The submission proposes to scale up e-democracy. A variety of ICT-platforms are intended to enhancing the citizens’ direct participation in government and policy making. Citizens are to be able to collaborate in the actions of governance, and allow them to monitor the outcomes and with the possibility to make administrative decisions. The enhanced accountability is to improve efficiency and terminate systemic corruption. Actions made possible by the e-democracy model are for instance participatory budgeting, verified online petitioning and a system for political debate over the internet, and geo-localized infrastructure problem notification. Different government systems can choose settings that best suit their needs and their internal regulations.
1. Abstract

Democrare proposes an innovation action addressing the democratic evolutions of governments necessary to overcome the limit of representational systems, aims at implementing a widespread pilot of an open government online platform.

We propose this code name Democrare, a new word, defining the implementation from representational to delegated, from delegated to participative and from participative to a more direct democracy.

Most of the coding of the web application is already done, but some functions are currently in an advanced analysis stage and others are written in different code languages. This needs to be addressed and integrated seamlessly. To do so, we will harmonize all the code in the most advanced and widespread programing language available today.

By using Open Data and leveraging existing technologies, such as mobile devices, Democrare addresses the growing need for a more transparent, inclusive, efficient and collaborative approach to public administration by giving full participation to all citizens. By enhancing the citizens direct participation in government and policy making, with the goal of a more prosperous, transparent and inclusive global society through the development of a new model of Governance, in which ICT-based technology platforms work to enhance transparency, Democrare enables citizens to collaborate in actions of governance, and allow them to monitor the outcomes and with the possibility to make administrative decisions. By this enhanced accountability Democrare aims for the termination of systemic corruption.

Once Democrare, an already proven method is fully implemented, the key activity of the project will be pilot programs aimed at reaching the widest range of citizens and administrations. The goal is to better engage both in creative problem solving, collaboration and the development of ideas and solutions. The pilots will be based on issues of proven interest, like Participatory Budgeting where enhanced follow on steps, where the verification of the successful implementation of these decisions can be monitored and maintained by the community.

The project goals are to increase engagement and participation between citizens and government. Whereas previous efforts to develop similar tools have failed as they were often unable to reach a critical mass-ignition point or manifested implicit conflicts of interest with the established governments unwilling to give up power, this initiative circumvents these problems by through direct deliberation by participating members and hence bypassing any middle man in the process.

The Democrare project has a major advantage, as it will fuse and integrate existing platforms like Airesis (the main decisional model and open source), Vilfredo (specific for small group to take a full consensual decision), LiquidFeedBack (as a case study to understand shortcomings of proxy voting), Loomio (specific for amendments of nonconsensual majority), Proxy for Me (another project presented in the GCP, does not yet address the full process of decision making but uses an algorithm for automated voting) and other minor decisional methods (quantitative decisions) resulting in an adaptive model for all societies.
Having worked in the development team that produced Airesis (http://www.Airesis.eu), which is a state-of-the-art, fully operational, open source, web-based application enabling E-Democracy, already translated into 16 languages allows for this to be used as the cornerstone of the Democrare project.

Democrare will be a totally open source platform focused on achieving the highest consensual resolutions in a participatory and collaborative way. The development effort will be directed at application integration and improving the capability of the user experience and accessibility for all end users, to create or co-produce new public services via open interaction models through publicly available open-data resources.

The Democrare architecture aims to effectively integrate current Open Data sources, provide OpenAPIs, and produce Open Data results using JSON standards. Efficiency and effectiveness will be pursued through innovative technologies such as semantic search algorithms and automated argumentation analysis, with particular attention paid to supporting a wide range of personalized, inclusive and accessible mobile user interfaces.

Specific add-on applications, for participatory budgeting, verified online petitioning, geo-localized infrastructure problem notification etc., will serve as a blueprint to facilitate any user of the platform to notify or co-produce new public services.

Information security and legal validation will be strongly integrated in Democrare, and following the online implementation of the features and pilot launch, the project will proceed to analyse usage data in terms of statistical indicators like happiness, participation, efficiency, social impact, cost savings, trust, and so on. This will be addressed through the help of social/policy scientists, universities, academic institutions and researchers in order to set the stage for successful mass implementation.

In order to widen the scope and usage base, from the beginning of the Pilot project, a full scale communication effort will be applied.

We will rely also on volunteers where possible, to involve active citizenship geared towards the scope of the Democrare plan.

The funds received will be used in 2 phases:

1 Phase:
Programming and finalization of the code,

full translation in all languages of the code (already done in 16 languages of which some partially),

cloud based scalable hardware implementation and maintenance and guaranteeing at least 3 years of full service prior to passing all this overhead expenses directly to taxpayers of the newly established democracy. (1/3 of the funds)
2 Phase:
communication campaign intended to spread the use and propagate Democrare
analysis of optimal strategies to drive transition from current governments to the
new system.
Pilot program involving one major city in every continent (1/3 of the funds)
The totality of funds may insufficient for the completion of 2 Phase however, once
successfully implemented in at at least one major center, a cascading domino
effect has been projected to take place in other potential cities.

2. Description of the model

PRINCIPLES AND CORE VALUES
Democrare is an open source decision-making tool based on the existing Airesis
Methodology for e-democracy, strongly oriented to problem-solving and designed
to maximize the immense evolutionary power of collective intelligence.

Entirely developed by volunteers according to non-profit principles, Airesis was
created to take faster and more informed, shared and participated decisions.

It is based on the following principles:

Participation Involving citizens. Means having more energy and points of view
available. Only through direct participation is it possible to investigate problems
and understand what people really want. Participation is the essence of the
democratic process.

Transparency and Security. Without transparency, rules can be easily
circumvented and democracy can quickly degenerate. Transparency also means
openness, ability to receive: for this reason Airesis also allows unregistered users to
view the contents of the site. The source code of the software is also “transparent”,
being entirely open source.

Constructive dialogue. No one owns all the right answers. Using appropriate tools,
elaborating ideas proposed by many people can be more productive than doing it
yourself.

Equal opportunities. How effective equality can be pursued by the system through
the possibilities it offers.

Flexibility. Each State has its own needs, each proposal unique, each user has their
own personal needs.
THE GOAL: A SYSTEM BASED ON THE POWER OF COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE TO PROVOKE A TRANSITION FROM REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY INTO A PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY AND FINALLY INTO A DIRECT AND DYNAMIC DEMOCRACY.

Structured as a useful social network, Democrare allows users to engage other people according to their interests and to sublimate the qualities of each in order to drive a consensual deliberation for any type of proposal. The architecture and its core values allow the platform to pursue goals of social and constructive debate on issues that may involve the territory, social promotion or sector policies and as a result bring out the best ideas.

Airesis provides Democrare with the tools for:

Promotion of the ideas and vast collective experience of individual members Groups the initiatives / proposals of individual users and presents them to the community Proposal finalization, through collaboration of large amount of members, in the definition of the possible solutions and ideas to solve the addressed problem. Provide tools for constructive debate leading to the final definition of the proposed solutions. The Vilfredo type algorithm will be used to promote shared editing of proposals by consensus groups. The Loomio type algorithm will be used to promote shared editing of proposals by non consensual groups and to address new possible solutions. Allow Individuals to submit personal contributions as well as take part in editing current or new solutions. Manage the vote of various initiatives and proposals Promote generic events or meetings Manage the candidates applications and the adjoining vote operations Manage restricted sub-groups, governed by specific regulations and permissions, using the tools provided by the platform.

CHARACTERISTICS AND FEATURES

The Democrare development team will enhance and build all the additional functions and tools according to the needs as they become clearer by the user community using the same democratic method which takes benefit from the platform. The same development group is present on the Democrare platform and decides consensually for future implementations.

Basic features

Sign up and login available from every page as well as after adding a comment or a contribution. Facebook, Google +, Meetup, Twitter, Linkedin and any other major identity provider login enabled.

To make a vote legally binding on Democrare it will be necessary to be an ID certified user, (votes made by non-certified users will be displayed for statistical purposes)

The deliberation by certified users once implemented, will create an incentive for everyone to become a certified user.

Creation of proposals and debates It is possible to post proposals/initiatives and receive contributions, comments and evaluations to edit a shared summary of the proposals that can gain the largest possible consensus.

Quorum and proposals vote Each proposal has its own quorum. Voting occurs by preference according to the Schulze method.
Events/calendar management It is possible to schedule events concerning meetings, voting, elections of candidates.

Messaging service and e-mail notifications (customizable by the user)

Uploading and managing documents and attachments to the proposals

Polls both internal and external using Schulze voting method.

Mobile App Proposal and debate tool

The core of the software is focused on the deliberative tool which allows for user participation in the drafting of a proposal, to set a common goal, to contribute to the search for alternative solutions and to bring to the vote the result of this work so that the proposal can receive the most possible consensus where the best and the most shared solution can emerge.

The process involves 4 steps:
- Opening a forum on an issue or a problem to be addressed.
- When a given number of participants define the necessity to take action and deliberate towards a decision, one or more participants can actively become author/s of the now joint proposal.
- The author/s create the proposal following a wizard, after which the system publishes the text in the section “In debate”. During this period the proposal can be modified by the editors on the basis of given evaluations and contributions added by other users.
- When the debate quorum is reached the proposal goes to the section “Voting” during this time the text of the proposal cannot be changed, the editor chooses a vote event (voting period) among those already planned or can create a new one using the calendar.

All eligible (certified and non certified) users can vote during the defined period.

At the end of the vote the system calculates the results (winner is based on certified users, non certified vote will give a non binding potential result) and places the proposal in the “Voted” section.

If however the debate quorum is not reached, the proposal goes to the “Abandoned” section, where it can be put back in debate to begin in a new life cycle.

Even voted proposals can be resubmitted and this is the dynamic democracy, if a decision create issues or major problems a new debate/proposal can be started.

Particularly interesting is the adoption of a discussion area for each published proposal that allows the proposal itself to be modified by the editors (like a wiki) according to the consensus obtained by individual contributions. For group contribution Vilfredo or Loomio type algorithm will be implemented. The discussion area composed of two indented levels, the first designed to collect contributions, the second containing personal considerations on the former. The first level implements a mechanism to increment the maturity of the proposal incorporating in it the most appreciated contributions. (up-vote/down-vote/neutral)
Vilfredo, a full consensus decisional platform for up to 25 peoples, will be integrated to promote group elaborated contributions already containing the appreciation of all the active participants.

Contributions can be a paragraph editing of the proposal or even new solutions to the addressed problem.

Solutions may be incompatible if promoted by different ideas that come from different perspectives, the final vote will decide the winner that will be implemented.

The debate quorum, necessary to promote a proposal to the voting phase, is composed of three different parameters:

Participants: number of people who participate in the debate;

Discussion time: period of time in which the proposal remains in the debate phase (starting from its submission);

Maturity: percentage of participants who claim that the proposal is ready to be voted;

The “maturity” evaluation of a proposal is a formal act by the members of the community (done during the discussion period), through which they express the suitability of the text of the proposal for the following voting phase.

There are different types of quorums: Depending on the complexity of the topic, the parameters (participation, time and maturity) vary.

Quorums will be defined during the first phase and may be discussed in the forum before the proposal is started or decided in a specific proposal.

The proposals are organized, sorted and searchable in different ways:

depending on their status ("In debate," "Voting", "Voted", "Abandoned"), according to predefined categories ("Work", "Health", "Education", etc.), depending on the type of proposal: standard, regulation, estimate, statement, technical decision, etc ...using free tags which can be entered in the text of the proposal as well as delineated through geographical area divisions.

Participants can be organized by geographical subgroups to be able to take regional, municipal or local decisions.

**Schulze voting method and Direct Democracy**

When the period of time assigned for the debate ends and a sufficient number of people agree on the maturity of the proposal (these conditions vary according to the quorums of debate), the proposal go to the voting phase.

At this point the proposal is frozen and the editor has to choose a time frame in which the group will be able to vote the proposal. The ‘voting’ event is recorded on the group calendar and is notified to all members of the group.
At the time of vote a new notification is sent in which is displayed the proposal to be voted and the page on which the vote occurs. At this point each participant, after having read the proposal and the list of possible solutions, can submit their preferential ordering of these solutions from the most liked to the least, thereby allowing the processing of the Schulze Method to find out preferred solution.

At the end of the vote, the proposals go to the “voted” status, where it is possible to review the result of the vote at any time.

**Promotion of Participatory Democracy**
Airesis was developed to promote the sharing of ideas and opinions within the community and represents the fundamental backbone of the Democrare initiative.

The platform offers different tools:

- Public Proposals by default. Publication of proposals can be promoted on social networks or on external blogs and forums;
- The personal blog. Community members can present themselves and post info and announcement, in addition to share ideas/opinions;
- The organizing of meetings, within members of the community;
- The marking interesting events, on a shared calendar;
- A discussion board in each proposal, formatted so that authors will be able to integrate in the text of the proposal, according to the evaluations received on constructive contributions, as well as to encourage problem solving and the opportunity to invite other contacts to join in the discussion,
- the opportunity to apply to become co-editors of a proposal and finally, Voting tools to delineate the most consensual solution.

**Temporary anonymity, secret ballot and auditable voting**
One of the peculiarities of Airesis is that groups can choose if the proposals debate will be anonymous or not.

If anonymity is enabled, authors and commentators of the proposals are indicated by means of a pseudonym. This feature allows for the evaluation of the proposals, criticisms and suggestions according to their content only, impartially, and without the actual identity of the authors and the dynamics of interpersonal liking/disliking influencing the debate.

In any case, at the end of the debate, and after the vote, the participants will be displayed with their real names so that it will be possible to verify each of their interventions.

This option is also applicable to the voting stage, making possible the choice between open or secret ballot. Of noteworthy importance, especially in the case of a secret ballot, is the ability to verify the registration of votes and the absence of fraud. This is only possible through the system of audited voting implemented by Airesis based on the Helios Voting algorithm.
Managing groups and user roles
Airesis implements a flexible system that manages permissions allowing members to have specific roles:
• View private proposals
• Contribute to proposals
• Insert new proposals in the group
• Publish in the Home Page of group
• Create events and votes
• Add participants in the group
• Nominate members for election

Different government systems can choose settings that best suit their needs and their internal regulations. It is possible, for example, allow access to certain functions only to active users and/or certificates, or those that have a particular role. There is also ample freedom on the management requirements that proposals must meet to access the vote.

Another important feature is the division into areas/working groups that makes it possible to create areas within states and to be entitled to hold each area of the participants who will discuss the proposals regarding that particular area. Each participant will be assigned particular roles for each area in order to maximise flexibility.

Security of the Democrare
Due to its open source nature, the whole world community will protect the platform and security will be guaranteed first by strong system administration and as the community grows, will be maintained by self-monitoring by the community as a whole.

Potentially and if necessary, the “transactions” of data on Democrare system can be blockchained to guarantee a cloud-based distribution of security, in the case for example of a major conspiracy in one part of the world or an internet block by a government is taking place or in the scenario of a super hacker sponsored attack. This is an extreme scenario and is not taken in consideration at this time.

Enhancement of Democrare
The use of Democrare can be enhanced by enabling different interfaces, as is currently seen through software like Windows, Apple, Linux, iOS etc. In Linux for instance, Unity Interface, Gnome etc, are all doing similar things in different ways. In the same manner, Democrare algorithm and flexible method will be working across operating systems but an underlying engine that will also work with different themes and interfaces. This will be left open to the creativity of the community.

Another enhancement can be the use of an automated voting system. Once the vote is statistically analyzed the option to choose to give to an AI algorithm the task to vote, the user will receive a message with all the necessary information including the vote that the AI has taken along with the possibility to overrule the vote.

* As this falls outside of the current proposal, please refer to proxyfor.me for GCP submission a process I am familiar with through a metagovernment discussion group I am participating in.*
Much enhancement to current education is needed before Democrare can even become fully implementable. The academisation though schools and institutions of Democrare once established, should become the norm for students starting at the age of 12, which is considered by many behavioural psychologists to be the age where the beginning of self-determination takes place. This most certainly will find its place within the new standards of Civic Education.

**Risks**
The obvious risk in all of this is the unwillingness to abdicate any power by the currently elected Governing Entities.

The timing and establishment of the Democrare method in the major cities is critical. All strategies should be tailored according to this.

The first analysis is to observe the electoral pattern/type in the next election round. Consequently a potential political group that shares the same vision must be identified remembering that once the political elections are done they will become Democrares first potential antagonist as this will challenge their current power structure.

In a Representative Democracy, during public addresses, every politician openly regards participation as the ultimate goal but once off the podium rarely enacts the positions expressed.

### 3. Motivation

How we will use the money from the prize.

Finalize all the functions that the community decides to be necessary.

Finalize translation in all languages and make cross translations by volunteers rendering proposals supranational, live translated allowing the evaluation of contributions by the citizens of the nation’s interested.

We imagine that peace in an area of conflict may be resolved by members of those countries, if not, a global vote may be requested to facilitate matters.

Most of the work is to drive the transition in each country by positive examples and use of open data to replicate good and successful decisions implemented within the local rules and regulations. When this is not possible the decision will be analyzed and taken locally and adapted by the concerned community.

This system must be protected as taking good decisions for the course of humanity also seems to conflict with current major interest groups. Eliminating wars or the use of petrol through collective decision processes isn’t always the first priority for multinational entities.

By the use of collective decision, given the time to change in a better vehicle for human education the new system would be a self-healing/evolving one.
I cannot fully describe what is possible when a good society promotes solidarity and respect but that is what I believe will happen when everyone is entitled to empowered and real participation inside of a governance.

I cannot fully describe when the best collective intelligence is responsible to make decisions but this definitely represent a reality that for me should exist beyond a dream and I would like to be there when it is implemented.

There are no references to provide but I will provide if requested a full project presented to the European Commission by me and a partnership of 14 great organizations that was not financed as it was judged unfeasible. I assume the judge in question may not have had the appropriate time to fully appreciate and understand the work done by a small group of fully involved volunteers and a global community of followers that helped produced the Airesis platform in only 5 years.

Democrae is the next evolution of such implementation formed with some of the top contributors of the Airesis project that I had a personal chance to work and collaborate with over the course of those 5 years.

I stay short on this to give you

To complement this informations we suggest watching the following videos:
- https://youtu.be/rMEEw9twn0 1.16 minutes
- https://youtu.be/bJQd82MSDRg 3.20 minutes
- https://youtu.be/bT2nZaP0fnA Italian only , sorry
- https://youtu.be/7m_z2caJNGA Italian only , sorry
- https://youtu.be/8VmM_eZUqyU Italian only worth looking with cc active and auto translation.
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