessible, plain, and comprehensible throughout.

2.10 "Expert Conduct Code" means the binding rules governing the behaviour, neutrality, and accountability of all registered experts, as set out in Article 5.

2.11 "Conflict of Interest" means any financial, professional, personal, or institutional relationship that could reasonably be expected to influence the content or framing of a briefing.

2.12 "Deferred Decision Protocol" means the defined process by which an assembly may formally record insufficient evidence and defer a decision, as set out in Article 10.

2.13 "Civic Epistemics Training" means the mandatory preparation given to all assembly members equipping them to evaluate the quality of arguments rather than the authority of those making them, as set out in Article 11.

ARTICLE 3 — The Verified Expert Register

Purpose and Maintenance

3.1 The Verified Expert Register is a constitutionally maintained, independently audited database of individuals whose knowledge is available to Sortition Assemblies and referendum processes. It is owned by no institution and controlled by no single body. The National Sortition Assembly's Register Oversight Function administers it, itself selected by sortition.

3.2 The Register is organised by Domain. Schedule A of this Protocol defines the initial list of Domains. New Domains may be added by the NSA following a public consultation process. No Domain may be removed except by public referendum.

3.3 The Register is a living document. It is audited annually by a freshly selected resident audit panel with no institutional affiliations to any registered expert.

Entry onto the Register — Formal Equality of Expertise

3.4 Any individual may apply to join the Register in any Domain in which they meet the entry criteria. Applications are assessed by the Register Oversight Function using the criteria in this Article. Credentialed Expertise and Lived Expertise are assessed by separate but formally equal criteria and awarded identical standing upon registration.

Entry Criteria — Credentialed Expertise

3.5 An individual qualifies under Credentialed Expertise if they can demonstrate at least one of the following:

A formal qualification at degree level or above in the relevant Domain, plus at least five years of active professional practice in that Domain

Peer-reviewed published work directly relevant to the Domain within the past ten years

Verifiable professional practice of at least ten years in the relevant Domain, with documented outputs — such as reports, case records, project histories, or institutional records — that demonstrate

sustained competence

3.6 The possession of a formal qualification alone, without active practice or documented output, does not qualify an individual for the Register. The Register values applied, current knowledge — not historical credentials held in isolation.

Entry Criteria — Lived Expertise

3.7 An individual qualifies under Lived Expertise if they can demonstrate sustained direct personal experience in the relevant Domain of at least ten years, evidenced by at least one of the following:

Occupational practice — such as a nurse, farmer, builder, or social worker — verified by employment records, professional registrations, or equivalent documentation

Community experience — such as sustained community leadership, care-giving, or advocacy — verified by two independent witnesses and documentary evidence

Personal lived experience directly relevant to the Domain — such as long-term health condition expertise, housing insecurity experience, or disability experience — verified through documented record and, where appropriate, community corroboration

3.8 Lived Expertise carries the same formal weight as Credentialed Expertise on the Register. A registered nurse of twenty years and a professor of nursing hold equal standing. A lifelong farmer and an agricultural economist hold equal standing. This equality is not symbolic — it is structural and reflected in all selection processes.

Conflict of Interest Rules

3.9 Every registered expert declares all potential conflicts of interest upon registration and updates this declaration whenever circumstances change. Failure to declare a known conflict is a breach of the Expert Conduct Code and results in immediate suspension.

3.10 A conflict of interest is defined broadly. It includes:

Financial interest in the outcome of a decision in the relevant Domain

Current or recent employment by an organisation with a direct stake in the decision

Funding received from any organisation with a direct stake in the decision, within the past five years

Personal relationships with assembly members, other briefers, or key decision-makers in the relevant process

Public prior advocacy for a specific outcome in the matter being briefed

3.11 A conflict of interest in one matter does not remove an expert from the Register. It recuses them from that specific briefing only. Their registration in all other matters is unaffected.

3.12 Conflict of interest declarations are public. Any resident may challenge a declaration as incomplete. Challenged declarations are reviewed by the Register Oversight Function within 14 days.

Registration Renewal and Anti-Entrenchment Rules

3.13 Registration is renewable every three years. Renewal requires a fresh conflict of interest audit and a demonstration that the expert's knowledge in the Domain remains current and active.

3.14 No registered expert may brief the same Sortition Assembly — at any level — more than once in any rolling 12-month period. This is the Anti-Entrenchment Rule. It prevents any individual from

becoming the assembly's habitual or trusted voice in a domain and thereby acquiring informal authority.

3.15 No registered expert may serve as both Lead Briefer and Challenge Briefer in the same process. These roles are structurally separated.

3.16 No two registered experts from the same institution, employer, research group, or professional network may serve as Lead Briefer and Challenge Briefer in the same process. The adversarial requirement demands genuine independence of perspective, not the performance of disagreement between colleagues.

ARTICLE 4 — Schedule A: Register Domains

The following Domains are constitutionally specified at the establishment of the Register. This list is not exhaustive — new Domains are added as governance requires. Each Domain maintains separate pools of Credentialed and Lived Expertise, with equal standing between them.

ARTICLE 5 — The Expert Conduct Code

5.1 All registered experts are bound by the Expert Conduct Code from the moment of registration. The Code governs their conduct in all briefing processes under this Protocol.

5.2 The Expert Conduct Code requires:

Accuracy and Intellectual Honesty

All factual claims made in a briefing must be supportable by verifiable evidence. Experts must not state as fact anything that is contested, uncertain, or based on incomplete evidence without explicitly identifying it as such.

Experts are required to name uncertainties, knowledge gaps, and areas of genuine scientific or professional disagreement. Presenting a contested field as having a settled consensus when it does not is a conduct breach.

Experts must state the strongest counterargument to their own position. Failure to do so when a credible counterargument exists is a conduct breach.

Neutrality in Briefing

The Lead Briefer's primary briefing must be factual and structural. It may explain implications and consequences but may not advocate for a specific outcome.

The Challenge Briefer may take a more interrogative and contesting stance but must ground all challenges in evidence, not rhetoric.

Neither briefer may use emotional framing, loaded language, or persuasive techniques designed to influence the assembly's decision rather than inform their understanding.

Transparency

Experts must disclose, at the start of every briefing, any financial interests, prior advocacy positions, or institutional affiliations relevant to the matter being briefed, even if these fall below the formal conflict of interest threshold.

Experts must answer questions from assembly members and the Resident Comprehension Panel directly and plainly. Deflection, evasion, or the use of technical language to avoid a question is a

conduct breach.

Conduct Breach Consequences

5.3 Conduct breaches are assessed by the Register Oversight Function following any briefing where a breach is reported by an assembly member, a Resident Comprehension Panel member, or the Challenge Briefer.

5.4 Consequences are graduated:

5.4.1 Minor breach — formal written record on the Register entry. Visible to future selection processes.

5.4.2 Significant breach — suspension from the Register for a period of six to eighteen months, determined by the Register Oversight Function.

5.4.3 Serious breach — permanent removal from the Register. This includes deliberate misrepresentation of evidence, undisclosed conflicts of interest, and advocacy disguised as neutral briefing.

5.5 All conduct breach records are public and permanently attached to the expert's Register entry, including those that result in no consequence beyond a formal record.

ARTICLE 6 — The Adversarial Briefing Mechanism: Overview

The Adversarial Briefing Mechanism is the core process by which expert knowledge reaches Sortition Assemblies and referendum processes. It has four structural components that operate together as a single integrated system. No component may be removed or modified without triggering a constitutional amendment process.

6.1 The four components are not sequential in all respects. The Resident Comprehension Panel operates throughout the entire process, not only in a defined phase. The Structured Question Period follows both briefings. The Lead and Challenge Briefers operate in defined sequence but with overlapping accountability throughout.

6.2 The Adversarial Briefing Mechanism is not designed to produce a winner and a loser between the two briefers. It is designed to produce a more complete, more honest, and more challengeable picture of what is known — so that the assembly can make a genuinely informed decision.

ARTICLE 7 — The Lead Briefer: Selection and Responsibilities

Selection

7.1 The Lead Briefer is selected by stratified random draw from the relevant Domain pool of the Verified Expert Register. The draw is conducted by the Register Oversight Function and is auditable.

7.2 The selection process automatically excludes:

Any expert with a declared conflict of interest in the specific matter being briefed

Any expert who has briefed the same assembly in any matter in the preceding 12 months

Any expert from the same institution, employer, or professional network as the pre-selected Challenge Briefer

7.3 If the Domain pool produces fewer than three eligible candidates after exclusions, the Register Oversight Function widens the search to adjacent Domains and notifies the assembly of this. The assembly may request a delay to allow additional registration in the Domain.

Preparation

7.4 The Lead Briefer is given a defined preparation period — a minimum of seven days for standard briefings, a minimum of 48 hours for accelerated processes under the Emergency Governance Protocol — in which to prepare their briefing materials.

7.5 The Lead Briefer's briefing must be structured around three explicitly labelled sections:

7.5.1 WHAT IS KNOWN: Factual claims supported by strong, verifiable evidence. The briefer must be able to cite the evidence basis for every claim in this section.

7.5.2 WHAT IS UNCERTAIN: Areas where evidence exists but is incomplete, contested, or subject to reasonable professional disagreement. The briefer must not move claims from this section to the 'What Is Known' section unless the evidence clearly supports doing so.

7.5.3 WHAT IS CONTESTED: Areas where expert opinion is genuinely divided, where different analytical frameworks produce different conclusions, or where value judgments are embedded in apparently technical claims. The briefer must name the strongest opposing view, not merely acknowledge that opposing views exist.

7.6 The Lead Briefer submits their briefing materials to the Register Oversight Function and to the Challenge Briefer simultaneously, at least 48 hours before the briefing session. The Challenge Briefer receives the full materials; the assembly receives a pre-read summary.

During the Briefing Session

7.7 The Lead Briefer presents their structured briefing to the assembly. The presentation is time-limited — a maximum of 45 minutes for standard briefings. No PowerPoint presentations, slide decks, or visual materials designed to persuade rather than inform are permitted. Plain documents and factual diagrams are permitted.

7.8 The Lead Briefer may not be interrupted during their presentation except by the Resident Comprehension Panel invoking their right to request plain-English restatement under Article 9.

7.9 Following the Challenge Briefer's response, the Lead Briefer has a defined right of reply — a maximum of 15 minutes — to address specific challenges raised. The right of reply is for clarification and correction, not for re-presenting the original briefing.

ARTICLE 8 — The Challenge Briefer: Selection and Responsibilities

Selection — The Independent Perspective Requirement

8.1 The Challenge Briefer is selected by a separate stratified random draw from the same Domain pool, conducted independently of the Lead Briefer selection.

8.2 In addition to the standard exclusions in Article 7.2, the Challenge Briefer selection applies one further filter: the selected individual must hold a demonstrably different professional or analytical perspective from the Lead Briefer. This is assessed by the Register Oversight Function based on the expert's registered profile, published positions, and institutional background.

8.3 A 'demonstrably different perspective' does not require fundamental disagreement with the Lead Briefer's conclusions. It requires that the Challenge Briefer brings a different analytical framework, a different domain emphasis, or a different evidence base to the same question. The purpose is breadth, not conflict.

8.4 Where the Register Oversight Function cannot identify a sufficiently independent Challenge Briefer from the same Domain pool, it may draw from an adjacent Domain with explicit notification to the assembly. In this case, the Challenge Briefer's domain context is made clear to the assembly before the session begins.

Preparation

8.5 The Challenge Briefer receives the Lead Briefer's full materials at least 48 hours before the session. Their preparation period is used specifically to:

Identify claims in the 'What Is Known' section that they believe are overstated, rely on incomplete evidence, or exclude relevant contrary evidence

Identify claims in the 'What Is Uncertain' section that they believe should be classified as more or less uncertain than the Lead Briefer has indicated

Identify claims in the 'What Is Contested' section where they believe the Lead Briefer has not fairly represented the strongest opposing view

Identify any significant relevant evidence, research, or professional perspective that the Lead Briefer has not included

8.6 The Challenge Briefer is not required to disagree with the Lead Briefer on every point. If the Challenge Briefer finds the Lead Briefer's materials to be accurate, fair, and complete, they must say so explicitly — and explain what they checked and why they are satisfied. Manufactured disagreement is a conduct breach.

During the Briefing Session

8.7 The Challenge Briefer presents their assessment following the Lead Briefer's presentation. They are allocated equal time — a maximum of 45 minutes — and equal standing in the session.

8.8 The Challenge Briefer structures their presentation around the specific areas of the Lead Briefer's materials they are contesting, clarifying, or endorsing. They do not re-present the full subject area from scratch — they interrogate the existing briefing.

8.9 The Challenge Briefer must be specific. 'I disagree with the general thrust of this briefing' is not a valid challenge. Every challenge must name the specific claim being contested and the specific evidence or reasoning supporting the challenge.

8.10 Where the Challenge Briefer finds no material grounds for contest, their role becomes one of corroboration and depth — adding evidence that supports and strengthens the Lead Briefer's picture. This is as valuable to the assembly as challenge, and the Protocol treats it as such.

ARTICLE 9 — The Resident Comprehension Panel

9.1 The Resident Comprehension Panel consists of five residents selected by fresh sortition from the general resident register for each briefing session. Panel members are not domain experts. Their selection specifically excludes individuals with professional or academic qualifications in the Domain being briefed.

9.2 The Resident Comprehension Panel's role is singular and important: to ensure that the briefing process remains comprehensible to the assembly members who will make the decision. They are the assembly's quality control on accessibility, not on content.

Powers of the Resident Comprehension Panel

9.3 Any member of the Resident Comprehension Panel may, at any point during the briefing session, raise their hand to invoke a Plain English Request. When a Plain English Request is raised:

9.3.1 The briefing pauses immediately.

9.3.2 The Panel member identifies the term, claim, or passage they did not understand.

9.3.3 The briefer — Lead or Challenge, depending on who was speaking — must restate the relevant content in plain, accessible English without jargon, technical notation, or assumed prior knowledge.

9.3.4 The Panel member confirms whether the restatement is now comprehensible. If not, the briefer must try again.

9.3.5 The Plain English Request and the briefer's response are recorded in the session record.

9.4 There is no limit on the number of Plain English Requests a Panel member may raise. Briefers may not express frustration, impatience, or condescension in response to Plain English Requests. Doing so is a conduct breach under Article 5.

9.5 At the end of the briefing session, the Resident Comprehension Panel produces a brief written assessment — one page maximum — recording:

Which parts of the briefing they found clear and accessible

Which parts remained unclear or inaccessible despite Plain English Requests

Any moments where they felt the briefing had moved from informing to persuading

9.6 The Panel's written assessment is included in full in the briefing summary distributed to assembly members before their deliberation and vote. It is not advisory — assembly members weigh it as they see fit. But it must be included.

ARTICLE 10 — The Structured Question Period

10.1 The Structured Question Period follows both the Lead Briefer's presentation and the Challenge Briefer's assessment. It is the assembly's opportunity to put questions directly to both briefers simultaneously.

Pre-Submission of Questions

10.2 Assembly members receive the pre-read summary of the Lead Briefer's materials at least 24 hours before the briefing session. During this pre-read period, they submit written questions to the session facilitator.

10.3 Questions are categorised by the facilitator into thematic groups. Duplicate questions are merged. The facilitator does not filter questions on grounds of relevance or quality — only on grounds of duplication.

10.4 Questions submitted by Resident Comprehension Panel members are included alongside assembly member questions and treated identically.

The Question Session

10.5 Each question is put to both briefers simultaneously. The Lead Briefer answers first. The Challenge Briefer answers second. The order does not reverse — this prevents the Challenge Briefer from simply endorsing or refuting the Lead Briefer's answer without independent formulation.

10.6 Where the two briefers' answers diverge, the session facilitator explicitly flags the divergence to the assembly: 'The briefers have given different answers to this question. The divergence is recorded.' The specific nature of the divergence is noted in the session record.

10.7 Where the two briefers' answers agree, this is also noted. Agreement between independently selected briefers with different perspectives carries evidential weight and the assembly should be aware of it.

10.8 Assembly members may ask follow-up questions in response to a briefer's answer, subject to a time allocation managed by the facilitator. No assembly member may dominate the question period.

The Briefing Summary

10.9 Following the session, the facilitator produces a Briefing Summary that includes:

The Lead Briefer's three-section structured briefing in condensed form

The Challenge Briefer's specific points of contest, corroboration, and addition

A clear list of all points where the two briefers agreed

A clear list of all points where the two briefers diverged, with the nature of the divergence specified

The Resident Comprehension Panel's written assessment

All questions asked and both briefers' answers, in full

10.10 The Briefing Summary is distributed to all assembly members before deliberation begins. It is also published on the National Intranet in full as a public record. Expert identities in the Briefing Summary are publicly recorded — there is no anonymity for briefers.

ARTICLE 11 — Civic Epistemics Training

11.1 All Sortition Assembly members at every level undergo Civic Epistemics Training before assuming their duties. This training is not optional and is not waivable.

11.2 Civic Epistemics Training does not attempt to make assembly members experts in any domain. It equips them to evaluate the quality of arguments and the reliability of claims regardless of the domain in which those arguments appear.

11.3 Training covers four core modules:

Module One — The Three Types of Claim

11.4 Assembly members are trained to distinguish between:

11.4.1 EMPIRICAL CLAIMS — statements about what is the case, supported or refuted by observable evidence. Experts are highly reliable on well-evidenced empirical claims. Example: 'Air pollution levels in this region exceed WHO thresholds.'

11.4.2 PREDICTIVE CLAIMS — statements about what will happen if a particular course of action is taken. Experts are moderately reliable on predictive claims, which depend on modelling assumptions

that may or may not hold. Example: 'This policy will reduce unemployment by 2% within three years.' Assembly members are trained to ask: what assumptions underlie this prediction, and what happens to the prediction if those assumptions are wrong?

11.4.3 VALUE CLAIMS — statements about what should be done, what matters most, or what a good outcome looks like. Experts are no more reliable on value claims than any other resident. Their expertise does not extend to deciding what the public should want. Example: 'Economic growth should take priority over environmental protection.' Assembly members are trained to identify when an apparently technical claim is, in fact, a value claim in disguise.

Module Two — Markers of a Weak Argument

11.5 Assembly members are trained to recognise the following markers, which — when present — indicate that a claim requires additional scrutiny regardless of who is making it:

Appeal to consensus without evidence: 'All experts agree that...' — assembly members are trained to ask: what is the evidence, not who agrees with it?

Failure to acknowledge uncertainty: presenting a field with genuine uncertainty as though it is settled

Inability to name the strongest counterargument: an expert who cannot fairly state the best opposing case has not fully understood the question

Predictions presented with false precision: '17.3% improvement' stated without confidence intervals or assumptions is a warning sign, not reassurance

Complexity used as authority: a claim that cannot be explained plainly has not been understood well enough to be briefed

Ad hominem challenge: attacking the person making an opposing argument rather than the argument itself

Module Three — The Burden of Proof Principle

11.6 Assembly members are trained in the principle that the stronger the claim, the heavier the evidence burden the claimant carries. A briefer who makes a dramatic or counterintuitive claim bears a heavier evidence burden than one making a modest or well-established claim. The assembly is entitled to hold dramatic claims to a higher evidential standard — and to say so.

Module Four — The Right to Defer

11.7 Assembly members are trained that it is constitutionally valid — and sometimes correct — to conclude that there is insufficient evidence to make a good decision at this time. This is not failure or weakness. It is epistemic integrity.

11.8 Where an assembly concludes, by majority vote, that the evidence base for a decision is insufficient, it may invoke the Deferred Decision Protocol:

11.8.1 A formal record is made of what evidence is missing and why the current evidence is insufficient.

11.8.2 The Register Oversight Function is tasked with identifying what further expert input would address the gap.

11.8.3 A defined timeline is set — a maximum of 90 days — within which the additional evidence is gathered and a new briefing is scheduled.

11.8.4 The deferred decision and its reasons are published on the National Intranet. Residents are informed that the assembly has concluded the current evidence is insufficient and that a new process is underway.

11.9 The Deferred Decision Protocol may not be used indefinitely on the same question. If a decision has been deferred twice, the third briefing process produces a decision regardless — with a public record of the evidence limitations acknowledged by the assembly.

ARTICLE 12 — Oversight, Audit, and Amendment

Register Oversight Function

12.1 The Register Oversight Function is administered by a panel of nine members selected by stratified sortition from the resident register. Members serve staggered two-year terms. No member may serve consecutive terms. The Function has no institutional allegiance and reports directly to the NSA.

12.2 The Register Oversight Function is responsible for: maintaining the Register; conducting conflict of interest reviews; managing expert selection processes; assessing conduct breach reports; and producing an annual public report on the health and integrity of the Register.

Annual Independent Audit

12.3 The Register and the Adversarial Briefing Mechanism are subject to an independent annual audit conducted by a freshly selected resident audit panel with no connections to any registered expert. The audit assesses:

Domain coverage — are all relevant domains adequately represented?

Diversity of perspective — is the Register genuinely pluralistic in analytical approach, or does any school of thought dominate?

Anti-entrenchment compliance — has the 12-month briefing rule been observed?

Conflict of interest management — have all declared and challenged conflicts been properly handled?

Conduct breach records — have breaches been assessed and consequences applied consistently?

12.4 The audit report is published in full on the National Intranet. It is submitted to the NSA for review. Where the audit identifies systemic problems, the NSA is required to respond within 60 days with a published remediation plan.

Amendment

12.5 This Protocol may be amended only by a full public referendum under the Referendum Code.

12.6 No amendment may reduce the formal equality between Credentialed and Lived Expertise. No amendment may remove the Challenge Briefer requirement. No amendment may eliminate or weaken the Resident Comprehension Panel's right to invoke plain-English restatement. No amendment may remove the Anti-Entrenchment Rule.

12.7 Amendments that strengthen accountability, expand the Domain list, tighten conflict of interest rules, or add further safeguards against epistemic capture may be introduced without the supermajority requirement that applies to weakening amendments.

CLOSING STATEMENT

This Protocol rests on a single principle:

A claim that has survived challenge is worth more than a claim that was never tested.

Expertise is indispensable. Expert dominance is impermissible.

The resident decides. The expert informs. The structure guarantees the difference between the two.

— END OF DOCUMENT —