

Judging Criteria

by The Program for the Future, Design Challenge

Your Method, Tool or Technology

- Q1 Can your innovation be a stepping stone towards enabling people to solve an important **problem**?
- A1 Yes, setting budgets quickly and fairly is important to small groups and great nations.
- Q2 Does your innovation promote **communication** and **collaboration**?
- A2 Yes. It makes people show their priorities clearly and honestly. It helps them share resources to support common goods.
- Q3 Will your innovation enable changes in the way people work together that will lead to better **decisions** or outcomes?
- A3 Yes, it makes co-operation more satisfying and safe – this reduces the underfunding of common goods.
- Q4 Does your innovation **scale**, continuing to support better outcomes even as more people use it?
- A4 Yes, the time used does not balloon with more voters. A larger, more diverse group may achieve better decisions.
- Q5 Does your innovation have the potential to change social and **cultural practices** for the better?
- A5 Yes, it makes co-operation more satisfying and safe. Voting rules affect our laws – and our views on life. By making us practice winner-take-all or sharing, rules change the way we treat each other and see the world.

Your Demo

- Q6 Is your demo **hands-on** and interactive? Is the **museum** visitor's experience an improvement over Web access?
- A6 Yes, our **workshop** is a rewarding social experience. Voters move their cards on a tally board, working together as they try to fund projects or treats.
- Q7 Does your demo adequately **explain how** and why your method, tool or technology works?
- A7 Yes, visitors can see the pieces coming together for a budget.
- Q8 Will your demo **inspire** others?

A8 Yes, many people are excited to learn that voting does not have to mean winner take all.

Your Plan for Impact

- A Our plan is to promote MMV initially in colleges, high schools and large co-ops.
- Q9 Is your plan likely to lead to successful **adoption** and widespread dissemination?
- A9 Yes, its cost of implementation is very low.

In October 2009 we tallied the world's first MMV allocation. At the same time, Chicago alderman Joe Moore announced his country's first public process for a Participatory Budget. Our tool can help hurried American voters participate.

Q10 Would winning a **prize** make a significant difference to your innovation's potential impact?

A11 The traits of our target **audience** are the same as the museum's visitors: students, early adopters.

Most Americans don't think of votes as technology. They don't know there is more than one way to elect reps. Most of the minority who understand IRV and PR think such inventions were completed in the 19th century. Most of the few who know of recent work on voting think it is just theoretical tinkering with the fine details.

Our leading tech museums can help lift this ignorance.

Q11 Does your plan favor **community contribution** and **global connection**?

A11 Yes, any council or club that respects all members can use it. This includes local and international foundations, NGOs...

The Top 10 Collective Intelligence Goals

Voted at the 2008 Program for the Future Conference

1. To develop more intelligent forms of **collective governance and accountability** and responsibility
MMV voters can see a rep's grants to each program, tax cut or debt reduction and hold her accountable.
2. We are excited by the potential of collaborative intelligence to make **learning** a ubiquitous and lifelong endeavor.
MMV voters learn as they read proposals and weigh the realistic choices.
3. We believe that the highest goal of collective

intelligence (CI) is the restoration of **integrity** at the individual, community, institutional, governmental, global levels as well as down to the level of knowledge, ideas and data.

MMV reveals each voter's honest priorities.

4. Collective Intelligence Communities (NIC's) should also value and support **dissent**.

MMV goes further; it gives minorities fair shares of power – within a limited part of the budget. (It can be used to allocate a large or small fraction of a group's overall budget.)

5. To use social networks and a deeper understanding of our own perceptions and cognitive **frameworks** to enable more effective collaboration.

MMV finds allies we were not aware of; in effect, it creates a Venn diagram of overlapping support for varied proposals

6. Make sure CI methods are part of an ongoing process for **improvement**, not a one-time shot.

MMV we hope will be featured at our next Web site, annual-meeting.org.

7. Design a **learning system** capable of evolving a life-enhancing world full of creativity, passion, & invention.

MMV will fund voter-initiated projects *e.g.* proposals for student-initiated Winter-Term projects.

8. Cooperatively study and experiment to scientifically understand how people and organizations work and how to improve through feedback (*i.e.* Bootstrap with NIC's).

MMV ballots are data for studies.

9. Integrate the human side to identify and solve the right problems – transparently incorporating values and motivations to **find common ground out of diversity**.

MMV excels at this.

10. Nurture and support access to **multiple modal** interfaces (*e.g.* voice, screenless, etc.) to educate next generations.

MMV can reach students through print or Web pages of text, pictures, screencast movies or simulation games.

Places to Intervene in a System

by Donella Meadows (emphasis and MMV notes added)
<http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/419>

12. **Constants**, parameters, numbers (subsidies, taxes, standards).
11. Sizes of **buffers** and other stabilizing stocks, relative to their flows.
10. **Structure** of material stocks and flows (such as transport networks, population age structures).
9. Lengths of **delays**, relative to the rate of system change. {lag time before effect is seen}.

MMV's **fast** voting on projects and budgets allows biannual meetings to start projects and adjust budgets.

8. Strength of **negative feedback** loops, relative to the impacts they are trying to correct against.
7. The gain around driving **positive feedback** loops.
6. Structure of **information flows** (who does and does not have access to what kinds of information).

MMV finds more **nodes** of co-operation. It makes budget votes more **transparent** to everyone. It responds to more people, so it has more awareness of needs.

5. **Rules** of the system (incentives, punishments, constraints).

MMV makes (hidden) empires less profitable. So it may reduce empire building.

4. **Power** to add, change, evolve, or self-organize system structure.

MMV gives ad hoc groups the power to initiate projects without new levels of administration, taxes or dues.

3. **Goals** of the system.
2. The **mindset** or paradigm out of which the system – its goals, structure, rules, delays, parameters – arises.

MMV changes our concept of democracy toward fundamentally cooperative relationships, neither adversarial nor consensual.

1. The power to **transcend** paradigms.

“The higher the leverage point, the more the system will resist changing it...” – Donella Meadows

MMV gives access to several high leverage points. Organizing people for **power** is a very high leverage point in a system. Yet this tool can be put to use quickly by any group, large or small, that chooses to try it. It is free and doesn't require special equipment or expertise to get going. Many colleges, clubs, co-ops, condos, or congregations can use this tool on their own.

A voting system is a **“tool between people.”** It clearly defines a very public model showing us the way to treat each other. Thus voting affects our quality of life, not only in setting our policies and budgets but also in setting our mixture of conflict and co-operation, the respect we give and receive. “Do unto others...”

This tool promotes reasonable, just and peaceful **relations** among people. MMV involves everyone, a super majority, working together. It pools together their knowledge of the community's priorities.

Although the funds for fair-share spending might be limited, the right to spend some revenue is a major expansion in the basic **concept** of democracy, similar to earlier expansions in the right to vote and the right to representation. How important are those?

Two of this century's greatest **challenges** are to manage cultural diversity and to allocate resources efficiently and fairly. Our invention helps with both.

Meet the Inventors of Fair-share Spending

Q last, Who invented this Design-Challenge entry?

A last, We did!

Fair-share Spending has been developed mainly by current and former members of **Twin Oaks Community**: co-founder Kat Kinkade, Trade-Off Game innovator Prof. Henry Hammer, quota co-inventor Keenan Dakota, facilitator Tree Bressen, activator Paxus Calta and gamer Jess Little.

Rob Loring has made accurate democracy his top priority since 1989. Without his persistence, there probably would have been little progress on FS. “In the creation of Fair-share Spending, I was chiefly the chain of a necklace; its gems were discovered and shaped by visionary minds who have graced my life.”

Dr. Robert Tupelo-Schneck invented and programmed the best system for Fair-share Spending. In less than two years of part-time volunteer work, he:

- greatly improved the algorithm;
- programmed it;
- tested it;
- programmed an easy-to-use yet powerful ballot;*
- helped arrange its first real-world use;
- performed the tally (in autumn 2009); and
- presented its results to the community of voters.

They compared the fair-share results to those from their old winner-take-all method. They chose the fair-share results and thanked Robert many times.

* Please try out the ballot at:

<http://tupelo-schneck.org:8080/cgi-bin/WebObjects/OtraBallot.woa/wa/login>