

DIRECT DEMOCRACY & SORTITION ASSEMBLIES

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

DDSA-ROADMAP-001 | Edition 1.0

Full Production Roadmap

The sequencing logic for building and publishing the DD&SA; corpus

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Version: 1.0

Author: Ian R. Graham

Document ID: DDSA-ROADMAP-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

Placeholder for table of contents	0
-----------------------------------	---

A few strategic notes on the sequencing logic:

Why Phase 1 before any public publication. The Civic Justice Architecture in particular is load-bearing — the constitution names Magisters, Civic Advocates, and Consequence Hearings, but if no document defines how they actually work, any serious reader will flag it as a gap. The devolution architecture is similarly urgent because the "what about Scotland?" question will come in the first five minutes of any public conversation.

Why health before digital. Public trust is earned in the order people experience the state — body first, data second. The NHS question is also the single most effective rhetorical weapon available to opponents: "you'd hand control of the health service to randomly selected people." That needs a full architectural answer, not a deflection.

A note on Phase 2 depth. These documents do not need the same density as the constitutional corpus. What they need is sufficient operational clarity to close the sceptic's objection, plus a clear account of why sortition governance produces better outcomes in that domain than a Health Secretary or Housing Minister does. The argument is always the same; the domain-specific evidence varies.

The outstanding gap to watch. Defence is placed in Phase 1 because it's constitutionally necessary, but it is also the domain where the most political caution is required. The question of who authorises military force under a non-executive civic model is genuinely novel territory — it may need its own stress-testing session before drafting.

— END OF DOCUMENT —