

# An open platform for solving global problems

## Author

Andrej Dunajev

The submission proposes an open platform, which will enable anyone who believes they can solve challenges, to delineate them in the form of specific proposals from opinion leaders to solve global challenges. The platform contains an open source wiki for data and descriptions of challenges, and of proposals for solutions. Users can voluntarily donate money on proposals brought forward by opinion leaders on the platform. Participants can influence the price of goods they favor or unfavor through subsidies with the difference going to industries in compliance with their ideas. Identity verification on the platform, of certifications, record-keeping, voting, financial information is to be done through a blockchain passport available to national immigration agencies for easier transfer. Safety will be kept through distributed operations and storage of data, and through special cryptographic software installed by the users. Intellectual property is to be managed by new open system which grant a worthy reward to the author if there is a real need for the invention. It does not limit, but encourages the dissemination of knowledge. With the growth of consumers, the cost of the solution falls to zero. The platform guarantees free access for 10 per cent of the poorest people. An new UNO would establish and support the platform, and make sure proposals on the platform conform with international accords and national laws.



# 1. Abstract

The governance model we propose involves the creation of a tool set (the Platform) through which people who share global values can speak up, make their voices heard, and supply the resources needed for solving the global challenges we face. In addition, an organization (the new UN) would establish and support legal precedents for the tool set.

There is no need to set up an organization that itself would solve the challenges or locate solutions elsewhere. What needs to be set up, rather, is an open platform, which will enable anyone who so wishes, and who believes they can solve certain challenges, to delineate them in the form of specific Proposals. Others, who are prepared to support this, would be able to express their support in the form of changing their financial relations.

Based on the prior experience of mankind, we do not believe in any single model. We also believe that people are not stupid. And one of our fundamental principles is the rejection of any imposition of solutions by force. We are all so interconnected, that as soon as we help people to become conscious of their interaction, everyone will be compelled to make their own conscious choices.

People with global consciousness, as well as self-identity, are needed for solving these global challenges. There are more and more such people throughout the world, but they have not come forward, because until now there has been no organization representing their positions and interests. At the same time, any attempt to deal with such issues at the national level results in solutions for challenges that are in the national interest, and, as a rule, at the expense or to the detriment of other countries, which is what gives rise to the majority of humanitarian violations worldwide, and consequently to global environmental ones.

The Platform will not assume the role of determining a list of challenges to be considered and methods for solving them, but will merely create the needed tool set for implementing solutions proposed by Platform Participants, while ensuring that the tool set functions and that data sources used on the Platform are reliable.

Main components of the Platform:

**Global Open Data Model (GODM).** The GODM is similar to Wikipedia, but is for open-source data and structured descriptions of challenges, rather than text. It provides for uploading data, connecting datasets, and describing the interrelationships between them. The Platform monitors whether or not data are up to date and valid, while providing access to the data and the model for purposes of editing or modelling.

**Proposals Platform (PP).** This is an open platform where some people may propose solutions to challenges (in the form of precise plans of action), while others may familiarize themselves with these and support them.

**The Ecosystem** is a set of new open-source tools for ordering social and economic relations based on new principles:

**Global ID** is a global identification system, through which someone can declare his or her global identity and get involved in the New UN's processes. A blockchain



passport that is integrated with national ID systems, it makes it easier to transfer a person's identification information between national emigration agencies.

**Open Profile** is a storage system for personal information (such as certificates and recommendations), which is connected to Global [ID], where other organizations record information about a person. **Open Vote** is a system of personal declarations, through which one can monitor and become a follower of the declarations of other people. **Frank Society** is a record-keeping system for profiles that interfaces with other public institutions when terms of interaction change based on information in a profile. **Frank Money** is a "smart finance" system that records Open Votes, as well as information about production chains and specific features of economic relations. **The Licence** is a new system for compensation of intellectual labour and capitalization of intellectual property (replacing the existing patents and certificates of authorship), which takes into account the phenomenon of replicability.

The Platform will have distributed operations and distributed storage of all data, on the computers of users who have installed special software. The data storage bank will use cryptographic functions to ensure data immutability and data access control. The Platform's entire code, as well as the algorithms of solutions proposed on the Platform (hereinafter "Proposals") will be open-source and in the public domain, i.e., accessible for all Participants to view and use.

The Platform is an open space for any of its Participants, whether an authentically identified (via Global ID) individual or an organization, to claim their expertise and become an opinion leader.

Data providers voluntarily post research and experimental results on the Platform. Researchers work together to compare and study these data, in order to arrive at high-quality formulations and numerical expressions of the challenges and to determine the interrelationships between them.

Opinion leaders will have a tool for setting up a Proposal (Bill of Actions).

Opinion Leaders will have a tool for making a Proposal (in the form of a list of steps).

Other Participants (followers, sponsors and volunteers) will be able to subscribe to Opinion Leaders and cast Open Votes to support Proposals. Thus, Participants will voluntarily grant the Platform the right to survey and analyse their actions.

Proposals also define additional tax which will be added on top of any purchase which adversely affects the goal a participant voted for. Collected money goes to support the goal in a way predefined by the Proposal Opinion Leader. Small fraction of the collected taxes can go to Opinion Leaders who developed the Proposals in order to support their activity and to The Platform as a licence fee to cover creation of The Platform and its existence.

Thus, we are proposing a system in which people (Significant Followers) voluntarily and openly increase their spending for goals publicly declared by the Opinion Leaders and ways to achieve them, giving others an object lesson. There may be few of them at first, but we presume that they will include the most aware and prosperous people (who are the most advanced and experienced in using their



own money and social connections), and that they will rapidly gain support from numerous groups that share their views.

We believe in people.  
We believe in technologies for cooperation,  
and we know how to make them.

We are all thinking about solutions for global challenges. There are many people besides us who are thinking about the same thing. The solutions have existed in their minds for a long time, but have not yet been implemented. Therefore, the problem is not that solutions have not been found, but that people lack cooperative technologies for implementing them.

### **ACTORS**

**The Organizer** creates the initial software and determines general rules; ensures data validity; and ensures that Proposals comply with human rights principles.

**Data Providers and Researchers** provide data for analysis and for the qualitative and quantitative definition of challenges.

**Opinion Leaders (organizations or individuals)** create Proposals with plans for achieving them, and with all their components; determine data sources and collect the data; and recruit Participants to vote for what has been proposed.

**Participants** identify themselves on the Platform; provide access for the Platform's systems to bank systems containing data on their transactions and investments; cast Votes in support of Proposals; and share their Votes with other Participants.

## **2. Description of the model**

### **THE IMPACT OF AN OPEN VOTE ON THE COST OF GOODS AND SERVICES**

The Platform allows any person (hereinafter, "Participant") to give material form to his Open Vote through public changes in relations with the producers of goods and services he uses. "Changes" in relations occur exclusively by means of the Participant's using Platform tools to apply additional charges to all purchases of goods of producers whose business solutions do not correspond to the Participant's Open Votes.

For example, a Participant may have stated that he is in favour of healthy eating and against harmful additives. Harmful additives are often used to lower cost, and now these products cost him just as much as healthy ones; the Participant has voluntarily fenced himself off from the economic factor when purchasing food. Increasing the cost will make purchasing such goods less attractive for the Participant and increase the probability of his shifting to the products of other producers, whose operations are in accordance with the Participant's Votes.

### **DISTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL CHARGES**

The additional charges will be used to subsidize bringing the relevant production processes into line with the Open Votes or to support those that are already in line.



That is, producers using harmful additives may use this money to improve their production process without harmful additives. It thereby becomes less financially effective for the producer to make decisions that contradict the Votes of his buyers for the purpose of increasing profits, taking into account that his competitors are working under the same conditions.

Where the money accumulated from the additional charges will be directed is also determined on the Platform: whether to subsidizing businesses that are already in line with the person's Votes; to subsidizing credits for businesses that are prepared to change their operations in order to bring them into line with those Votes; to financing needed research, in the event that there is not yet an effective solution to the challenge of concern to the person; or to promoting a given Vote so that more people will vote likewise, etc. It is also possible to define a formula on the Platform, for how the distribution of this money may change over time.

The amount of the charge ideally should reflect the difference in the product's price, were the producer's operations to be brought into line with Participants' Open Votes. The formula for this calculation, as well as sources of data for it, will be provided and fine-tuned on the Platform.

#### **VALIDITY OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN AN OPEN VOTE AND REAL ACTIONS**

In order for their choices to be reliably verifiable and valid, Participants will give the Platform access to their bank details in a format that protects the Participants' privacy. The Platform will accurately record a Participant's completion of transactions and the relevant calculated additional charges through interfaces with payments and banking systems. A token will then be generated as valid confirmation of compliance with the Participant's Open Vote. The Participant will be able to share this token with other people as he wishes, or even make this Vote publicly accessible.

#### **THE EFFECTS OF AN OPEN VOTE ON RELATIONS WITH COMPANIES**

Based on the same principle, the Platform will provide a tool with which someone can bring his relations with companies, in whose stock shares he has invested his savings, into line with his Vote. Or relations with companies he works for, or relations with people hired by his company. As in the case of products, the Platform only allows calculating and effecting additional payments (making interaction with a counterparty more expensive for oneself) or determining voting policy as a shareholder.

All the above-described principles of a Vote are an integral part thereof, and, accordingly, anyone with whom the token of a particular Vote has been shared may view all of their details.

#### **THE CREATION OF PROPOSALS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH OPEN VOTES (OPINION LEADER STATUS)**

For convenience and greater efficiency, the Platform allows any identified person or organization to become an Opinion Leader and set up Proposals for people to cast similar Votes. A Proposal will include a formula for calculating the additional price, as well as data sources, a policy for money invested in shares, the distribution of money received from the additional charges, etc. An Opinion Leader may determine what portion of the additional charge will go towards financing



his activity, as long as the spending of all of these funds is transparent down to the kopeck. All elements of a Proposal will be open for Participants, their algorithms will be distributed as open-source software, and, accordingly, other Opinion Leaders will be allowed to create threads that are variations on these Proposals. People may subscribe to all Proposal updates done by various Opinion Leaders, making it possible for their new initiatives to be disseminated more rapidly.

Proposals make it easy for people to cast their Vote (supporting these Proposals), as well giving that Vote a very big role when the person shares it with others. Especially popular Votes from well-known Opinion Leaders will become, in a sense, marks of excellence, which will be important in many communities. And for some Votes which have to do with the solution of pressing global challenges, it will be possible to develop a social norm, making them part of one's public profile. Thus, the number of people who are following the Proposals of an Opinion Leader and are casting Votes accordingly will determine their decision-making mandate.

A Vote may also determine changes in a Participant's interaction with companies and people who have not cast the same Vote (they cannot present the relevant token, i.e., no such Vote on their part is open for the Participant). Here again, the change will be expressed only through the Participant's adding a charge, over and above the cost of his interaction with them.

### **PARTICIPANTS**

Each monetary transaction of a Participant performs the functions of (i) building a public opinion "barometer", (ii) subsidizing the achievement of the objectives defined by the Vote cast, and (iii) financing the Platform. Having made a choice, a Participant may only raise the cost of a transaction, and only for himself, thereby casting his Vote. The participant himself determines precisely which mechanism in the framework of the Vote he has cast is to receive the additional cost paid in the framework of the transaction.

### **OPINION LEADERS**

They create public Proposals (as a description of a goal and a specific plan for achieving it), thereby expressing their values and worldviews. They may receive a portion of the additional charges for supporting their own activity, individually from each Participant and at the discretion of the latter. They disclose (automatically; this is a Platform requirement) the use of this money, making it possible to monitor reliably that it corresponds to the stated goals and plan. The Platform also explicitly shows deviations from following the Votes (for example, if he has said that he does not use dangerous labour, and all Participants see that the plan for achieving the goal has become more expensive due to spending on labour safety).

### **THE ORGANIZER**

The Organizer provides for the recording of all Votes in a single system. All Votes are personalized, while the consolidated result of the Votes cast is accessible to all Participants.

### **TASKS OF THE ORGANIZATION:**

**a) Software development** – providing development of software for needed components of the Platform, including through recruiting developer communities on the open-source development principle;



**b) Law-making** – providing for the creation of legal precedents to legitimize all Platform tools and allow them to be customized by various organizations and government agencies;

**c) Storage and validation of data** – constructing mechanisms for the collection and distributed storage of verifiable data, including on financial transactions;

**d) Promotion** – promoting the Platform’s activity among potential Opinion Leaders and globally-oriented people;

**e) Human rights** – ensuring that all Proposals published on the Platform are in compliance with universally accepted principles of human rights;

**f) Financing** – determining the portion of payments received by Opinion Leaders which is to be collected by the Organization itself to finance its operations and further advancement.

#### **Examples of how challenges could be solved.**

##### **CLIMATE CHANGE**

We shall analyse current approaches to solving the problem of atmospheric CO2 emissions (and, accordingly, of the associated global destabilization of the climate) and compare them with a proposed new approach. It should be noted that for this example it doesn’t matter how the entire population of Earth sees this problem. As of today, many people believe the problem is real, and that is sufficient for the proposed model.

Taking the example of the European Union, the majority of people believe that this problem exists. And the EU governments, embodying the ideas of that majority and striving to carry out their choice, are implementing the relevant market regulation measures, designed to reduce emissions within the European Union. These regulations appear to be effective. If we take the data on the volume of CO2 emissions in different regions of the planet, we see the following: China and the USA produce the greatest quantity of emissions; in Europe the emissions level is very small, compared with them. European governments have really succeeded in solving this task. But let us add to these data information on the export and import of the goods, production of which entailed these emissions. Then we shall look and see not who is the producer, but who is the consumer of these emissions. How does the picture change? The emissions consumed by the USA only slightly exceed those produced there, but the volume of emissions consumed by Europe is greater than in the USA! The emissions consumed in China turn out to be significantly less.

Yes, indeed, this is exactly how regulations and elected governments work. We elect a government and endow them with responsibility, making no linkage between the results of what happens and our own personal responsibility for our own personal actions. For example, at the moment when we buy a cheaper product, which was produced with large quantities of emissions.

Now we shall analyse how this problem can be solved through the prism of three steps.

I declare my Vote: “I am for reducing CO2 emissions,” and this implies the complex, finely tuned profile of this Vote; I do not necessarily have to have made



adjustments to it myself, but could simply follow another person's Vote, such as that of Ken Caldeira, a Stanford professor of climate science, and he himself may not have fine-tuned it, but might also be following someone else. I can follow him in all Votes related to the environment, or only some of them. On the whole, regardless of whether this system continues to seem complicated to you, this doesn't mean that people will spend a lot of time tweaking these profiles; it will be as simple as using Twitter. So now I have declared this Vote, and then I go to a store to buy, say, a drinking glass. I see two glasses (for starters, let's say they are identical). One was produced in Europe in compliance with the emissions norms, and it costs ten dollars, while the other was produced in China without compliance with the norms (or, rather, statistically without compliance with the norms, since there is no open, authenticated information to the contrary), and it costs five dollars. So that my Open Vote of mine, or, more accurately, the aforementioned profile, contains the information that compliance with the relevant norms raised the price of the first glass by three dollars (this information may be precise, if the producer has provided it through a system of open information and reporting, or, if not, it could be statistical information). Then, since the Open Vote system is linked with my open account, at the moment I decide to purchase a glass, these two glasses will cost me ten and eight dollars, respectively, rather than ten and five. Accordingly the price difference that occurred because of non-compliance with emissions norms on the part of the producer of the second glass will no longer influence my choice (once again, norms here are not defined by laws, but are determined by the profile of the Vote I am following).

Besides my Vote about reducing emissions, I could also vote openly that I am opposed to discrimination against the local labour force, which happens because of low wages abroad. And this Vote of mine could lead to the glasses costing ten and twelve dollars, respectively (with four dollars added to the second glass, based on the difference in the cost of labour). But I might possibly still buy the second glass, which may be better made (Europeans have lost their ability to work well), or it may be the colour I need, whereas no made-in-Europe alternative was offered. But economic factors – the difference in price – would not have influenced my choice. And there is no longer any reason for the producer of the second glass not to comply with the norms.

Returning to the Vote, it may be highly customized; for example, I may believe that it is wrong to discriminate on the basis of labour costs in innovative industries, whereas in other industries I think it is fine. And that is the Vote that will affect my transactions. And that is the Vote that will be openly indicated in my profile. This may be called self-taxation.

You are likely to ask where the difference goes. This, too, is freely adjustable and is determined by the profile of the Vote. It could go towards subsidizing businesses that are already in compliance with the indicated norms, or towards subsidizing other businesses so that they switch to more environmentally friendly production processes, or this money could even go towards advertising the Vote in question, so that more and more people will choose it "openly".

### **LARGE-SCALE ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION**

Besides the fact that people's Open Votes will influence their purchases, the Organization will also create tools that make it possible to affect how their investments in pension funds and hedge funds are used. Pension funds in the





USA alone hold more than \$20 trillion. If these resources are synchronized with people's Votes, that will make it possible to have a significant impact on the decisions of leading world companies. On the one hand, it will become more expensive to have investments in the shares of companies which do not comply with your Votes. On the other hand, representatives of the funds will begin to influence the companies' decisions and to better comply with the Open Votes cast by their customers.

Thus, for example, an Opinion Leader who has collected data supporting the finding that large-scale environmental degradation is primarily associated with the use for land for growing monocultures, could create a Proposal that would help influence companies like Monsanto, the leading dominant company in the seed market for the crops used in this type of production. This influence will be brought to bear not only because it will become more expensive for people to buy end products that use Monsanto's output, but also the resources of the pension funds of people who support that Vote could be used to buy out that company (its market capitalization is only \$50 billion, or 0.2% of total pension fund resources) and change its policy.

#### **VIOLENT CONFLICT**

The majority of violent conflicts in the world require constant replenishment with finances. By making the supply chain of the goods people consume more transparent, we can substantially reduce the financing of militarized groups. The tools created by the Organization will make it possible for goods producers to provide accurate information on their compliance with people's Votes and on which suppliers have been used in producing their products. If some number of goods producers choose not to provide this information, people can cast an open Vote that will lead to an additional tax on their products.

At the same time, it is not enough to reduce one's interaction with those who breed these conflicts. It is also necessary to identify the victims of these conflicts who also share global humanist values. And increase our interactions with these people. To buy their products, and to make our products cheaper for them than for their oppressors. Today the majority of sanctions connected with violent conflicts are directed against entire nations, so we are not only not supporting people who share global values, but we are putting even more pressure on them and depriving them of their means of existence, driving them out of the places where they live, and only polarizing the world even more. The tools created by the Organization will make it possible to identify such people, in part even before the outbreak of a conflict, and to help them promptly at the outbreak of such a conflict, using the Votes of people who are prepared to support them.

#### **EXTREME POVERTY**

Besides the fact that people's Open Votes in and of themselves will make possible more effective support for people below the poverty line, they will make it possible for consumers who are Platform users to influence the policies of leading world businesses.

For example, an Opinion Leader could come out with a Proposal that one of the greatest possibilities for fighting poverty is a revision of how we handle intellectual property (IP). IP is replicable, which means that after creation of the first copy of an intellectual product, all subsequent copies cost virtually nothing. And despite



the fact that companies try to cover the large investments in creating the first copy by selling millions of subsequent copies, there is no reason not to give these copies free of charge to the people who cannot afford them – the poorest ten percent of the population. While this will make it possible to create wealth for them worth several trillion dollars every minute. Thus this Proposal could lead to a pledge by all leading companies to give free access to replicable products they have created to the poorest ten percent of the people both in the world in general and in each country. The tools created by the Organization (user identification and transparent finances) will make it possible to determine accurately who should receive such help.

## 3. Motivation

### A) CORE VALUES

Decisions within the governance model must be guided by the good of all humankind and by respect for the equal value of all human beings.

**Nonviolence.** We reject the idea of the majority and of voting, except as the voluntary and open casting of one's financial vote for the implementation of some solution. If a good solution lacks sufficient votes, it will not be implemented either. Neither the majority nor a minority will choose. Each will choose for himself, and thus the system will self-balance for the maximum good of the maximum number of people.

**Variety of approaches and solutions.** We tolerate and welcome as great as possible variety of points of view on the pathways to solving global challenges, reject criticism and attacks, and provide equal opportunities for any Proposal to be considered, supported, and implemented, if people choose it for themselves.

**Open interactions.** We believe that fully open intentions and goals, methods and operations, participants and resources, and results and conclusions will make it possible to shift from competition to cooperation, as well as fundamentally changing the approaches to interaction and significantly increasing its effectiveness.

### B) DECISION-MAKING CAPACITY

Decision-making within the governance model must generally be possible without crippling delays that prevent the challenges from being adequately addressed (e.g. due to parties exercising powers of veto).

The proposed model is designed to have no bureaucratic delays, since there is no decision-making mechanism for the Proposals offered. A solution is listed for implementation as soon as enough Participants have supported it.

This is like how the crowdfunding model differs from venture investing: when the financing for a project comes directly from its future beneficiaries, it means that no market analysis is required, nor is any evaluation of the risk of possible lack of interest. Here, too, there are no approvals, elections, or expectations of any kind of organizational procedures, because as soon as someone has recognized a challenge and made a Proposal for its solution, it is possible to start immediately.



The Platform fully allows for financing and implementation of Proposals in stages, with interim evaluation of the achievements and results, which could significantly speed up the launch of large-scale projects. This is also good for ensuring quality in plan implementation; if the Participants see from the interim result that the Proposal is not being implemented in accordance with the announced plans, or that an Opinion Leader is violating his Open Votes, or other promises he has made, they can instantaneously disconnect their bank accounts from the Proposal and their Open Profiles from the Opinion Leader.

At the same time, the Platform allows another Opinion Leader to copy that Proposal and propose himself as a new director of the project's implementation. This kind of flexibility in the provision and allocation of resources makes it possible to react almost instantaneously to problems that arise and changing circumstances, and to raise significant amounts of funds. Examples of crowdfunding are a good illustration of how this principle works.

### **C) EFFECTIVENESS**

The governance model must be capable of handling the global challenges and risks, and must include means to ensure the implementation of decisions.

The Platform features an important combination of properties that make it effective for solving such tasks:

The Platform has no political regulations and works directly with challenges and their solutions. This makes it possible to avoid coming under government or philanthropic programs and to avoid solutions from the relevant government agencies, instead beginning to work directly with the existing challenges. One part of the Platform is the Global Open Data Model (GDOM), which helps sort out the nature of complex global challenges, break them down into simpler phenomena, and discover their causes. This significantly increases the chances of handling it as separate parts.

The Platform is unlimited as to forms of support for it. These may be materials, tools, technologies, services, participation as volunteer labour, or money. The greater the challenge, the more people are brought into its space and experience its consequences. And that means there are great potential resources to be assembled for solving it. Anyone who so wishes can choose the form of his own participation in solving the challenges of concern to him.

### **D) RESOURCES AND FINANCING**

The governance model must have sufficient human and material resources at its disposal, and these resources must be financed in an equitable manner.

Private and corporate contributions are certainly greater than any other source of funding. Counting only the possibilities of influencing investments, we arrive at a potential of \$20 trillion in the USA alone. The Platform also allows for participation as a volunteer or in kind, which significantly broadens the possibilities of providing resources for Proposals. A good feature of the Platform is that the Participants themselves decide on the sufficiency of financing and see the Proposal's Budget beforehand, so that they have an opportunity to evaluate its adequacy and compare it with the Proposals of other Opinion Leaders.



## **E) TRUST AND INSIGHT**

The trust enjoyed by a successful governance model and its institutions relies on transparency and considerable insight into power structures and decision-making.

The Model provides for direct and transparent interaction with an Opinion Leader (or voluntary transparent delegation on the basis of following an Open Vote), as well as transparent implementation of a Proposal, so Participants have every tool for developing reliable and well-founded trust.

Another source of trust is the Open Votes of the Opinion Leader and Participants, since they allow seeing each other's profile of preferences, attitudes in life, and values before the beginning of their interaction. From the outset the Platform focuses on providing transparency and validity of data, the lack of which is one of the strongest factors in the genesis of mistrust between participants in joint projects today.

Transparency of intentions and projects and transparency in fundraising have made modern crowdfunding an area of unusually high trust. It shaped a culture of support and ensured that there would be a low level of thievery; parties who are interested and open to each other have opportunities for careful study of a project and the prior experience of its team, and for making a prudent and well-founded decision. The Platform takes the next step, by likewise disclosing both the use of money and the implementation of the project. This allows Participants not merely to await the end of a project, but to follow the course of the process and have an opportunity to help with current operations or suggest better solutions.

## **F) FLEXIBILITY**

In order to be able to fulfil its objectives effectively, a successful governance model must contain mechanisms that allow for revisions and improvements to be made to its structure and components.

Openness gives an opportunity to keep track of each stage of consideration and implementation of a Proposal, and to reuse any of its fragments. The model also allows for support of several Proposals at once, comparing the implementation and (interim) results.

## **G) PROTECTION AGAINST THE ABUSE OF POWER**

A control system must be in place to take action if the organization oversteps its mandate, e.g. by unduly interfering with the internal affairs of nation states or favouring the special interests of individuals, groups, organizations, states or groups of states.

On the one hand, we offer a system in which the principle of nonviolence has been elevated to an absolute: Opinion Leaders have no authority to impose anything, but only to put forward their Proposals. Participants also have no obligations and voluntarily support those Proposals, which they consider correct and in accordance with their values.

On the other hand, we understand that some Proposals may affect people in the world who do not support them and do not wish to see such changes in the world. And indirectly this becomes forcible interference in their lives.



To minimize these risks we propose to create an organization called the New UN, which will ensure that all Proposals on the Platform comply with international agreements on the defence of human rights, as well as the local laws of the countries within which the Proposals in question are to be implemented.

In the implementation of Proposals on changing laws, the Platform will also act exclusively by legal methods, not exceeding its authority under the law. The Platform does not exclude the possibility of participation by individuals who are currently government officials as Opinion Leaders, which gives the Platform opportunities to implement Proposals for improvement at the highest level.

#### **H) ACCOUNTABILITY**

It is a fundamental requirement of a successful governance model that it perform the tasks it has been charged with, and the governance model must include the power to hold the decision-makers accountable for their actions.

In our proposed model we rely on two factors: total transparency, and direct interaction between Participants and Opinion Leaders. As of today, this system is closest of all to a real-time mandate. An Opinion Leader receives support not for some period of time or general authority, but for a totally specific Proposal, and he earns his reputation in only one way – by open actions in accordance with his Proposal.

If an Opinion Leader ceases to act in accordance with the agreements, or with the Open Votes towards which the Participants following him are oriented, then they begin to unsubscribe from him, disconnecting their bank accounts from support of the Proposal and their Open Profiles from the Opinion Leader himself. He immediately begins to lose both support in the form of Followers and money for the implementation of his Proposal.

We believe that openness and the opportunity to change one's decisions, direct interaction, and voluntary cooperation around a goal of mutual interest are a far stronger idea than any sort of regulation-making or taking decisions on behalf of other people.