

THE PLANET'S VOTE

WORLD DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

A Framework for Planetary-Scale Direct Democracy

White Paper - Version 2.0 | June 2026

INTRODUCTION

Today, in 2026, there still exists no global effort or adequate funding to address the events that threaten our very existence every day. In past mass extinction events, up to 90% of all life on Earth was wiped out by one or more of these forces. Supervolcanoes can erupt at any moment, and while scientists believe they can be de-pressurised - NASA's own proposals project that eruption probability could be reduced by up to 72% - addressing this is not on the agenda of most governments. AI itself has explained several scenarios whereby it could bring about our demise, yet no globally accepted regulations for its productive use are in place. Near-Earth objects such as asteroids have been successfully deflected by NASA's DART program, but planetary defence remains underfunded. Reversals of the North and South magnetic poles have occurred in the past, and some scientists have identified signs that another may be beginning, yet it remains an unimportant topic to the world at large.

This project is a necessary attempt to coordinate an urgent global response. Individuals are not blind to the fact that the main focus of governments and corporations is unfortunately mostly power and profit, not long-term planetary stability. By the sheer weight of its numbers, a platform that allows all individuals to have their say on these things will give governments and world bodies the mandated power to act. We urge decision-makers worldwide to support this worthy cause. Humanity has never lacked the intelligence to solve its greatest problems. It has lacked the institutional architecture to act on that intelligence collectively, at the speed and scale those problems demand. The Planet's Vote is that architecture.

Every existential threat facing humanity shares a single defining characteristic: it cannot be addressed by any nation acting alone, and it cannot wait for the consensus mechanisms of institutions designed in a different century. The United Nations, the WHO, the IAEA- these bodies represent genuine achievements of human cooperation. But they were built for a world of sovereign actors negotiating with each other. They were not built for a world that requires 8 billion people to act as one, on a decision that affects all of them equally. No such mechanism has ever existed. Until now.

The Planet's Vote is a verified, cryptographically private, geographically distributed platform for direct planetary democracy. Every adult human being, regardless of nationality, wealth, language, or location, holds exactly one vote on the decisions that determine the future of the species. A resolution requires a genuine supermajority- 66.7% of participating voters-

plus a minimum floor of support across all geographic regions, so that no result can pass without resonance in every part of the world.

The platform has been designed to be tamper-proof, coercion-resistant, and auditable by anyone in the world in real time. Its identity infrastructure does not store personal data. Its voting mechanism cannot be reverse engineered to reveal how any individual voted. Its code is open-source, and its results are written to a public, immutable ledger that no government, corporation, or institution can alter or delete.

This is not a proposal for world government. The Planet's Vote does not seek to replace nations, dissolve borders, or override domestic law. It seeks to do one specific and necessary thing: give humanity a voice on the decisions that belong to all of humanity- and give that voice a weight that no government, institution, or power bloc can simply ignore.

The mandate that emerges from a two-thirds global supermajority is something the world has never had before. It is more legitimate than any treaty, more representative than any election, more durable than any resolution passed by a body of state delegates negotiating in their national interest. It is the expressed will of the people of Earth -verified, counted, published, and permanent. The cost of building and operating this platform is negligible measured against what it protects. The cost of not building it is everything.

This White Paper is an invitation- to governance scholars, technologists, legal experts, democratic theorists, civil society organisations, national governments, and individual human beings everywhere- to treat this project with the seriousness it deserves and the urgency the moment demands.

Key Metrics:

Parameter	Value
Eligible voters at launch	~5.2 billion adults globally
Supermajority threshold	66.7% (two-thirds) of participating voters
Crisis vote threshold	75% of participating voters
Constitutional threshold	80% of participating voters
Voting cycle	Quarterly (demand-triggered)
Issues per cycle	Minimum 2, maximum 5 + emergency overrides
Identity standard	Self-sovereign, biometric-verified, zero-knowledge
Minimum participation	20% of registered voters globally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I - The Problem: Why Nations Cannot Solve Planetary Problems

- 1.1 The Structural Failure of Nation-State Governance
- 1.2 The Democratic Deficit in International Institutions

Part II - The Solution: Architecture of The Planet's Vote

- 2.1 Foundational Principles
- 2.2 The Jurisdictional Test
 - 2.2.1 Hardened Constitutional Boundaries
 - 2.2.2 The Jurisdictional Appeals Panel
- 2.3 Deliberation and Informed Participation
- 2.4 The Demand-Triggered Voting Model
- 2.5 Regional Legitimacy and Dual Concurrence
- 2.6 Emergency Override Protocol
- 2.7 Planetary Coordination Council
- 2.8 Legitimacy, Inclusion, and Non-Western Governance Traditions

Part III - Technical Architecture

- 3.1 Five Technical Pillars
- 3.2 Identity Verification - A Phased Deployment Architecture
- 3.3 Zero-Knowledge Voting and Cryptographic Privacy
- 3.4 Coercion-Resistance Architecture
 - 3.4.1 The 'Last Vote Wins' Overwrite Protocol
 - 3.4.2 The Stochastic Buffer Protocol
 - 3.4.3 Physical Community Attestation Havens
 - 3.4.4 Community Attestation Vulnerability Mitigations
- 3.5 Accessibility and Offline Pathways
- 3.6 Soft Sybil and AI-Driven Ideological Capture

Part IV - The Enforcement Architecture

- 4.1 Replacing the Parliament–Executive Analogy
- 4.2 The Graduated Legitimacy Model
- 4.3 The Bypass Architecture
- 4.4 Economic and Reputational Enforcement Mechanisms
- 4.5 Clarifying the Legal Status of Resolutions

Part V - Constitutional Framework and Governance Safeguards

- 5.1 The Constitutional Layer - Development Process
- 5.2 Oversight Architecture and Anti-Capture Safeguards
- 5.3 Failure Mode Governance

Part VI - Financial Sustainability

- 6.1 Operational Funding - The Scale of the Challenge
- 6.2 The Phased Funding Model
- 6.3 Financial Governance

Part VII - The First Vote: Planetary Defence

- 7.1 Why Planetary Defence is the Right First Issue
- 7.2 The Shadow Vote Strategy

Part VIII - Strategic Innovations and Future Directions

- 8.1 Liquid Sortition Networks
- 8.2 Retroactive Democratic Bounties

8.3 Participation Equity Dashboards

8.4 Post-Election Forensic Audit Protocol

Part IX - Implementation Roadmap

Closing Statement

PART I - THE PROBLEM: WHY NATIONS CANNOT SOLVE PLANETARY PROBLEMS

1.1 The Structural Failure of Nation-State Governance

The nation-state is a remarkable human invention - a mechanism for organising collective decision-making across populations of millions. But it was designed for a world in which the most consequential threats were local or regional: invasion, famine, disease within borders. The 21st century has rendered that assumption obsolete.

The five greatest threats to human civilisation share a single defining characteristic: they are indifferent to national borders.

1. **Super volcanic eruption:** A Yellowstone-class eruption would inject sufficient sulphur dioxide into the upper atmosphere to reduce global temperatures by 5–10 degrees Celsius for three to seven years, collapsing agriculture and potentially killing billions within a decade. Current mitigation research is critically underfunded. No coordinated international programme exists to extract heat from any super volcanic system. NASA has published preliminary proposals for deep geothermal drilling at Yellowstone, projecting that a network of boreholes could reduce eruption probability by up to 72% over a century at an estimated cost of \$3.46 billion - roughly three days of global military spending. The absence of such a programme is not a technical failure. It is a governance failure.
2. **Near-earth object impact:** NASA's DART mission in 2022 demonstrated that kinetic deflection of an asteroid is not science fiction - it works. We know what to do. We lack only the institutional framework to authorise doing it at planetary scale. The International Asteroid Warning Network and the Space Mission Planning Advisory Group exist as voluntary coordination bodies with no binding authority and no dedicated funding. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty restricts the use of nuclear devices in space - a restriction that may need revisiting for large-object deflection scenarios.
3. **Pandemic:** The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the catastrophic cost of uncoordinated national responses to a global biological threat. A pathogen with higher lethality and equivalent transmissibility would constitute an existential event under conditions of fractured governance.
4. **Irreversible climate change:** The window for meaningful mitigation is closing. International climate frameworks have produced commitments without enforcement mechanisms sufficient to compel compliance.

5. **Misaligned artificial general intelligence:** The development of AGI without globally coordinated safety standards represents a risk that no nation can manage unilaterally.

Yet our decision-making architecture remains profoundly national. The United Nations operates by consensus among sovereign states - a process that moves at diplomacy's pace rather than planetary threats' pace.

1.2 The Democratic Deficit in International Institutions

Existing international bodies were designed for a world that has changed profoundly since their founding. The question The Planet's Vote asks is not whether these institutions have value, but whether they are sufficient, alone, for the scale and speed of the planetary challenges now facing humanity.

The Planet's Vote is designed to complement existing institutions, not to replace them, by providing something none of them currently possess: a direct, verified democratic mandate from the people of Earth. A resolution passed by a two-thirds (66.7%) supermajority of participating voters across all regions of the world carries a moral and political authority that no treaty negotiated between governments can match.

Historical Precedent: The closest analogues to what The Planet's Vote proposes are the Antarctic Treaty System (1959), which placed an entire continent under cooperative international governance, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968). Both demonstrated that nations can cede a narrow domain of sovereignty when the existential stakes are sufficiently clear. Crucially, both began as moral frameworks before hardening into binding instruments over decades. The Planet's Vote follows the same trajectory deliberately, not reluctantly.

PART II - THE SOLUTION: ARCHITECTURE OF THE PLANET'S VOTE

2.1 Foundational Principles

The Planet's Vote is built on seven foundational principles:

Principle	Definition	Implication
One Person, One Vote	Every adult human being has exactly equal voting weight regardless of nationality, wealth, or geography	No nation's citizens count more than any other's
Supermajority Legitimacy	No resolution passes without 66.7% of participating voters. Crisis and constitutional thresholds are higher	Prevents bare-majority tyranny on planetary decisions
Radical Transparency	Every line of code, every algorithmic parameter, every vote count is publicly auditable in real time	Eliminates the possibility of hidden manipulation
Cryptographic Privacy	Zero-knowledge proofs guarantee that individual votes cannot be identified or coerced	Separates verifiability from identifiability
Geographic Sovereignty	No single nation can shut down the platform. Infrastructure is distributed across jurisdictions	Prevents authoritarian capture
Scientific Grounding	The trending algorithm classifies questions by evidentiary confidence level, publishes minority scientific reports, and requires adversarial review	Prevents misinformation from capturing the global agenda
Subsidiarity	The Planet's Vote votes only on issues that genuinely require planetary-level coordination. All other matters remain with nations, regions, and communities	Prevents global overreach into local affairs

2.2 The Jurisdictional Test

The most important constitutional question for any governance system is: what falls within its jurisdiction? The Planet's Vote defines its scope as planetary-scale issues- but without a precise test, that definition is vulnerable to gradual expansion. Almost any issue can eventually be framed as global: migration, economics, speech, energy, reproduction, food systems, education, public health. Over decades, jurisdiction naturally expands unless constitutionally restrained.

The Planet's Vote therefore adopts an explicit four-part constitutional jurisdictional test. A matter qualifies for planetary voting only if ALL of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The issue produces transnational consequences that materially affect humanity beyond national borders.
2. No individual nation can effectively mitigate the issue alone.
3. Coordinated planetary action substantially improves outcomes compared to uncoordinated national responses.
4. The issue cannot reasonably be governed at a lower level of subsidiarity - that is, it cannot be adequately addressed by cities, regions, or nations acting independently.

This four-part test is constitutional. Any proposed question that fails any one of the four criteria is outside the scope of The Planet's Vote, regardless of how many people signal support for it.

2.2.1 Hardened Constitutional Boundaries and Jurisdiction Expansion

Jurisdiction expansion - the addition of new issue categories to the platform's scope - requires a separate constitutional amendment track distinct from ordinary votes. This track requires:

- A supermajority in every geographic region (not merely a global supermajority)
- A mandatory minimum deliberation period of 24 months between proposal and vote
- A 75% global constitutional threshold (above the standard 66.7%)
- Publication and public comment on the proposed expansion for a minimum of 12 months before the vote opens
- Formal review by the Jurisdictional Appeals Panel confirming the proposed expansion satisfies the four-part test

No question that fails the four-part jurisdictional test may be placed on any ballot - standard, constitutional, or emergency - regardless of signal support. The Jurisdictional Appeals Panel's determination that a question fails the test cannot be overridden by voter petition alone; it requires a constitutional amendment to the test itself.

Provisionally out-of-scope categories (these require the full constitutional amendment track, not a shadow vote, to bring into scope):

- Religion, religious practice, and the internal governance of religious institutions
- The internal constitutional arrangements of sovereign states, including electoral systems and governmental structures
- Language policy and the internal linguistic choices of nations and communities

- Cultural and educational content within national and regional jurisdictions

2.2.2 The Jurisdictional Appeals Panel

Edge cases are inevitable. Some issues will sit on the boundary of the jurisdictional test - AI safety sub-domains, pandemic-related supply chains, transboundary resource management - where reasonable people applying the four-part test in good faith reach different conclusions.

The Planet's Vote therefore establishes a standing Jurisdictional Appeals Panel. The panel consists of rotating global scholars drawn from legal, governance, and democratic theory backgrounds, with no more than one member from any single nation or civilisational tradition, appointed through an open public process. Its mandate is narrow: to determine whether a specific proposed question satisfies or fails each of the four jurisdictional criteria, and to publish its reasoning in full.

A binding Jurisdictional Decision Matrix is published alongside this White Paper and maintained as a living document. It records all panel determinations with reasoning, building a body of precedent that governs future edge cases. This prevents ad hoc decisions and reduces the risk of jurisdictional ambiguity being weaponised.

Panel decisions may be appealed to the registered voter base through a defined process, ensuring that jurisdictional determinations remain ultimately accountable to the people the platform serves.

2.3 Deliberation and Informed Participation

The Planet's Vote recognises that democratic legitimacy does not arise solely from equal voting rights. Legitimacy also depends upon whether participants have meaningful access to information, competing perspectives, and sufficient opportunity to reflect before decisions are made.

The platform therefore adopts a Deliberation and Informed Participation Framework.

This framework does not require ideological agreement, nor does it compel voters to consume prescribed content before voting. Universal participation remains absolute. Every eligible voter retains equal voting rights regardless of educational background, level of engagement, or completion of deliberative materials.

The purpose of the framework is narrower and more practical: to ensure every participant has access to fair, transparent and comprehensible decision-support structures before participating in planetary decisions.

Deliberation is understood not as a mechanism for determining outcomes, but as a process for improving both public understanding and the quality of proposals themselves. Democratic authority always remains with participating voters.

The framework operates according to ten principles.

1. Information Accessibility

Every ratified question must be accompanied by plain-language explanatory materials translated into major world languages and adapted for accessibility requirements wherever practical.

Materials should be understandable to a non-specialist audience without requiring technical expertise. Complexity in the underlying issue does not justify inaccessible public communication.

Participants may access multilingual explanatory resources tailored to differing levels of technical knowledge, including AI-assisted educational tools where appropriate, provided such tools remain transparent, publicly auditable, and do not advocate particular voting outcomes.

2. Question Framing Integrity

Before entering the preparation process, every proposed question undergoes an independent framing review to ensure that it is:

- clear and unambiguous
- free from emotionally persuasive or misleading language
- capable of being answered meaningfully by voters
- accompanied by a clearly defined implementation pathway where applicable
- consistent with the constitutional jurisdiction of The Planet's Vote.

Where multiple legitimate formulations exist, the reasons for selecting the final wording are published. Editorial decisions, revisions, and disagreements are documented through publicly accessible version histories.

3. Adversarial Balance

Every question placed before voters must publish:

- the strongest good-faith arguments supporting the proposal
- the strongest good-faith arguments opposing the proposal
- the quality and strength of the available evidence supporting each position

- areas of scientific or practical uncertainty
- unresolved disagreements
- minority expert perspectives where they exist
- known implementation trade-offs.

The objective is not to manufacture artificial balance where evidence overwhelmingly favours one position. Rather, it is to ensure that voters understand the strongest available arguments, the quality of the supporting evidence, and any remaining areas of legitimate disagreement. Fairness concerns the integrity of the process, not the equal weighting of unequal evidence.

4. Evidence Transparency

All expert submissions, reviews, assumptions, methodologies and source materials informing the final question must be publicly available and permanently archived. Voters must be able to inspect not only conclusions, but also the reasoning and evidence supporting them.

All contributors must disclose relevant conflicts of interest, funding sources, institutional affiliations, and declared advocacy roles.

Where appropriate, briefing materials distinguish between:

- empirical questions capable of scientific investigation
- ethical or value-based judgements
- implementation choices involving policy trade-offs.

Where disagreement primarily reflects differing values rather than disputed evidence, this distinction should be made explicit.

Where scientific evidence exists, briefing materials should communicate:

- current confidence levels
- principal uncertainties
- areas requiring further research
- the degree of expert consensus where measurable.

5. Independent Deliberation

The preparation of briefing materials should be institutionally separated from the governance bodies responsible for administering votes. Independent multidisciplinary editorial panels, operating under transparent appointment processes and conflict-of-interest requirements, should oversee the preparation of explanatory materials.

Relevant expertise may include scientific, engineering, legal, economic, ethical, Indigenous, community, and lived-experience perspectives where appropriate to the question under consideration.

Experts do not determine democratic outcomes. Their role is to clarify evidence, identify uncertainties, explain implementation challenges, and assist public understanding. Democratic authority remains exclusively with participating voters.

6. Participatory Deliberation

The platform may provide structured opportunities for:

- multilingual public discussion
- moderated public submissions
- citizen panels and assemblies
- expert question-and-answer sessions
- AI-assisted neutral summarisation
- future deliberative mechanisms.

Participation remains voluntary and may never become a prerequisite for voting eligibility.

Deliberation may begin during proposal development, allowing proponents, experts and participants to improve proposals before they progress through the voting process. The platform's role is to support informed participation - not to prescribe correct conclusions.

7. Deliberation Readiness Standard

No question proceeds to a binding vote until minimum deliberation readiness standards are satisfied. These standards include:

- briefing materials published
- translation requirements met
- framing review completed
- adversarial review completed
- minority reports disclosed
- expert submissions archived
- accessibility requirements satisfied
- public preparation period completed
- independent editorial review completed.

Questions failing readiness requirements remain active but do not proceed to voting.

8. Pre-Vote Preparation Window

Every ratified question enters a structured preparation period before voting opens.

Stage 1 - Publication. Question text, implementation implications and initial briefing materials are released.

Stage 2 - Expert Review. Relevant experts review evidence, identify uncertainties, and provide commentary.

Stage 3 - Public Participation. Public submissions, discussion and clarifying questions are accepted.

Stage 4 - Revision and Synthesis. Feedback from expert review and public participation may result in revisions to:

- question wording
- implementation details
- explanatory materials
- supporting evidence.

Substantive revisions are published together with explanations of what changed and why.

Where revisions materially alter the intent of the proposal, the proposal returns to an earlier stage of review before progressing.

The platform also publishes:

- summary materials
- unresolved disagreements
- evidence confidence assessments
- minority reports
- responses explaining why major recommendations were accepted, modified or rejected.

Where appropriate, participants are also informed of what evidence or circumstances would reasonably change the principal positions presented.

Stage 5 - Voting. Voting opens.

The preparation window exists not simply to educate voters, but to improve the quality, clarity and legitimacy of the proposal itself before democratic decision-making begins.

9. Institutional Learning

Following each shadow or binding vote, the platform publishes a Deliberation Report documenting:

- participation patterns
- regional inclusion metrics
- deliberation engagement
- proposal revisions throughout development
- areas of consensus
- areas of disagreement
- evidence challenges
- framing decisions
- lessons for future democratic cycles.

Question evolution logs remain permanently accessible so that the development of every proposal remains transparent over time.

10. Continuous Improvement

The Planet's Vote recognises that deliberative democracy remains an evolving field. The platform commits to continuously evaluating emerging research, conducting independent review of its deliberative processes, and adapting its framework through transparent constitutional processes where improvements are demonstrated.

Future iterations may explore:

- deliberative mini-publics
- liquid sortition networks
- rotating planetary juries
- citizen assemblies
- participatory budgeting mechanisms
- structured global dialogue formats
- AI-assisted deliberation support
- new methods for improving accessibility, inclusion and collective reasoning.

These mechanisms remain advisory unless constitutionally ratified otherwise.

The Planet's Vote does not assume that informed participation and democratic scale are opposing values. It treats them as complementary design challenges to be solved together.

2.4 The Demand-Triggered Voting Model

The Planet's Vote does not operate on a fixed calendar. Votes are triggered by the demonstrated will of registered individuals - not by the passage of time.

Votes are held on a quarterly schedule - a maximum of four times per year. The Emergency Override Protocol operates entirely outside this quarterly schedule.

Any verified individual registered voter may propose a question. Organisations, corporations, governments, and institutions may not propose questions - only individual human beings. This principle is non-negotiable.

Before a proposed question enters the active signal queue, it must pass a scientific ratification process conducted by individual scientists and researchers - verified as individuals with relevant expertise - not by institutions or organisations acting as bodies.

The ratification process serves two purposes only:

- Scientific soundness: is the question grounded in scientific evidence, or does it misrepresent the state of knowledge?
- Plain language phrasing: is the question intelligible to a person with no specialist background?

The signal threshold required to trigger a formal vote is phased in proportion to the registered voter base:

- Phase 1 (under 1 million registered voters): threshold is 100,000 individual signals
- Phase 2 (1 million to 50 million registered voters): threshold is 1 million individual signals
- Phase 3 (over 50 million registered voters): threshold is 2% of total registered voters - at full global registration, approximately 110 million signals

A quarterly vote is called when a minimum of two ratified questions have each independently reached the signal threshold. A maximum of five questions may appear on any single quarterly ballot.

Questions do not expire. After one year in the active queue without crossing the threshold, a question moves to the Archive but remains active and signable indefinitely.

2.5 Regional Legitimacy and Dual Concurrence

A global supermajority is powerful. But a vote can win globally while losing catastrophically in specific regions - and that asymmetry matters enormously for legitimacy. Historical patterns of colonialism mean a world vote weighted only by population could reproduce the same asymmetries of power it was meant to overcome.

The Planet's Vote therefore adopts a dual concurrence requirement:

For a resolution to pass with binding authority, it must achieve:

- A global supermajority of 66.7% of participating voters; AND
- A minimum of 40% support in each of the platform's six geographic regions: Africa, Asia-Pacific, the Americas, Eurasia, the Middle East and North Africa, and Other

The regional minimum of 40% is not a veto - no single region can block a genuine global consensus. It is a floor ensuring no resolution passes in the complete absence of support from any part of the world.

Regional Concurrence and Participation Equity Metrics: The Planet's Vote commits to publishing, before any binding vote, a dashboard of regional turnout, registration friction, device-access gaps, and refusal rates. If the dashboard reveals that the 40% regional floor cannot be meaningfully met in a given region due to structural exclusion - infrastructure deficits, state repression, systematic identity pathway exclusion - the floor may be adjusted through the multi-cycle constitutional ratification process. It cannot be lowered ad hoc.

The Emergency Override Protocol does not require regional concurrence. In verified planetary emergencies, the global supermajority threshold alone determines the outcome.

2.6 Emergency Override Protocol

For threats of planetary-class urgency, the standard quarterly schedule is suspended. A crisis vote opens within six hours of verified threat confirmation, provided:

- Independent verification by at least three internationally recognised scientific institutions
- Classification of the threat as planetary-class by the Planetary Science Advisory Panel
- Formal notification to all registered voters via the platform's emergency broadcast system

Crisis votes remain open for 48 hours. The supermajority threshold is raised to 75%. Crisis resolutions authorise the Planetary Coordination Council to act immediately with the resources and mandate specified in the resolution.

The Emergency Override Protocol is not a mechanism for bypassing democracy - it is a mechanism for exercising democracy at the speed that existential threats demand.

2.7 Planetary Coordination Council

The Planetary Coordination Council is the executive body of The Planet's Vote - the mechanism through which passed resolutions are translated into coordinated international action. It is not a sovereign government. It has no authority to legislate beyond the mandates passed to it by the voting population.

The Council consists of 17 Regional Representatives elected by supermajority vote within their regions, plus a Secretary-General elected by global supermajority vote.

Representatives serve terms of approximately one year. Any representative whose approval rating falls below 55% in a mid-term confidence vote faces a recall election.

The Council's authority is strictly bounded: it may only act on resolutions that have passed the 66.7% supermajority threshold. It reports publicly and in full on all actions taken.

2.8 Legitimacy, Inclusion, and Non-Western Governance Traditions

Legitimacy at planetary scale cannot emerge from one civilisational tradition alone. The history of global governance is predominantly a history of Western liberal democratic frameworks being offered as universal solutions - and being received, often correctly, as expressions of cultural particularity rather than universal truth.

The constitutional layer of The Planet's Vote must be developed through a process that actively incorporates African governance traditions, South Asian democratic philosophy, indigenous democratic practices, Middle Eastern legal scholarship, and non-Western constitutional frameworks - not symbolically, but structurally.

Concrete structural measures:

- Multilingual constitutional drafting forums conducted simultaneously in major world languages, with translations prepared by human translators from the relevant linguistic communities, not automated systems
- Regional expert panels in the ratification process with explicit representation requirements for African, South Asian, indigenous, Middle Eastern, and other non-Western governance traditions
- Advisory council diversity as a hard requirement: the founding advisory council cannot proceed with constitutional work until it includes genuine representation from non-Western democratic and legal traditions
- Published annual audit of civilisational representation - assessing whether the constitutional development process is genuinely incorporating non-Western frameworks or merely citing them

PART III - TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE

3.1 Five Technical Pillars

The platform is built on five technical pillars:

1. Decentralised self-sovereign identity verification
2. Zero-knowledge voting proofs (Ring VRF)
3. Open-source auditable code
4. Blockchain vote confirmation
5. Geographically distributed hosting infrastructure resistant to single-nation shutdown

Technology in The Planet's Vote is always subordinate to legitimacy. Where a technical approach serves transparency, accessibility, verifiability, and trust, it is adopted. Where it serves ideological commitment to a particular technological paradigm at the expense of those qualities, it is rejected.

3.2 Identity Verification - A Phased Deployment Architecture

The identity layer is the hardest engineering problem in this entire system. Version 2.0 acknowledges this plainly: the identity layer is not a finished design. It is a phased deployment architecture, to be implemented in order of achievable trust and expanded as each phase is validated.

Pathway 1 - ePassport NFC Verification (Highest Trust): The voter uses a smartphone with NFC capability to scan the cryptographic chip embedded in a biometric passport. The zero-knowledge passport protocol (zkPassport) extracts a cryptographic proof that the passport is genuine, unexpired, and biometrically linked to the holder, without transmitting any passport data to the platform's servers. The platform receives only a cryptographic commitment confirming: "a valid, unique human is present." No identity data is stored.

Pathway 2 - National Digital Identity Credential: Where nations have deployed government-issued digital identity credentials (EU eID, India Aadhaar-linked systems, other verified national schemes), these may be used in place of ePassport NFC, subject to the same zero-knowledge proof generation. Each national credential system must pass a security audit before being added to the approved list.

Pathway 3 - Community Attestation Network (Web-of-Trust): For the 3.2 billion adults who lack ePassports or equivalent digital credentials, the platform implements an in-person Community Attestation Network. This pathway is described in full detail in Section 3.5. It carries a higher human-failure risk than Pathways 1 and 2 and will not be used for binding votes until its fraud and exclusion rates have been independently audited and published.

Pathway 4 - Assisted Registration: For adults in extremely low-connectivity or documentation-poor environments, assisted registration through accredited civil society partners provides a final pathway. This pathway is currently classified as advisory-vote-only until further development.

Phased deployment commitment: The Planet's Vote commits to beginning with Pathways 1 and 2 in pilot regions, publishing full data on fraud rates, exclusion rates, and access friction within 12 months of deployment, and expanding to Pathways 3 and 4 only after independent audit confirms acceptable standards.

3.3 Zero-Knowledge Voting and Cryptographic Privacy

The vote itself is designed around three properties that must all be satisfied simultaneously: every vote must be verifiable as cast by a unique registered human; no vote must be linkable to the individual who cast it; the aggregate result must be computable without decrypting any individual ballot.

These three properties are achieved through a combination of Ring Verifiable Random Functions (Ring VRF), zero-knowledge proofs of membership, and homomorphic tallying.

Ring VRF: When a voter casts their ballot, their device generates a cryptographic proof that the voter is a member of the registered voter set, without revealing which member. The proof is mathematically verifiable by any independent observer without the observer learning anything about the voter's identity.

Homomorphic tallying: Encrypted votes are tallied without decryption. The final tally is produced by combining all encrypted ballots and decrypting only the aggregate result. No individual vote is ever decrypted.

Blockchain confirmation: The vote commitment (not the vote content) is written to a public, distributed ledger. Any observer can confirm that a registered vote exists, verify the cryptographic proof of membership, and verify the tally — without accessing any individual vote's content.

Client-side proof generation: All zero-knowledge proof generation occurs entirely client-side on the voter's device before transmission. This eliminates server-side computation as a single point of failure and ensures that a state-sponsored Denial of Service attack targeting the platform's servers cannot prevent proof generation or vote submission.

The security architecture described in this Part reflects The Planet's Vote's own extensive research into what the voting component of the platform requires. In parallel, the project is also considering adapting an established, independently developed voting system, and is

currently assessing whether all of the platform's requirements can be met by that system and whether it can also accommodate the full protocol proposed here.

3.4 Coercion-Resistance Architecture

Coercion is the most difficult problem in any remote voting system. The Planet's Vote is fully open-source - every technical mechanism is public knowledge. This means coercion cannot be solved by hidden features or secret protocols. A duress code written into the white paper will be read by the very regimes it is designed to defeat, who will simply demand proof that the voter did not use it.

Version 2.0 therefore defeats coercion exclusively through game-theoretic structures and physical architecture - mechanisms where the overseer knows the rules but is mathematically or physically powerless to enforce them.

3.4.1 The "Last Vote Wins" Overwrite Protocol

This is the primary coercion-resistance mechanism for digital remote voting, modelled on Estonia's national e-voting framework which has used it successfully since 2005.

The rule is simple and fully public: a voter may cast their ballot as many times as they wish during the 90-day preparation and active voting window. Each new vote cryptographically overwrites the previous one using a rolling nullifier system. Only the absolute final vote cast before the quarterly deadline is decrypted and tallied.

Why this defeats the overseer: If a voter is forced by a family member, employer, or state official to cast a vote under observation on Monday, they comply safely. When they next have a moment of privacy - using a friend's phone, a public library terminal, or a Community Attestation Haven - they recast their vote freely. The overseer's coercion yields no permanent result. The rule is public because its power does not depend on secrecy. The overseer knows that any compliance extracted from a voter at home can be silently overwritten later. This structural fact destroys the economic incentive for most coercive voting behaviour.

3.4.2 The Stochastic Buffer Protocol - Defeating Network Surveillance

State-level surveillance can attempt to identify when a voter submitted a ballot by monitoring network traffic. The Stochastic Buffer Protocol defeats this by decoupling the act of voting from the transmission of the vote.

When a voter clicks "Submit," the application enters a Stochastic Buffer State. The actual transmission time is determined by:

$$T_{\text{delay}} = T_{\text{base}} + T_{\text{jitter}}$$

Where T_{base} is a mandatory minimum hold time (default: 6 hours) and T_{jitter} is a cryptographically random variable between 0 and 18 hours, ensuring votes are dispersed across a rolling 24-hour window.

Simultaneously, the application generates hundreds of dummy data packets (chaff) identical in size, cryptographic signature format, and destination routing to an actual vote. The real encrypted ballot is slipped into this stream at the random T_{delay} point. An overseer monitoring network traffic sees continuous, undifferentiated traffic from the moment the voter clicks Submit - with no way to identify when, or whether, the actual ballot was transmitted.

3.4.3 Physical Community Attestation Havens - The Absolute Override

For situations where a regime has achieved total digital surveillance or territory lockdown, cryptographic solutions alone are insufficient. The Physical Community Attestation Haven is the system's ultimate coercion-resistance mechanism.

The Physical Override Rule (publicly stated): While remote digital ballots may be cast continuously during the voting window, any ballot cast from within a verified, structurally isolated Community Attestation Haven booth instantly and permanently locks the voter's ledger for that cycle. No subsequent digital ballot can override a Haven-cast ballot.

Why the overseer is powerless: The overseer knows this rule. They may extract a digital vote from the voter at home on Monday. But they also know that if the voter walks into a privacy booth on Tuesday, the home vote is instantly and permanently erased. Because the booth is structurally single-occupancy and enforced by international charter, the overseer cannot enter. The value of coercing the voter at home drops to zero.

Haven Physical Architecture:

- The "One Human" Spatial Interlock: The booth uses a mechanical or weight-sensitive threshold allowing exactly one biological body inside at any time
- Localized Signal Jamming: The booth is lined with passive Faraday shielding (copper mesh), dropping all local cellular, Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth signals inside the booth, preventing coercion via earpiece or live stream
- Independent Ledger Uplink: The voting terminal connects directly to the global network via a hardened, battery-powered satellite transceiver (Starlink or equivalent) running over encrypted peer-to-peer protocols. Local authorities cannot block the vote without cutting off satellite communications entirely across the region
- Single-occupancy confirmation via weight sensor is logged to the Haven's public audit ledger

Haven Operational Model (The "Pop-Up Embassy" Model): Havens do not rely on permanent, vulnerable real estate. They operate as transient, highly localised setups managed by the Community Attestation Network.

- Where possible, Havens are deployed inside internationally protected zones: Red Cross/Red Crescent sites, UN outposts, or foreign diplomatic properties
- In areas lacking international real estate, a Haven is validated by a minimum of three locally trusted, structurally opposing civic groups (e.g., a local doctor, a traditional elder, and an independent schoolteacher). This multi-party custody ensures no single local faction or regime official can occupy the space without alerting the global network

Community Attestation Audit Framework

Because community attestation is the identity pathway most vulnerable to fraud and local capture, it requires its own dedicated audit architecture.

- Random audits: A statistically significant random sample of registrations are independently verified each cycle, using a published and verifiable sampling methodology.
- Statistical anomaly detection: Automated systems flag registration clusters exhibiting unusual velocity, geographic concentration, attester overlap, or demographic uniformity.
- Fraud bounty programme: Verified reports of coordinated attestation fraud are financially rewarded, creating economic incentives for community members to report fraud.
- Attestation centre suspension: Centres found to have processed fraudulent registrations are suspended pending investigation, with reinstatement requiring independent certification.
- Attester accountability: Attestors disproportionately associated with fraudulent identities lose attestation rights and face public review.

3.4.4 Community Attestation Vulnerability - Mitigations

The Community Attestation pathway (Pathway 3 identity) introduces a risk that local power structures - warlords, state actors, cartel leaders - could compromise verification centres and register ghost voters or deceased persons, weaponising the 40% regional concurrence floor.

Mitigations:

- **Multi-party custody:** No Haven can be validated by a single local actor. The minimum-three opposing civic group requirement means compromise requires coordinated corruption across structurally adversarial community members.
- **Cross-regional anomaly detection:** Unusually high registration rates from specific community verification centres trigger automatic audit flags reviewed by the independent international audit committee.
- **Turnout pattern forensics:** Post-election forensic analysis of suspicious turnout patterns (e.g. near-100% turnout from specific attestation centres, unusual voting uniformity) is mandatory before results in affected regions are confirmed.
- **Graduated binding authority:** Community Attestation votes count toward advisory results immediately but do not count toward binding results until the pathway has passed independent audit in that region.

3.5 Accessibility and Offline Pathways

3.2 billion adults globally lack reliable internet access. The Planet's Vote's accessibility story must be operationally credible, not aspirational.

Version 2.0 separates accessibility from eligibility. Offline, assisted, and low-bandwidth pathways are tested as equal-status pathways with independent audits - not treated as fallback exceptions. If a pathway cannot demonstrably meet the same security, auditability, and coercion-resistance standards as the online path, it is not used for binding votes.

Offline pathways under development:

- SMS-based voting for feature phones, using encrypted one-time codes distributed at Community Attestation Havens
- Community terminal voting at accredited civil society partner locations
- Assisted registration and voting for adults with disabilities or low literacy

All offline pathways are currently classified as advisory-vote-eligible. The path to binding-vote eligibility requires independent security audit, published exclusion and fraud rate data, and constitutional ratification of the pathway's equivalence standard.

3.6 Soft Sybil and AI-Driven Ideological Capture

The platform's astroturfing detection addresses overt coordinated inauthentic behaviour.

Version 2.0 adds a structural defence against the subtler threat: generative AI seeding

genuine-looking organic ideological movements across millions of individually authentic users, without leaving coordinated-behaviour signatures detectable by standard methods.

Structural defences:

- Narrative diversity auditing: The scientific ratification process includes adversarial review of whether a question's framing reflects a diversity of genuine perspectives or converges suspiciously on a single rhetorical approach
- Signal velocity monitoring: Unusually rapid signal accumulation patterns - even from verified individual accounts - trigger automated investigation. Genuine organic movements accumulate signals with characteristic temporal irregularity; AI-seeded movements tend toward statistical smoothness
- Deliberation period as structural protection: The 90-day preparation window before each vote provides a mandatory period during which counter-narratives, minority scientific reports, and adversarial perspectives are formally published and distributed to all registered voters

PART IV - THE ENFORCEMENT ARCHITECTURE

This section constitutes the most significant structural advance of Version 2.0 over its predecessors.

4.1 Replacing the Parliament–Executive Analogy

Legitimacy Through Progressive Inclusion

The Planet's Vote does not claim to represent humanity perfectly. What it claims is that its legitimacy increases proportionally with demonstrated inclusion, transparency, and participation. A platform that is transparent about who it is not yet reaching is more legitimate, not less, than one that claims a universal mandate it has not demonstrated.

A national parliament's authority over its executive agencies rests on three mechanisms that The Planet's Vote does not currently possess:

1. Legal supremacy - domestic law compels the executive to comply
2. Budget control - parliament controls agency funding and can defund non-compliance
3. Personnel authority - parliament can remove ministers, trigger elections, or dissolve governments

The United Nations Security Council has none of these relationships with The Planet's Vote. A single permanent member with a geopolitical interest can veto any corresponding UN action regardless of what 4 billion voters have decided - with zero legal consequence.

Version 2.0 replaces this analogy with an honest account of how international authority actually develops and hardens over time.

4.2 The Graduated Legitimacy Model

The Silent Majority and the Limits of Democratic Mandate

A verified supermajority of participants is not the same as a majority of humanity. If 800 million people vote and 600 million support a resolution, that is a 75% supermajority of participants - but approximately 10% of the world's adult population. The Planet's Vote answers this with intellectual honesty: abstention is not consent. What it claims is more modest and more defensible: a verified supermajority mandate from those who chose to participate is more legitimate than the available alternatives.

The 40% regional floor was not chosen arbitrarily. It ensures no resolution passes without resonance in every part of the world while being deliberately set below 50% so that no single region holds a veto. If persistent structural disparities prevent a region from reaching 40%, the constitutional ratification process may adjust the threshold for a defined transitional period, automatically expiring after ten years unless renewed.

International norms do not begin as binding law. They begin as moral frameworks, accumulate political weight through repeated invocation, generate economic and reputational consequences for non-compliance, and harden - over years or decades - into treaty obligations.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) began as a non-binding resolution. The norms it codified now constitute *jus cogens* - peremptory norms of international law that cannot be derogated by treaty. The Paris Agreement began as a framework of voluntary commitments; its ratchet mechanism progressively raised the political cost of non-compliance until withdrawal itself became a significant geopolitical event.

The Planet's Vote follows the same trajectory. Its enforcement architecture is honest about where it stands at each phase and what mechanisms are available at that phase.

Phase A - Shadow Vote and Record-Building (Years 1-5): The platform produces politically significant, publicly verifiable mandates that carry no binding legal force in international law. Their authority is moral and political. A government that ignores a two-

thirds (66.7%) global supermajority does so visibly, on a permanent public record, at political cost. That is not nothing. It is, in fact, how international norm development begins.

Phase B - Advisory Coordination (Years 3-8): As the voter base grows and credibility is established, The Planet's Vote submits results to the UN General Assembly, major international bodies, and national governments as documented democratic mandates. Governments acting in accordance with planetary votes are recognised as Founding Signatories.

Phase C - Signatory Treaty Lock-In (Years 5-15): Founding Signatory nations formalise their relationship through treaty arrangements, committing to implement resolutions achieving the supermajority threshold in defined issue categories - beginning with planetary defence and pandemic preparedness. This is not aspirational language: it is a binding treaty obligation for participating nations.

Phase D - Operational Coordination Authority (Years 15+): A platform with verified global participation, an established constitutional layer, and treaty relationships sufficient for resolutions to carry genuine operational weight. This phase is measured in decades. The distinction between Phase A and Phase D is one of earned legitimacy — a platform that has spent twenty years building trust and accumulating a genuine democratic record arrives at operational authority having earned it.

The Compliance Architecture for Founding Signatories:

- A published compliance scorecard for every Founding Signatory nation, updated after each binding resolution
- Non-compliance triggers suspension of Founding Signatory status and formal notification to the UN General Assembly
- Persistent non-compliance results in exclusion from the coordinated funding mechanisms and cooperative benefits that passed resolutions unlock
- The model is deliberately analogous to the Paris Agreement's ratchet mechanism - no coercive force, but structured reputational and economic consequence for non-compliance

4.3 The Bypass Architecture - Routing Mandates Around Institutional Gridlock

For any passed resolution, the Planetary Coordination Council is empowered to pursue implementation through whichever existing institution is capable and willing - not only the "obvious" first-choice institution.

If the UN Security Council is paralysed by veto on a planetary defence resolution, the Council routes the mandate through:

- NASA and ESA under their existing bilateral and multilateral cooperative frameworks
- The G20 as an informal but practically powerful coordination body with no veto structure
- Regional multilateral bodies (African Union, European Union, ASEAN, etc.) that are not veto-bound
- Bilateral treaty arrangements between Founding Signatory nations that can proceed without Security Council authorisation

4.4 Economic and Reputational Enforcement Mechanisms

Nations and institutions that align with passed resolutions receive:

- Founding Signatory recognition and its associated reputational benefits
- Priority access to the coordinated funding mechanisms the resolution authorises
- Preferential standing in future planetary coordination decisions and treaty negotiations
- Public recognition in the permanent democratic record

Nations and institutions that block or ignore implementation face:

- Published non-compliance reports submitted formally to the UN General Assembly
- Exclusion from the cooperative benefits unlocked by the resolution
- A formal, permanent record of non-compliance that follows into subsequent treaty negotiations
- Reputational cost proportional to the size of the supermajority they are ignoring

This model draws on the WTO dispute resolution framework and the Paris Agreement compliance mechanism - both of which operate without coercive force but generate structured consequences sufficient to influence state behaviour.

4.5 Clarifying the Legal Status of Resolutions

The Planet's Vote distinguishes clearly between three categories of authority:

1. Moral legitimacy - a passed resolution has moral authority proportional to its supermajority. A 75% global vote carries greater moral weight than a 67% vote. This authority exists from the moment a resolution passes, in all phases.

2. Advisory authority - resolutions submitted to international institutions as formal democratic mandates carry advisory authority. International bodies that ignore them do so on the public record.
3. Binding legal authority - resolutions achieve binding legal force only in jurisdictions where Founding Signatory treaties have been ratified by domestic legislatures. This authority is real, limited in scope, and grows as the Founding Signatory network expands.

The Planet's Vote does not claim to possess binding legal authority it does not have. It claims, accurately, that moral and advisory authority are not nothing - and that binding authority develops through the same trajectory every major international norm has followed.

PART V - CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE SAFEGUARDS

5.1 The Constitutional Layer - Development Process

The constitutional layer of The Planet's Vote does not yet exist. It must be developed through a globally inclusive process before the platform can claim constitutional legitimacy.

This is stated plainly because the alternative - treating a Western-authored constitutional framework as universal - would reproduce the exact legitimacy failure the platform was designed to transcend.

The constitutional development process:

1. Formation of a globally representative Constitutional Drafting Council, with the advisory council diversity requirement (non-Western representation as a hard precondition, not a target)
2. Multilingual constitutional drafting forums conducted in all major world languages simultaneously
3. Regional ratification consultations in each of the six geographic regions
4. A minimum 24-month public comment period before any constitutional text is put to a shadow vote
5. A constitutional shadow vote requiring 75% global support AND regional supermajority in each region to pass
6. Annual published audit of whether the process is genuinely incorporating non-Western governance frameworks

5.2 Oversight Architecture and Anti-Capture Safeguards

Founder's Equality Principle

The Planet's Vote recognises no permanent founder authority. The founder's role is limited to the establishment of the platform and its initial organisational structure. Thereafter, the founder possesses no constitutional status, no special voting rights, no veto power, and no privileged authority beyond that held by any other verified participant.

The legitimacy of The Planet's Vote derives solely from its processes and participants, not from any individual, including its founder. There is no throne. There is no revolutionary vanguard that will eventually relinquish power. The platform is its processes. Its authority is its participants.

The Independent Audit Committee: An independent audit committee - appointed through an open public process, with no more than one member from any single nation or institution - has standing authority to examine any aspect of the platform's operations and publish findings without prior approval from the platform's founders or administrators. Its reports are published in full and cannot be redacted.

Sortition in Oversight: To prevent capture by professional or regional elites, no less than one-third of seats on each oversight body are filled by randomly selected verified registered voters, drawn by cryptographically auditable lottery. Sortition members serve fixed terms with full support and briefing.

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure: All appointed members must publicly disclose all funding sources, institutional affiliations, and potential conflicts of interest, with automatic recusal applying to decisions where a conflict exists.

Donor Neutrality: No single donor may contribute more than 5% of the platform's total funding in any fiscal year. The full funding ledger is publicly audited and published.

Red-Team Review: The platform commissions independent external red-team review of its funding model, identity architecture, and moderation systems on an annual basis. Red-team reports are published in full.

No Ideological Alignment

The Planet's Vote has no preferred ideological outcome. It is not progressive, conservative, capitalist, socialist, Western, anti-Western, environmentalist, or technocratic. Its purpose is democratic legitimacy, not policy direction. A platform that produces a consistent ideological tendency in its outcomes is a platform that has failed.

5.3 Failure Mode Governance

Disputed results: An independent technical audit panel conducts a full cryptographic audit. The vote result is suspended pending audit if the challenge meets a defined evidence threshold.

Fraud allegations: All vote data is written to an immutable public log. Independent researchers may verify at any time. Fraud allegations unresolvable by cryptographic audit are referred to an international independent review panel.

Software compromise: The open-source distributed architecture means no single compromise can alter outcomes undetected. In confirmed compromise, the affected vote is invalidated and rerun.

Regional boycott: The dual concurrence requirement means a regional boycott may prevent a resolution from achieving its regional floor. This is by design. A resolution without minimum support in any major region has not achieved planetary legitimacy.

Constitutional crisis: Disputes about constitutional scope are referred to an independent constitutional review panel before a vote proceeds.

The Planet's Vote does not claim that all failure modes are anticipated. It claims that the commitment to visible recovery mechanisms is itself a form of institutional legitimacy.

5.4 Future Generations, Children, and the Tyranny of Present Humanity

The Planet's Vote addresses the governance failures of the present. But planetary decisions taken today affect people who are not yet old enough to vote, and people who have not yet been born. Political philosophers - from John Rawls to Derek Parfit to contemporary climate ethicists - have identified the tyranny of present humanity: the capacity of people alive today to impose costs and constraints on people who cannot participate in making those decisions.

The platform explicitly acknowledges that its current architecture does not fully resolve this problem. The question of how future generations and children might be formally represented - through guardian roles, proxy representation, or constitutional protections requiring extraordinary supermajorities to override - is reserved as an open constitutional question to be resolved through the platform's own democratic processes.

PART VI - FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

6.1 Operational Funding - The Scale of the Challenge

The operational costs of the platform at scale are substantial:

- Continuous multilingual server infrastructure across geographically distributed jurisdictions

- Zero-knowledge proof compute cycles at planetary voter scale
- Physical Community Attestation Haven infrastructure in hundreds of locations globally
- Satellite uplink hardware and service costs for Havens in low-connectivity regions
- Human translation services for all constitutional and ballot materials in major world languages
- Independent audit committee and red-team review costs
- Planetary Coordination Council secretariat functions

6.2 The Phased Funding Model

Phase 1 (Years 1-3) - Philanthropic Seed Funding: \$38–55 million from diversified sources subject to the 5% donor cap. No single government, corporation, or individual may contribute more than 5%. This phase funds platform development, identity pathway pilots, and the first shadow votes.

Phase 2 (Years 3-8) - Diversified Foundation Model: As the platform establishes credibility and a voter base, the funding model expands to include: small voluntary contributions from registered voters (strictly optional, no minimum, no voting weight attached to contribution); foundation grants subject to the same 5% cap applied across foundation networks with shared governance; Founding Signatory nation contributions, capped at 10% of total annual budget collectively to prevent state capture; civil society partnership fees for use of the platform's identity verification infrastructure for non-electoral purposes.

Phase 3 (Years 8+) - Treaty-Linked Operational Funding: Founding Signatory treaty arrangements include a defined per-capita operational contribution from signatory nations - analogous to UN assessed contributions - scaled to national GDP. This provides a sustainable, state-independent funding base without granting any nation disproportionate influence.

6.3 Financial Governance

All funding sources, amounts, and disbursements are published in real time on a public ledger. The independent audit committee's mandate explicitly covers financial operations. Any funding arrangement that would give a single donor, nation, or institution disproportionate influence over platform operations is prohibited and subject to automatic audit.

PART VII - THE FIRST VOTE: PLANETARY DEFENCE

7.1 Why Planetary Defence is the Right First Issue

The choice of the first real issue matters enormously. It must be an issue where the case for global coordination is overwhelming and uncontroversial, where the science is clear, where the cost is manageable relative to the stakes, and where success would demonstrate The Planet's Vote's value beyond any reasonable doubt.

Planetary defence - specifically, the establishment of a permanent, internationally funded Near-Earth Object monitoring and deflection capability - satisfies all of these criteria:

- The science is unambiguous: asteroid and comet impacts have caused mass extinctions in Earth's past
- The technology works: NASA's DART mission proved kinetic deflection in 2022
- The cost is negligible: a comprehensive system costs approximately \$1-2 billion per year - less than 0.003% of global GDP
- The issue is non-ideological: no political philosophy opposes not being struck by an asteroid
- No single nation can do it alone: planetary defence requires global telescope coverage and deflection coordination

A genuine global vote achieving a two-thirds (66.7%) supermajority would produce a mandate no existing international institution has ever had.

7.2 The Shadow Vote Strategy

A Shadow Vote is a fully functional, technically rigorous, publicly verifiable vote that is non-binding in international law but carries significant political and moral weight.

The shadow vote proceeds as follows:

1. Technical deployment of the full platform for a single issue vote
2. Open registration to any adult globally with internet access and a verifiable identity credential
3. A quarterly vote on the planetary defence mandate question
4. Full public reporting of results with cryptographic verification
5. Formal submission of the result to the UN General Assembly, NASA, ESA, and relevant national governments

The shadow vote serves three purposes simultaneously: it demonstrates the platform's technical capability to sceptical observers; it builds the registered voter base; and it generates a politically significant mandate that cannot be easily dismissed as theoretical.

7.3 Artificial Intelligence and Human Sovereignty

By 2030-2040, artificial intelligence may represent the single greatest threat to democratic legitimacy that any large-scale voting system faces. The Planet's Vote requires explicit constitutional principles governing AI's role.

What AI May Do

- AI may assist voters in understanding questions, summarising arguments, and accessing information.
- AI may translate questions and arguments into any language.
- AI-generated pro/con briefs may be used in the deliberation layer if clearly labelled and accompanied by human-authored counterparts.
- AI may assist with anomaly detection, astroturfing identification, and platform security.

What AI May Not Do

- AI may not vote or hold any governance position.
- AI may not propose questions for the ballot.
- AI-generated advocacy must be clearly and permanently labelled. Unlabelled AI advocacy is a violation of the platform's founding charter.
- No AI system may conduct coordinated voter outreach without full public disclosure of its origin, funding, and deployment scale.

The Human Sovereignty Principle

The Planet's Vote is a human democratic platform. No AI system - regardless of its capability or apparent benevolence - may claim democratic authority within its architecture. This principle is absolute and requires the full multi-cycle constitutional ratification process to modify.

PART VIII - STRATEGIC INNOVATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

8.1 Liquid Sortition Networks

Rather than using basic sortition (lotteries) only for one-third of oversight committee seats, the platform could pioneer Liquid Sortition as a pre-ballot deliberation mechanism. The system randomly selects a rotating sample of 100,000 citizens monthly to act as a planetary jury - reviewing and deliberating on proposals before they reach the active global ballot. This substantially mitigates voter fatigue and improves ballot question quality, drawing on the Citizens' Assembly model proven in Ireland's constitutional referenda.

8.2 Retroactive Democratic Bounties

The platform could allow citizens to vote on "Problem Statements" rather than only on finalised solutions. Once a problem statement passes the threshold, it opens a global, crowd-sourced reward bounty for technical solutions - bridging direct democracy directly with open-source global innovation. This mechanism would allow the platform to harness collective human ingenuity rather than merely ratifying proposals generated by elite expert bodies.

8.3 Participation Equity Dashboards

Before any binding vote, The Planet's Vote publishes a live participation equity dashboard showing:

- Registration rates by region and by identity pathway
- Device access and connectivity gaps by country
- Registration friction scores (how many steps required, in which languages, with what failure rates)
- Refusal rates and their geographic distribution

This dashboard is a pre-condition for binding votes, not a post-hoc transparency measure. If the dashboard reveals structural exclusion that would make the 40% regional floor meaningless, the vote does not proceed on a binding basis until the exclusion is addressed.

8.4 Post-Election Forensic Audit Protocol

Following every vote - shadow or binding - a mandatory post-election forensic audit is conducted examining:

- Suspicious turnout patterns (unusually high turnout uniformity from specific attestation centres)
- Statistically anomalous voting uniformity in specific regions

- Signal accumulation velocity patterns inconsistent with organic behaviour
- Network traffic anomalies during the voting window

The audit report is published in full before results are confirmed as final.

PART IX - IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

Phase	Timeline	Key Milestones	Success Criteria
Phase A - Foundation	Years 1-2	Platform development, identity pathway pilots (Pathways 1 & 2), Constitutional Drafting Council formation, first shadow vote preparation	Pilot identity error and exclusion rates published; Constitutional Drafting Council assembled with non-Western representation precondition met; Platform open-source code audit completed
Phase B - Shadow Vote	Years 2-4	First shadow vote on planetary defence; voter base building; UN observer status application; Founding Signatory identification	First shadow vote conducted with cryptographic verification; Results submitted to UN General Assembly; Founding Signatory conversations initiated with 10-15 nations
Phase C - Treaty Pathway	Years 4-10	Founding Signatory treaty ratification; Community Attestation pathway audit and expansion; Constitutional shadow vote process	First binding treaty arrangements in planetary defence and pandemic preparedness; Pathway 3 audit completed and regional expansion initiated
Phase D - Operational Authority	Years 10+	Full constitutional ratification; Treaty-linked operational funding; multi-issue binding votes	Constitutional layer ratified by supermajority in all regions; Binding votes on AI governance and climate preparedness

Constitutional Humility Principle

Every governance system in history has contained flaws that were invisible to its founders. The Planet's Vote assumes the same is true of itself. Its constitutional architecture is therefore designed not around claims of perfection, but around the ability to discover and correct its own mistakes.

This principle is structural: it is why the constitutional layer is developed through democratic process rather than declared by founders, why failure-mode governance exists, why the audit committee has recall powers, and why sortition injects randomness into oversight bodies. The platform is not designed to be right. It is designed to be correctable.

CLOSING STATEMENT

The Planet's Vote does not claim to have solved planetary governance. It claims to have designed a credible pathway toward it - one that is honest about what it can do today, clear about what it is building toward, and transparent about the problems it has not yet fully solved.

The greatest threats to humanity do not respect national borders. Yet our systems of governance remain fractured by exactly those borders. The Planet's Vote proposes not to eliminate those borders - but to build, above them, the minimum democratic infrastructure that humanity needs to coordinate on the issues that affect all of us equally.

We invite governance scholars, technologists, legal experts, democratic theorists, civil society organisations, and individual human beings everywhere to collaborate on making it real.

— *theplanetsvote.org* —