# Contents

# THE COVENANT OF EARTH

## FOUNDATIONAL COMMITMENTS

This Covenant establishes one planetary cooperative system and supersedes the nation-state order. It is not founded against any civilization. It draws on constitutional, customary, scientific, religious, indigenous, communitarian, liberal, republican, market, cooperative, and administrative traditions, and treats none of them as complete or as automatically illegitimate. Institutions are judged by what they permit, what they prevent, and what they correct.

**What we reject:**

1. **Unaccountable coercive power.** Birth, wealth, national office, inherited office, military force, religious office, or popular acclaim create no authority. Election, accountable appointment, demonstrated competence, technical expertise, and correctable customary selection may contribute to authority only as this Covenant expressly provides; none creates an unlimited right to rule.

2. **Capture without correction.** No public, private, customary, religious, civic, or technical institution may place its decisions beyond evidence, challenge, review, correction, and peaceful succession where those decisions affect others.

3. **Bodily abuse and imposed deprivation.** No political objective, market outcome, collective preference, inherited rule, or expert calculation may legalize the non-derogable harms prohibited by Article X.

4. **Destruction of shared life-support systems.** No property form, state claim, development model, or ideology may authorize irreversible planetary harm.

5. **Forced civilizational uniformity.** The Covenant supersedes states and sovereignty claims. It does not supersede peoples, cultures, faiths, families, local institutions, legal traditions, markets, or ways of life that remain consistent with this Covenant, Article X, the stewardship duties in Commitment 3, and the rights of affected persons and communities.

**What we affirm:**

1. **Legitimacy has several necessary sources.** Consequential authority requires demonstrated competence, affected-person participation, accountable human judgment, lawful authorization under this Covenant, continuity of service, and effective correction. The weight of each source varies with the function; none may erase the others.

2. **Institutional forms are tools, not sacred ends.** Election, sortition, examination, accountable appointment, consensus, accountable customary selection, professional qualification, community attestation, and mixed systems may all be used where their incentives fit the task and their failures remain correctable. Inherited office and customary succession by birth create no authority.

3. **Property is stewardship with duties.** Personal, private, family, cooperative, communal, indigenous, charitable, public, and trusteeship arrangements may coexist as forms of lawful stewardship, not absolute title. Every property interest carries a duty not to externalize human or planetary harm. Control of resources essential to survival carries enforceable obligations to affected communities, humanity, future generations, and the biosphere. Inherited unearned claims, absentee control of the commons, and claims inconsistent with Article X or these duties are void.

4. **Supersession and allocation of function.** No pre-Covenant political community retains lawful space by inheritance. Nations and states are superseded as political authorities at ratification. Where a state or bloc of states declines cooperation with or actively obstructs ratification, referendum administration, or the founding schedule, the provisional authorities shall continue under Article XI, Section 11.4 until the Covenant is functional in the cooperating territories; a non-cooperating territory is not excused from the Covenant's reach by its own obstruction. The provisional authorities, together with the Constitutional Court once constituted, shall determine the lawful minimum of cooperation required for operational continuity in the obstructing territory, applying the burden rule in this Commitment. A substantiated finding of material obstruction is grounds for the provisional bodies to treat the obstructing territory's non-cooperation as a failure of the founding schedule warranting adjusted territorial application, partial activation, or continued provisional administration, in each case without prejudicing the Covenant's claim to planetary reach. Every local, regional, and planetary function exists within one Covenant government and is allocated according to demonstrated competence, affected-person participation, correction capacity, and planetary necessity. Proof that a function requires distinct local or regional administration permits allocation only to an LCC or RCA within the Covenant and never creates sovereignty outside it. A claimant of separate authority bears the burden of proving that the claimed function cannot be performed within the Covenant; the Covenant bears no burden to justify planetary unity.

5. **Knowledge is plural but consequences are reviewable.** Empirical, professional, practical, historical, customary, indigenous, spiritual, relational, and place-based knowledge may inform governance. No knowledge claim is dismissed because of its origin, and no claim affecting others is exempt from proportionate scrutiny because of its origin.

6. **Every person is protected.** These guarantees may be understood through inherent dignity, sacred obligation, reciprocal duty, ancestral law, communal responsibility, natural rights, or another tradition. Their protection does not depend on acceptance of one philosophical foundation.

7. **Continuity and correction are joint duties.** A failed metric, expired office, missed deadline, broken network, rejected proposal, or captured body must activate a lawful fallback. Correction

changes the operator or method without abandoning the governed function or the people who depend on it.

8. **The future has standing.** Decisions must account for generations not yet born and for the living systems on which every civilization depends.

9. **Equal worth does not mean interchangeable fitness.** Every person has equal dignity, but no person is competent for every role. Authority shall be assigned by the capability the function actually requires, whether analytical, practical, physical, relational, custodial, technical, moral, local, or otherwise demonstrated. Competence in one role creates no general superiority, caste, hereditary claim, or right to rule outside that role. The system is strongest when different capabilities constrain and complete one another.

10. **Cooperation without merger.** Covenant bodies are differentiated parts of one constitutional system, not rival sovereigns. Scrutiny, dissent, inspection, appeal, and correction are forms of maintenance rather than hostility. Institutions shall make truthful disclosure, lawful assistance, and repair more advantageous than concealment, retaliation, obstruction, or escalation. They shall do so while retaining independent judgment, and shall forbid collusion or reciprocal non-enforcement. The constitutional-organism metaphor does not make a person an instrument or an expendable component of the state: every person remains a participant, a rights-holder, and a beneficiary whom the system exists to serve.

11. **One planetary cooperative system.** Local Cultural Councils, Regional Coordinating Assemblies, the Expert Body, and communities are differentiated participants in one planetary government. They are not separate sovereigns, a federation of pre-existing states, or self-contained rival economies competing over territorial resource endowments. Geological, ecological, climatic, cultural, technical, and practical differences make regions differently suited to mining, farming, energy, care, production, stewardship, and other functions. The Covenant coordinates those complementary capabilities, and moves resources, goods, services, infrastructure, knowledge, and benefits across administrative boundaries for every human and for Earth. Local participation and authority protect people, culture, place, and competent development. They are exercises of Covenant authority, and must not be framed as hostile bargaining against the whole. A community's dignity, rights, opportunity, and access never depend on the resources found within its administrative boundaries or the output expected from its population. Interdependence here is designed. It is a source of reciprocal provision and shared capacity, not a permission for domination, extraction, forced uniformity, or treating any community as expendable. Institutional disagreement shall be treated first as a coordination and repair problem within one constitutional system, consistent with commitment 10. Treating it that way does not remove the system's ability to handle actual defection or rights violations elsewhere.

These commitments are enforced through distributed selection, competence thresholds, plural public participation, rights floors, independent inspection, transparent succession, manual continuity, metric challenge, and institutions capable of correcting one another without stopping essential governance.

## PREAMBLE

We, the peoples of Earth, inheritors of many civilizations and many ways of ordering common life, establish this Covenant as the one government of Earth. It exercises planetary authority and allocates every function to the level competent to perform it.

We preserve peoples, cultures, communities, faiths, families, traditions, and ways of life consistent with this Covenant and Article X. Institutions and markets may continue only as expressly Covenant-authorized, stewardship-compliant forms and never by inheritance. We supersede nations and states as political authorities and join all public power within one constitutional system to protect human life, peace, and the biosphere.

We reject inherited office and unchecked power whether exercised by a ruler, majority, market, bureaucracy, expert body, armed force, or global institution.

We affirm governance as a practical duty requiring disciplined inquiry, accountable judgment, inherited wisdom, lived experience, consent, competence, and correction.

We establish this Covenant as a living and continuous framework, not a final word. It is open to scrutiny, capable of repair, and accountable to persons, communities, future generations, and Earth.

## ARTICLE I: THE EXPERT BODY (EB)

### Section 1.0: The three levels of one government

The Covenant government shall operate through three distinct levels with allocated functions. No level is sovereign against another. Each shall respect the functions allocated to the others except through the temporary reallocation procedure in Section 1.4.

**Level 1: Local Cultural Councils (LCC)**

- **Jurisdiction:** Communities, cities, and cultural blocs (population 10,000 to 10 million).
- **Authority:** Local language preservation, cultural practices, zoning, community dispute resolution, and local education enrichment (provided global minimum standards are met).
- **Composition:** Each community may use sortition, election, consensus, customary councils, indigenous institutions, religious or communitarian bodies, or a hybrid. Every method operates under this Covenant; no office passes by birth. Its method must permit meaningful participation by affected persons, disclose who holds authority, provide a non-coercive personal exit from participation or a challenge route, and remain subject to Article X. Personal exit under this provision never means territorial secession.
- **Limitation:** Shall not make policy that affects neighboring regions, global resources, or planetary systems.

**Level 2: Regional Coordinating Assemblies (RCA)**

- **Jurisdiction:** Bioregions or continental coordinating regions (population 10 million to 1 billion), defined by ecological and cultural boundaries rather than historical nation-states.
- **Authority:** Infrastructure planning (transport, energy grids), water rights, regional trade coordination, disaster response logistics, and regional environmental stewardship.
- **Composition:** Delegates or representatives authorized by Local Cultural Councils through their Covenant-lawful selection methods, serving 5-year staggered terms. Regional procedure shall accommodate electoral, consensus, customary, and mixed mandates while preventing one selection tradition from excluding the others.
- **Limitation:** Shall not make policy that affects other bioregions or the global commons (atmosphere, oceans, climate, space).

**Level 3: Global Expert Body (EB)**

- **Jurisdiction:** Planetary systems and cross-bioregional functions that no LCC or RCA is competent to govern; the population governed is humanity as a whole.
- **Authority:** Climate stabilization and carbon-cycle management; global pandemic prevention and response; planetary resource allocation (energy, food, water at the macro scale); inter-bioregional infrastructure (transoceanic cables, pipelines, satellite networks); artificial intelligence and emerging-technology governance; space exploration and planetary defense; global peacekeeping and enforcement of Constitutional rulings. Detailed scope and the Temporary Reallocation Protocol governing transient assumption of LCC or RCA functions appear in Section 1.4.
- **Composition:** 55 to 87 members, an odd number, selected by the seven-phase pipeline in Section 1.1 and allocated across the domains in Section 1.5. Single non-renewable staggered terms of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, or 20 years, with no more than 20% of seats ending in any 2-year window. Sortition-first from binary-threshold qualified pools; no member holds office by wealth, election, or inheritance.
- **Limitation:** Shall not dictate local cultural practices, religious traditions, or personal conduct; shall not intervene in regional infrastructure unless it affects another bioregion; shall not act outside the domains in Section 1.5 or the scope in Section 1.4; shall not remove, extend, or shorten any Covenant term outside the procedures in this Article, Article III, and Article IV. The detailed provisions of Sections 1.1 through 1.6 govern where this summary is silent.

#### Section 1.0.1: Bioregional boundary architecture

**(a) Guiding principles** Bioregional boundaries shall be drawn under the following principles, which are subordinate to Rule Zero (Article XI, Section 11.1) and the inviolable rights floor of Article X:

1. **Watershed coherence.** A Regional Coordinating Assembly boundary shall follow a major watershed divide. A river system from headwaters to delta shall, where population and geography permit, constitute a single RCA. Closed basins (endorheic systems) may form their own RCAs. The boundary of an RCA shall never bisect a river's main stem or its primary tributary.

2. **Ecological continuity.** An RCA shall encompass a coherent biome or set of adjacent biomes that share climate regime, vegetation class, and disturbance dynamics (fire, flood, drought, permafrost). Where a watershed divide also separates biomes, the divide becomes the boundary.

3. **Infrastructure and disaster-logistic coherence.** An RCA shall enclose transport corridors, energy grids, and disaster-response zones that share physical connectivity. A mountain range, desert, or sea that interrupts infrastructure shall be a boundary. A cyclone belt, seismic fault zone, flood plain, or permafrost region that requires coordinated disaster logistics shall not be split.

4. **Population distribution.** An RCA shall contain between 10 million and 1 billion persons. Where a watershed meeting principles 1 through 3 exceeds 1 billion, it may be split along sub-basin boundaries. Where a watershed meeting principles 1 through 3 falls below 10 million, it may be combined with an adjacent watershed sharing ecological and infrastructure characteristics.

5. **Mineral and resource basin coherence.** A major mineral province, hydrocarbon basin, or aquifer shall not be split across RCAs where avoidable. Where a resource basin straddles a

watershed divide, the Commission may adjust the boundary to enclose the basin within one RCA, recording the deviation in the Boundary Segment Record under subsection (e).

6. **Cultural legibility.** Boundaries shall, where consistent with principles 1 through 5, respect the territorial continuity of language families, customary land-tenure systems, and transhumance corridors. No boundary shall be drawn for the purpose of separating or concentrating any ethnic, linguistic, or religious group.
7. **Maritime boundaries.** Coastal RCA boundaries follow the low-water line along the coast, consistent with the baselines from which maritime zones are measured under Covenant maritime law. Maritime boundaries between RCAs extend from the land boundary terminus along the line equidistant from the nearest coastal baseline points of each RCA.
8. **Antarctica.** Antarctica is a custodial RCA with zero permanent population. Its boundary follows the grounding line of the continental ice sheet. The grounding-line position shall be surveyed by glaciologists drawn from pools maintained under subsection (c)(1), published in the evidence repository under subsection (g), and updated at each full redraw. The Expert Body acts as Antarctica's governance authority for all purposes under this Section, including standing under subsection (h), but the Boundary Delineation Commission draws Antarctica's boundaries following the same procedure as all other RCAs. The Commission shall include at least one glaciologist for Antarctic boundary work.
9. **Boundary definition defaults.** Where the Commission's ratified geodetic coordinates are silent or ambiguous, the default boundary features shall be: for rivers, the thalweg (line of deepest channel); for lakes, the median line; for coasts, the low-water line consistent with Covenant maritime baselines. The Commission's published geodetic coordinates control where specified; these defaults apply only to fill gaps in the ratified output.

**(b) Self-correcting criteria architecture** The nine principles in subsection (a) are co-equal; no principle has fixed lexical priority. Where principles conflict in application to a specific boundary segment, the Commission shall not resolve the conflict by a standing priority rule. Instead:

1. **Conflict recording.** The Commission shall record every material conflict between principles for that segment in the Boundary Segment Record under subsection (e), stating the competing principles, the evidence supporting each, the Commission's provisional resolution and its reasoning, and a quantitative comparison of the evidence weights for each principle. Where the Commission subordinates one principle to another, it shall state what additional evidence for the subordinated principle would have changed its resolution.
2. **Challenge escalation.** During the review period under subsection (f), any party with standing under subsection (h) may challenge the Commission's resolution of a principles conflict. The challenge shall identify the specific boundary segment, the competing principles, and prima facie evidence that the Commission's resolution is materially arbitrary, unsupported by its own evidence, inconsistent with its own reasoning on comparable segments, or based on materially deficient investigation of the subordinated principle.
3. **Boundary Review Tribunal.** Challenges are decided by a 7-member Boundary Review Tribunal drawn under subsection (i). The Tribunal shall resolve the principles conflict for that segment by applying the evidence adduced by the Commission and the challenger, without deference to the Commission's provisional resolution. The Tribunal may remand the segment to the Commission for redrawing with specific guidance, or may itself specify the resolution

where the correction follows necessarily from the evidence. The Tribunal's decision is binding on the Commission for that segment and dissolves after all judgments concerning that boundary cycle are rendered.

4. **Epistemic Council referral.** The EC may, at any time during the review period, publish a finding that the Commission's pattern of principles-conflict resolution reveals a systematic epistemic bias. Such a finding is diagnostic only; it creates no veto, does not stay the boundary process, and does not bind the Tribunal or the ratifying body. The Commission and the Tribunal shall each publish a response within 30 days.
5. **No single-principle capture.** No party may assert that a single principle, standing alone, defeats all others for a segment without engaging the specific conflict with the competing principle and the quantitative evidence comparison published by the Commission. The Tribunal shall dismiss any challenge that merely reasserts the primacy of one principle without addressing contrary evidence. The Tribunal may remand a segment if it finds that the Commission's evidence for a subordinated principle is materially deficient compared to the evidence for the dominant principle, and that additional investigation could reasonably change the resolution.

### (c) The Boundary Delineation Commission

1. **Constitution.** No earlier than 5 years and no later than 8 years after Covenant ratification, and every 50 years thereafter (except as modified by the first-cycle provision at paragraph 7), the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall constitute a Boundary Delineation Commission by constrained lot from openly recruited, independently screened, and independently certified pools. The Commission shall consist of no fewer than 23 and no more than 31 members, an odd number. Membership shall be stratified so that the Commission includes:

   a. At least 5 hydrologists or watershed scientists;
   b. At least 5 ecologists or biogeographers;
   c. At least 3 infrastructure or disaster-logistics specialists;
   d. At least 3 demographers or population geographers;
   e. At least 2 mineral-resource or hydrogeology specialists;
   f. At least 2 linguists, anthropologists, or affected-community knowledge holders;
   g. At least 3 generalist geographers or boundary-delimitation specialists;
   h. At least 2 oceanographers or maritime-law specialists, where the eligible pool permits and maritime RCAs exist;
   i. At least 1 glaciologist, where the eligible pool permits, for Antarctic boundary work;
   j. No single discipline enumerated in (a) through (i) shall constitute more than 40% of the Commission's seated members;
   k. At least one member shall be drawn from each of the six Covenant statistical regions;
   l. At least 30% of members shall be drawn from pools of persons whose principal knowledge pathway is vocational, informal, traditional, or indigenous.

2. **Hard minimum discipline requirements.** The Commission shall not be constituted with fewer than the stated minimums for disciplines (a) through (g). If the pool for any of these disciplines is insufficient after two independent recruitment rounds (each at least 90 days), the ISS shall notify the Constitutional Court and the Epistemic Council. The Court may, within 30 days and on published justification, authorize one of:

   a. A reduced-size Commission, no fewer than 15 members, maintaining the same discipline ratios where possible;
   b. Relaxation of one discipline stratum, with recruitment from an adjacent discipline and a published explanation;
   c. Extension of the draw window by up to 12 months with intensified recruitment funded from the Boundary Architecture appropriation.

   The Commission shall not be constituted with fewer than 15 members or without at least one member from each core discipline: hydrology or watershed science, ecology or biogeography, infrastructure or disaster logistics, demography or population geography, mineral resources or hydrogeology, and cultural or local knowledge. If the Court's authorized fallback fails to produce a valid Commission after 12 additional months, the function transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7, and the ISS shall publish a notice identifying the pool insufficiency as a constitutional continuity event.

3. **Pool sufficiency audit.** No later than 180 days before the scheduled Commission draw, the ISS shall publish a pool sufficiency audit certifying that:

   a. The global pool for each discipline stratum (a) through (g) contains at least 3 times the minimum number of eligible, conflict-free candidates;
   b. The pool for each statistical region contains at least 3 eligible, conflict-free candidates;
   c. The pool for non-formal knowledge holders contains at least 3 times the minimum implied by the 30% requirement;
   d. Conflict-exclusion rules under paragraph 6 have been applied and the remaining pool sizes meet the 3× threshold after exclusions.

   If any stratum fails the 3× threshold, the ISS shall immediately initiate a supplementary recruitment round of at least 90 days. If the supplementary round fails, the ISS shall notify the CC and EC and the fallback procedure in paragraph 2 applies. The pool sufficiency audit, the raw applicant list (anonymized), and all qualification determinations shall be published in the evidence repository.

4. **Qualification and auditor screening.** Each candidate pool shall be assembled by open application and binary threshold review. Qualification is binary; no assessor may rank candidates who meet the published threshold. The ISS administers the draw from the certified pool but shall not screen, rank, select, or deselect members, alter a pool or stratum, choose or reject an outcome, or rerun a valid draw.

   **Independent reproduction and screening verification.** Three independent auditors shall reproduce and verify: (i) pool formation from raw applicant data through qualification determinations to the final certified pool, verifying that every candidate in the pool meets the published qualification threshold and that no candidate who meets the threshold was excluded; (ii) stratification verification; and (iii) the final draw from the certified pool using published code, canonical inputs, and the public entropy schedule.

   **Auditor selection.** The three auditors shall be drawn by lot by the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network under Article XII, Section 12.7(b.1) from a CGA-certified pool of conflict-free forensic methodologists, statistical auditors, and domain experts. The ISS shall not select, influence, or communicate with the auditors concerning their verification. The auditors shall publish every qualification determination reviewed, with assessor identity, the evidence supporting the determination, and any dissent.

The Commission is not constituted until at least two of the three auditors have published matching reproductions for all three stages. A discrepancy shall be resolved by a temporary 7-member substitute tribunal drawn under the canonical-record dispute procedure in Article XII, Section 12.7(b.1); the tribunal may not select members, draw a new pool, or adjudicate beyond the disputed material.

5. **Post-service bar and dissolution.** No commissioner may serve in the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, Regional Coordinating Assembly governance, or any subsequent Boundary Delineation Commission, Statistical Region Commission, Boundary Review Tribunal, Interim Correction Commission, or Statistical Region Review Commission for 15 years after the Commission dissolves. Service on the Commission does not create preferential eligibility for any Covenant position. The bar does not extend to service on the Independent Sortition Secretariat, Epistemic Council, Citizen Grievance Assembly, Independent Metrics Council, Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, or temporary tribunals, juries, panels, or commissions unrelated to boundaries.

   The Commission dissolves upon ratification of the boundaries by the competent body under subsection (f). A commissioner who resigns or is removed before dissolution remains subject to the same 15-year bar, running from the Commission's dissolution date.

6. **No EB, CC, RCA, or prospective beneficiary control.** No EB member, Constitutional Court justice, Regional Coordinating Assembly officer, or prospective boundary beneficiary may nominate, remove, direct, selectively fund, or alter the inputs or outputs of a commissioner or the Commission. The ISS shall publish every communication between a commissioner and any person outside the Commission concerning a boundary decision, with the commissioner's identity protected until dissolution.

7. **First-cycle provisions.** The first Boundary Delineation Commission constituted after Covenant ratification is a provisional Commission. Its boundaries are subject to a mandatory full redraw at 30 years (not 50) by a freshly drawn Commission following the full procedure in this Section. The first Commission's review period under subsection (f)(1) is 180 days (not 120). All subsequent Commissions follow the standard 50-year cycle and 120-day review period. During the first Commission's review period, the provisional bodies under Article XI have standing under subsection (h) in addition to the standard standing list.

#### (d) The Statistical Region Commission

1. **Constitution and independence.** The ISS shall constitute a separate Statistical Region Commission after RCA boundaries are ratified under subsection (f). The Statistical Region Commission shall be drawn independently from different pools, using a different entropy source, and on a timeline that ensures no overlap in membership with the Boundary Delineation Commission. A person who served on the Boundary Delineation Commission for the same cycle, or who applied to that Commission's pools, is permanently ineligible for the Statistical Region Commission for that cycle.

2. **Composition.** The Statistical Region Commission shall consist of no fewer than 11 and no more than 17 members, an odd number, stratified to include:

   a. At least 3 statisticians or sampling methodologists;
   b. At least 3 demographers or population geographers;
   c. At least 2 constitutional methodologists or sortition-audit specialists;

d. At least 3 members drawn from pools of affected-community knowledge holders or persons whose principal knowledge pathway is non-formal;
e. At least one member from each of the six Covenant statistical regions.

3. **Qualification and reproduction.** The same binary-threshold qualification, auditor screening verification (auditors drawn by the External Network under subsection (c)(4)), ISS ministerial-only role, post-service bar, and dissolution rules as subsection (c)(4), (c)(5), and (c)(6) apply to the Statistical Region Commission.

4. **Six-region mandate.** The Commission shall delineate exactly six Covenant statistical regions solely for global sortition, rotating representation, comparison, and administration. The six statistical regions are a layer separate from the RCAs; they confer no sovereignty, identity, hierarchy, resource claim, or political boundary. Once operational, they replace the provisional six-region scheme and the Founding Macroregions under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.1).

5. **No Boundary Delineation Commission involvement.** The Boundary Delineation Commission shall not draft, review, or influence the statistical region assignment. No member of the Boundary Delineation Commission, no ISS clerk assigned to that Commission, and no auditor who reproduced that Commission's draw may serve on, advise, or communicate substantively with the Statistical Region Commission concerning its assignment.

### (e) Boundary Segment Record

1. **Requirement.** Every boundary segment proposed by the Commission shall carry a single unified Boundary Segment Record, published in the evidence repository before the review period begins. The Record shall contain four components:

   **Component 1. Placement claim and evidence.** The exact claim: "This segment follows [specified geographic feature] as the boundary between [RCA A] and [RCA B]." The hydrological, ecological, demographic, infrastructure, resource, and cultural data supporting the placement. Data sources, measurement rules, and material auxiliary assumptions. Serious alternative placements considered and reasons for rejection.

   **Component 2. Principles-conflict analysis.** For every material conflict between principles under subsection (b)(1): the competing principles, the evidence supporting each, the Commission's resolution and reasoning, a quantitative comparison of evidence weights, and a statement of what additional evidence for the subordinated principle would have changed the resolution.

   **Component 3. Disconfirmation Record.** An observation or pattern that would count against the placement: a specific change in watershed configuration, biome classification, population distribution, or infrastructure connectivity that would make a different boundary placement demonstrably superior. Also: the evidence threshold that triggers review, meaning what magnitude of change, in what variable, observed over what time period, would require reopening this segment.

   **Component 4. Deliberative annotations.** The reasoning for rejecting each serious alternative placement, including alternatives raised by commissioners in dissent. Annotations by commissioners concerning tacit knowledge: terrain conditions, local climatic patterns, informal understandings between affected communities, or other factors not captured in quantitative models but material to the boundary placement. Any political compromises or accommodations between affected RCAs, disclosed with the consent of the RCA governance bodies involved. Known limitations of the data, models, or methods applied to the segment.

2. **Standard of specificity and independent measurability.** The Disconfirmation Record component shall state a disconfirming condition that:

   a. Is specific enough that an independent reviewer could determine, from publicly available data, whether the condition has been met, without requiring the Commission's cooperation, access to non-public data, or interpretation of undefined terms;
   b. References a variable that is independently measurable by a third party using publicly available instruments, datasets, or direct observation;
   c. States a quantitative or clearly bounded qualitative threshold; "material," "significant," or "substantial" standing alone are insufficient unless operationalized by a specific metric, magnitude, and measurement rule;
   d. Is realistically attainable within the redraw cycle; a condition that no reasonable observer would expect to occur is presumptively unreasonable and may be flagged by the Independent Metrics Council under paragraph 5.

3. **Deliberative Record immunity.** No statement in a Deliberative annotation (Component 4) may be used as evidence in any proceeding against the commissioner who made it, except where the statement is an admission of knowing falsification of data or deliberate violation of a principle in subsection (a). This immunity protects candor in institutional deliberation and follows the Covenant pattern of protecting participants in assessment processes (cf. §1.1 Phase 2 declination protections, §12.8(f) anti-retaliation).

4. **Relationship to Metric Passport.** Where a Boundary Segment Record relies on a hydrological model, ecological classification, population dataset, or other metric, that metric shall carry a current Metric Passport under Article IV, Section 4.7(b). A segment whose Record relies on an expired, suspended, or passport-less metric is flagged under subsection (k) and may not be ratified until the metric is validated or an alternative Record using valid metrics is published.

5. **Metrics Council flagging.** At each 10-year boundary-relevant metric review under subsection (k)(2), the Independent Metrics Council shall review every Boundary Segment Record in force and may flag any Record whose disconfirming condition is:

   a. Unmeasurable without the Commission's cooperation or access to non-public data;
   b. Dependent on a metric whose Metric Passport has expired or been suspended;
   c. Stated in terms that have no operational definition in the published evidence repository;
   d. Dependent on a threshold that no reasonable observer would expect to be met within the relevant cycle.

   A flagged Record is published in the evidence repository and automatically opens a 180-day window during which any RCA whose territory includes the affected segment may petition for Interim Correction under subsection (j)(2) with a reduced threshold: 5% of the RCA's population, verified by the ISS. If no petition is filed, the flag remains but the boundary continues in force. At the next full redraw, the Commission shall replace the flagged Record or redraw the segment.

**(f) Ratification**

1. **Review period.** The Commission shall publish its complete proposal (including the final map, geodetic coordinates of every boundary segment, the evidence repository required by subsection (g), every segment's Boundary Segment Record, all dissent, and all code) for a public review period. The review period shall be 180 days for the first boundary cycle and 120 days for all subsequent cycles. During this period, any party with standing under subsection (h) may file a challenge. The Commission shall maintain the proposal as a version-controlled repository and shall publish every amendment, correction, or response during the review period.

   **Plain-language summary.** Within 30 days of the proposal's publication, the Commission shall publish a plain-language summary of each boundary segment's rationale, written in each of the six Covenant working languages. The summary shall explain, in terms accessible to a person without scientific training: what geographic feature the boundary follows, why that feature was chosen, which principles supported the choice, and how the Disconfirmation Record's defeat condition can be checked. The full proposal in the evidence repository is authoritative.

2. **Constitutional Court review.** Upon expiry of the review period, the Constitutional Court shall, within 60 days, either ratify the boundaries or remand them to the Commission. The Court may not draw a boundary, rewrite the methodology, substitute its preferred map, reweigh the evidence, resolve a principles conflict de novo, or impose a condition not grounded in a specific provision of this Covenant. Every justice who served on, advised, audited, or materially communicated with the Commission shall recuse; if fewer than 5 conflict-free justices remain, the substitute-bench procedure in Article X, Section 10.2.1 is mandatory.

   **Deemed ratification when no challenges filed.** If no challenge is filed under subsection (h) by the end of the review period, the boundaries are deemed ratified on day 60 after the review period closes without requiring Court action. The ISS shall publish a ministerial notice of deemed ratification. The Court retains jurisdiction to review procedural defects raised by a justice sua sponte within the 60-day window, but a remand on that basis extends the window only for the affected segments; unchallenged and unremanded segments are ratified.

3. **Remand requirements.** A remand order shall:

   a. Identify the specific boundary segment, subsection, or procedural step that is defective;
   b. Cite the Commission's own published evidence from the Boundary Segment Record or evidence repository that demonstrates the defect, with specific quotations or data references;
   c. State the specific provision of this Covenant that is violated;
   d. Identify the evidence that would cure the defect;
   e. Be decided by at least 5 of the 7 justices (or 5 members of a substitute bench), with dissents published.

   **Void remand standard.** A remand is automatically void and does not count toward the remand limits under paragraph 4 if it:

   i. Merely disagrees with the Commission's resolution of a principles conflict without citing a specific procedural or constitutional defect supported by a specific quotation or data reference from the Commission's evidence repository;
   ii. States a defect in general terms without citing a specific quotation or data reference from the Commission's own published evidence;

iii. Cites a provision of this Covenant that does not apply to the cited defect;
iv. Demands a remedy not within the Commission's authority.

The ISS shall record every remand, publish it in the evidence repository, and note whether the remand meets the citation requirements of this paragraph. The ISS makes no determination of validity; it records the presence or absence of specific citations. If the Commission, any party with standing, or any justice who dissented asserts that a remand is void, the dispute shall be resolved by a §10.2.1 substitute bench, which shall determine within 30 days whether the remand meets the standard. The substitute bench may not draw a boundary or reweigh evidence; its jurisdiction is limited to determining whether the remand order satisfies subparagraphs (i) through (iv). The substitute bench's determination is final. A remand found void does not count toward any limit. The 60-day ratification clock is tolled from the filing of a voidness challenge under this paragraph through the date of the substitute bench's determination, regardless of whether the remand is found void or valid; the clock resumes on that date.

4. **Remand limits and substitute bench transfer.**

   a. **Two-remand cap.** If the Constitutional Court remands the same boundary proposal more than twice, its jurisdiction over that boundary cycle terminates immediately.

   b. **Single substantive remand per segment.** After the Commission corrects a defect identified in a valid remand for a specific boundary segment, the Court may not remand that segment again on substantive grounds unless the subsequent remand cites new evidence (not available or reasonably discoverable during the original review period) that demonstrates a material defect. A procedural defect in the correction itself may be remanded separately. A second substantive remand on the same segment that does not cite new evidence is automatically void.

   c. **Substitute bench transfer.** If the CC remands more than twice, the ISS shall, within 7 days, draw a temporary 7-member §10.2.1 substitute bench from pools that exclude every justice who participated in any remand of that cycle and every person who served on the Commission. The substitute bench shall ratify or remand within 60 days. It may remand no more than once; a further defect transfers the function to a freshly drawn successor under §12.7. No bench may draw a boundary or resolve a principles conflict de novo. Every substitute bench dissolves upon ratification or transfer.

5. **Epistemic Council Blind Spot Report.** At any time before ratification, the EC may publish a Blind Spot Report on the boundary proposal. For the first boundary cycle, the EC shall publish a Blind Spot Report; publication is mandatory for that cycle. The Report is diagnostic only. The Commission, the Court, and any substitute bench shall each publish a response within 30 days.

6. **Effect of ratification.** Upon ratification, the boundaries become legally effective, the Commission dissolves, and the redraw clock under subsection (j) begins. Until ratification, the existing boundaries (or, for the first cycle, the RCA boundaries in Schedule A) remain in force. A boundary cycle that reaches its scheduled redraw year without ratification does not extend the Commission; existing boundaries continue under Article XII, Section 12.7(a), and the ISS shall constitute a fresh Commission within 180 days.

### (g) Public evidence repository

1. **Content.** The Commission shall maintain a public, version-controlled evidence repository containing, at minimum: annotated GIS data for every proposed boundary segment; all hydrological models, ecological classifications, population datasets, and code used; every Boundary Segment Record under subsection (e); all dissent by commissioners; all public comments received during the review period with the Commission's responses; and all EC findings, Court remand orders, substitute bench decisions, and Scientific Review Panel certifications concerning the boundary cycle.

2. **Permanence and integrity.** The repository shall be archived in the Covenant public ledger and shall remain permanently available. All entries shall be cryptographically hashed (SHA-256 or equivalent). The repository shall be independently mirrored on at least three geographically distributed storage systems, with at least one air-gapped archival copy maintained by the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network. A format migration audit shall be conducted at least every 10 years. Tamper-detection shall be verified at each full redraw cycle. No body may alter, delete, or restrict access to a published entry except to correct a factual error, with the correction published as a new version and the original preserved.

3. **Accessibility and language.** The repository shall be accessible through the Digital Grievance Portal under Article V, Section 5.1. All narrative components shall be published in at least the six Covenant working languages. Translations shall be certified by conflict-free translator pools administered by the ISS. The original-language version is authoritative. Every Boundary Segment Record shall include a structured-data component (machine-readable threshold values, geographic coordinates, variable names, measurement rules) that is language-independent.

### (h) Standing and challenge architecture

1. **Standing.** During the review period under subsection (f)(1), the following parties have standing to file a challenge:

   a. Any Regional Coordinating Assembly, acting through its lawful governance body;
   b. The Citizen Grievance Assembly, by a 60% supermajority vote;
   c. The Epistemic Council, by a finding of 6 of its 9 members;
   d. The Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, concerning any boundary affecting its operational jurisdiction;
   e. Any Local Cultural Council whose territory is materially affected by a proposed boundary;
   f. Any community of at least 10,000 persons whose principal residence is within 50 kilometres of a proposed boundary and who present specific prima facie evidence that the boundary violates a principle in subsection (a);
   g. Any citizen who presents specific prima facie evidence, grounded in the Commission's own published data, that a boundary segment's placement is materially inconsistent with its own Boundary Segment Record;
   h. For Antarctica, the Expert Body, acting as Antarctica's governance authority;
   i. For the first boundary cycle only, the provisional bodies under Article XI.

2. **Intake.** The ISS shall draw a conflict-free intake clerk from the forensic-methodology pool used for Article IV, Section 4.7(c). The clerk shall open review upon a showing of standing and specific prima facie evidence. Repetitive challenges without materially new evidence may be

denied with reasons. A denial receives one conflict-free procedural appeal under the substitute-tribunal model in Article IV, Section 4.7(i). The clerk shall docket all opened challenges and transmit them to the Boundary Review Tribunal under subsection (i) within 7 days.

3. **Consolidation.** The clerk shall consolidate challenges raising substantially the same objection to the same boundary segment and treat the consolidation as a single proceeding.
4. **No retaliation.** Filing a challenge, testifying before the Tribunal, or providing evidence shall carry no disadvantage. The anti-retaliation protections of Article XII, Section 12.8(f) apply.

### (i) Boundary Review Tribunal

1. **Constitution.** Upon docketing of one or more challenges, the ISS shall, within 14 days, draw a temporary 7-member Boundary Review Tribunal from independently maintained standing pools:

   a. Two hydrologists or ecologists;
   b. Two affected-community representatives, drawn from pools of persons whose principal residence is within 100 kilometres of the challenged boundary segment on either side. If the 100-kilometre radius contains fewer than 50,000 persons, the radius extends to 200 kilometres. The ISS shall apply this mechanical rule without discretion. The affiliation-cluster cap in Article II, Section 2.2 applies verbatim to this affected-community-representative pool: no disclosed affiliation, institution, employer, funder lineage, or coordinated applicant cluster (defined as candidates sharing controlling organizational, financial, or familial ties) shall constitute more than one-fifth of the pool's candidates for that Tribunal, and no applicant with any of the following ties to an entity whose commercial activity would materially benefit from the contested placement of the challenged boundary segment may enter the pool for that Tribunal: (i) direct or beneficial ownership, including interests held through a trust, holding company, nominee, or other vehicle; (ii) employment or material financial dependency of the applicant or of a parent, sibling, child, or spouse of the applicant; or (iii) a material contractual, consulting, lobbying, or advocacy relationship. "Commercial activity" for this purpose includes but is not limited to extraction, infrastructure, agribusiness, forestry, fisheries, real-estate development, and tourism operations. This exclusion is independent of and additional to the individual material-personal-interest bar in paragraph (2);
   c. Two constitutional jurists, drawn from pools meeting Article II plural-law composition requirements;
   d. One statistician or forensic methodologist.

2. **Conflict exclusions.** No person who served on the Boundary Delineation Commission, the ISS intake clerk assigned to that Commission, any auditor who reproduced that Commission's draw, any justice who issued a remand in the same boundary cycle, or any person with a material personal interest in the challenged boundary's placement may serve on the Tribunal.
3. **Procedure and decision.** The Tribunal shall: receive the challenge record and the Commission's evidence; hold a public hearing within 30 days of constitution; decide within 60 days by simple majority of seated non-recused members (4 of 7), with dissents published; state the specific evidence relied upon; and either confirm the Commission's placement, remand the segment for redrawing with specific guidance, or specify the correct placement if the correction follows necessarily from the evidence.

4. **Scope limitation.** The Tribunal may adjudicate only the challenged boundary segments and the specific objections raised.
5. **Dissolution and post-service bar.** The Tribunal dissolves after rendering all judgments. Members are subject to the same 15-year post-service bar as commissioners under subsection (c)(5).
6. **Continuity.** If the Tribunal fails to decide within 60 days, the function and record transfer under §12.7 to a freshly drawn successor Tribunal. The review period is extended by the period of Tribunal delay but by no more than 90 days.
7. **Appeal.** A party aggrieved by the Tribunal's specification of a boundary resolution may appeal once to a §10.2.1 substitute bench on the sole ground that the specified resolution does not follow necessarily from the evidence in the record. The substitute bench shall review for clear error only; it may not redraw the boundary or reweigh evidence. If the substitute bench finds clear error, it shall remand the segment to a freshly drawn Boundary Review Tribunal. The substitute bench's review shall be completed within 30 days.

### (j) Self-correction between redraw cycles

1. **Full redraw cycle.** RCA boundaries shall be redrawn in full every 50 years, following the complete procedure in subsections (c) through (i), except that the first cycle is 30 years per subsection (c)(7). Each full redraw shall also trigger a redraw of the six statistical regions by a fresh Statistical Region Commission under subsection (d).
2. **Interim Boundary Correction.** Between full redraw cycles, an RCA's boundary segments may be corrected through the following procedure:

   a. **Trigger.** An Interim Boundary Correction is triggered by any one of three routes:

      **Route 1: Automatic Disconfirmation Record trigger.** If the pre-stated disconfirming condition in a Boundary Segment Record is met, as certified by a Scientific Review Panel under subparagraph (b), the ISS shall constitute an Interim Boundary Correction Commission under subparagraph (d). No population petition required.

      **Route 2: Population petition.** A petition signed by 5% of the population of an RCA, verified through the Covenant identity registry by the ISS, may request Interim Correction. The petition shall identify the specific boundary segments, the ecological or demographic change, and the evidence supporting the claim. The ISS shall provide a secure digital collection mechanism.

      **Route 3: CGA or EC certification.** The CGA, by a 60% supermajority vote, or the EC, by a finding of 6 of its 9 members, may certify that a material ecological or demographic change warrants Interim Correction for specified boundary segments.

   b. **Scientific Review Panel.** Upon petition under Route 2 or certification under Route 3, the ISS shall, within 30 days, constitute a temporary 7-member Scientific Review Panel drawn from independently certified standing pools:

      i. Three hydrologists, climate scientists, or glaciologists (for Antarctic boundaries);
      ii. Two ecologists or biogeographers;
      iii. Two forensic methodologists or statisticians.

The Panel shall, within 90 days, certify whether a material ecological or demographic change has occurred that renders one or more boundary segments demonstrably invalid under the principles in subsections (a) and (b):

i. The change is material, meaning it alters watershed configuration, biome classification, infrastructure connectivity, or population distribution such that a reasonable Commission would place the boundary differently;
ii. The change is persistent, meaning a documented trend sustained over at least 10 years, or a single geophysical event confirmed by direct observation to have permanently altered watershed configuration. Permanence shall be confirmed within 180 days of the event;
iii. The affected Boundary Segment Record's pre-stated disconfirming condition is met, or the change is of a kind not contemplated by the Record but demonstrably material under standard (i).

The Panel's certification shall be published. The Panel's determination is appealable to a §10.2.1 substitute bench for clear error: whether the certification follows necessarily from the evidence in the record. The substitute bench may not substitute its own ecological or demographic finding for the Panel's. The Panel dissolves after issuing its certification.

c. **Demographic trigger.** In addition to ecological triggers, an Interim Boundary Correction is automatically triggered if an RCA's population falls outside the 10 million to 1 billion range for two consecutive decadal censuses, as certified by the Independent Metrics Council. The Metrics Council shall review RCA population against the 10M-1B range at each decadal census as part of its boundary-relevant metric review under subsection (k)(2). The Scientific Review Panel shall certify the demographic change, applying the same materiality and persistence standards.

d. **Constitution of Interim Commission.** Upon certification by the Scientific Review Panel (Routes 2 and 3) or automatically upon Disconfirmation Record trigger (Route 1), the ISS shall, within 180 days, constitute an Interim Boundary Correction Commission. The Interim Commission shall follow the same procedure as the Boundary Delineation Commission, with modifications: (i) 11 to 17 members, same discipline stratification but no region-per-member requirement; (ii) mandate limited to the RCA whose correction was triggered and the specific boundary segments identified; (iii) may adjust adjacent segments only to maintain boundary continuity; (iv) 60-day review period with the same standing, challenge, and Tribunal provisions; (v) ratification follows subsection (f), with remand limits applying independently.

e. **Queuing.** The ISS shall docket Interim Correction petitions in the order received and process them sequentially. No more than 3 Interim Correction Commissions may sit concurrently. Petitions received while 3 Commissions are sitting shall be queued and processed in docket order as Commissions dissolve. A petition queued for more than 2 years may be escalated to the CGA, which may by 60% vote reprioritize the queue. This queuing rule does not apply to Route 1 automatic triggers caused by catastrophic geophysical events certified under subparagraph (b)(ii), which shall be docketed ahead of all other pending petitions.

f. **Non-reset of redraw clock.** An Interim Correction does not reset the full redraw clock. The full redraw proceeds on its original schedule and shall incorporate any Interim Corrections made since the last full redraw, subject to de novo review.

3. **RCA lifecycle: merger, split, and dissolution.**

   a. **Merger.** Two adjacent RCAs may merge by: joint petition by both RCA governance bodies; ISS-verified population petition of 5% in each RCA; CC certification that the merged RCA satisfies subsection (a) principles including 10M-1B range; ratification by a Boundary Review Tribunal. The merged RCA assumes the names, identities, and obligations of both predecessors. Merger takes effect upon the next full redraw unless the Tribunal orders immediate effect upon finding of material harm from delay.

   b. **Split.** An RCA may split by: petition signed by 60% of the RCA's population or petition by the RCA governance body with CGA supermajority approval; CC certification that each successor RCA satisfies subsection (a) principles; constitution of a simplified Boundary Delineation Commission (11-17 members) to draw new boundaries. Split takes effect upon the next full redraw unless the Commission orders immediate effect.

   c. **Dissolution.** An RCA dissolves when its territory becomes demonstrably uninhabitable. "Demonstrably uninhabitable" means certified by a Scientific Review Panel as incapable of supporting permanent human habitation without continuous life-support infrastructure, due to climate-driven desertification, toxic contamination, permanent submergence, or other irreversible loss of habitability. Upon dissolution, the RCA's territory becomes a planetary commons stewardship zone under direct Expert Body supervision, following the Antarctic custodial model. Any remaining population shall be assisted in relocation under Article VII human development protections. The RCA's identity is retired; its number is not re-used.

   d. **Effect on RCA count.** The number of RCAs is not fixed. It fluctuates with mergers, splits, dissolutions, and the Commission's output. Each change is recorded in Schedule A.

4. **Boundary disputes between RCAs.** A dispute between two RCAs concerning an existing ratified boundary shall be adjudicated by a Boundary Review Tribunal constituted under subsection (i), with both RCAs as parties. This provision supersedes the grant of boundary dispute jurisdiction to the Constitutional Court in the pre-replacement Section 1.0.1(g). The Tribunal's decision is binding and may be appealed once to a §10.2.1 substitute bench for constitutional or procedural error only. The existing boundary remains in force during adjudication.

#### (k) Metric governance for boundary data

1. **Metric Passport requirement.** Every hydrological model, ecological classification, population dataset, climate projection, and other quantitative or taxonomic instrument used by the Commission shall carry a current Metric Passport under Article IV, Section 4.7(b) before the boundary proposal is published. A generic Passport that does not address the boundary-decision context is insufficient.

2. **Independent Metrics Council review.** The Independent Metrics Council shall review every boundary-relevant metric at each full redraw and, independently, at least once every 10 years. The review shall assess calibration drift, construct validity for boundary delineation, adequacy of Disconfirmation Record trigger thresholds, and the reasonableness of those thresholds under subsection (e)(5). The Council shall also review RCA population against the 10M-1B range at each decadal census for purposes of the demographic trigger under subsection (j)(2)(c). The Council shall publish its findings and may recommend Metric Passport renewal, revision, or

suspension challenge. The Council may not adjudicate a challenge to its own work; challenges proceed under §4.7.

3. **Effect of metric suspension.** If a metric materially relied upon by a boundary segment is suspended under §4.7(e), the segment is automatically flagged. While suspension persists: the boundary continues in legal force under §12.7(a); the ISS shall publish a notice identifying the affected segment; any RCA whose territory includes the flagged segment may petition for Interim Correction using any trigger route, and the metric suspension constitutes prima facie evidence; at the next full redraw, the Commission shall not rely on the suspended metric unless revalidated.

4. **No metric override.** No metric, model, or dataset may override the principles in subsections (a) and (b), the Boundary Segment Record requirement, the challenge architecture, or Rule Zero.

### (l) Statistical Region Review

1. **Timing.** The ISS shall constitute a Statistical Region Review Commission at the midpoint of each redraw cycle. The review offset is floor(cycle/2) years from the date the statistical regions were last ratified or certified. For the first cycle (30 years), the first review occurs at 15 years. For subsequent cycles (50 years), review occurs at 25 years.

2. **Frozen pools.** The pools for the Statistical Region Review Commission shall be drawn and frozen before the Boundary Delineation Commission publishes its boundary proposal for the preceding full redraw cycle. The frozen pools shall be held in escrow by the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network. This prevents the ISS from conditioning review pools on boundary cycle outputs.

3. **Composition and procedure.** Same composition, qualification, auditor screening (auditors drawn by External Network), post-service bar, and dissolution rules as the Statistical Region Commission under subsection (d).

4. **De novo counterfactual.** The Review Commission shall publish a de novo counterfactual analysis: "Would a Commission drawing statistical regions from scratch today, without knowledge of the existing scheme, produce materially different regions?" If the answer is yes, the Review Commission shall detail the differences and the evidence supporting them.

   **Automatic review trigger.** If the counterfactual finds a material difference, any RCA, the CGA (by 60% vote), or the EC (by 6 of 9 members) may petition for a fresh Statistical Region Commission within 2 years. The review shall be treated as an Interim Correction with standing reduced from "all RCAs" to "any single petitioner." The fresh Commission shall follow the full procedure in subsection (d).

5. **Certification or ratification.** The Review Commission's proposal shall be certified by the CC if it proposes no change. If it proposes changes, those changes follow the full ratification procedure for the Statistical Region Commission. The existing scheme remains in force until certification or ratification.

6. **Founding transition.** Until the first permanent statistical regions are ratified, the following provisional regions shall remain in force: Americas, Europe, Africa, Asia-Pacific, Arabia-Persia, and Oceania-Antarctica, together with the Founding Macroregions under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.1). The first Statistical Region Commission shall publish its proposal no later than 2 years after the first Boundary Delineation Commission ratifies RCA boundaries.

**(m) ISS ministerial role and constraints**

1. **Ministerial function.** For every Commission, Tribunal, and body constituted under this Section, the ISS shall administer draws as a ministerial function. It may execute published code against frozen or lawfully certified pools using fixed constraints, entropy, and counters. It may not screen, rank, select, or deselect members; alter a pool, stratum, or draw; create or change eligibility; choose or reject an outcome; or rerun a valid draw. Every material submission, pool state, conflict disclosure, entropy input, counter change, pending matter, and sortition act shall write to independently controlled Network custody under §12.7(b.1) before the draw is published.
2. **Audit and reproduction.** Three independent auditors, drawn by the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network under §12.7(b.1), shall reproduce every draw under this Section, including pool formation and screening verification as specified in subsection (c)(4). The body constituted is not seated until at least two auditors have published matching reproductions for all stages. A discrepancy shall be resolved by the canonical-record dispute tribunal under §12.7(b.1).
3. **ISS incapacity.** If the ISS is unavailable, conflicted, or incapable of administering a draw, the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network shall administer the draw ministerially under the same constraints. No boundary function may be suspended by ISS incapacity.
4. **Safety assessment.** ISS capture sufficient to manipulate boundary draws requires simultaneous compromise of: (i) the ISS (to prejudice the draw), (ii) at least two of three independent auditors (to certify the rigged pool and draw), and (iii) the External Network (to prejudice the auditor draw). This is a multi-body coalition. The EC retains diagnostic access; the CGA retains pool certification authority; and the Network retains external custody of pool states and draw records. The Covenant's general correction architecture (Mission Fidelity under §5.4, §10.2.1 substitute benches, §12.7 continuity) remains available.

**(n) Relationship to Article VIII enforcement** Nothing in this Section authorizes the use of force to impose, alter, or enforce a boundary. Boundary adjudication is exclusively civil. The Peacekeeping Corps shall not be deployed for boundary demarcation or enforcement except as incidental to its ordinary disaster-response and infrastructure-protection functions.

**(o) Continuity** A missed deadline at any stage of this Section transfers the unfinished function and complete record under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a freshly drawn replacement actor of the same type; it does not deem the boundary proposal ratified, rejected, or withdrawn. Existing boundaries remain in force until a redraw is ratified under §12.7(a). No Commission, Tribunal, or review body extends its term by missing a deadline; its members lose decision authority on schedule, and the function passes. Every temporary body constituted under this Section dissolves upon completing its function and creates no continuing office, policy jurisdiction, caste, or preferential eligibility. The full redraw clock does not reset due to delay in a prior cycle; the ISS shall publish a schedule adjustment preserving the redraw cadence, with accumulated delay absorbed by shortening the subsequent review period.

**(p) Anti-dynasty** The 15-year kinship bar in Article XII, Section 12.5 applies to every Commission, Tribunal, and review body constituted under this Section. No person may serve in any such body if their parent, sibling, child, or spouse serves or has served within the preceding 15 years in the same body for the same boundary cycle.

**(q) LCC boundary conformance** After each RCA boundary redraw, Local Cultural Council boundaries shall be adjusted to conform. The conformance is ministerial: the ISS shall publish adjusted LCC boundaries applying the following rules: (1) an LCC entirely within a single RCA retains its existing boundaries; (2) an LCC split by a new RCA boundary is assigned to the RCA containing the majority of its population, unless the LCC petitions for alternative assignment within 90 days; (3) an LCC whose territory becomes uninhabitable follows the RCA dissolution procedure; (4) LCCs retain their internal governance structures and Charter rights under Article VI regardless of RCA assignment.

**(r) Funding** Funding for every function under this Section follows the function under Article XII, Section 12.7(g). The ISS budget shall include a dedicated Boundary Architecture appropriation, administered separately from general ISS operations and protected from reallocation. The Independent Metrics Council's boundary-relevant metric reviews, the Scientific Review Panel's certifications, and the auditor reproduction work under subsection (c)(4) shall each be funded from the Boundary Architecture appropriation.

**(s) Schedule A: RCA boundaries**

1. Until the first Boundary Delineation Commission ratifies its boundaries, the 48 Regional Coordinating Assemblies listed in the pre-replacement Section 1.0.1(b) continue as the lawful RCAs. The pre-replacement list is preserved as Schedule A with the force of a transitional schedule. The first Commission's ratified boundaries supersede Schedule A.
2. Each full redraw and each Interim Correction updates Schedule A. The ISS shall maintain Schedule A as a version-controlled public record. The current Schedule A is the authoritative RCA boundary map.
3. RCA identities (names, numbers, territories) are Commission output, not constitutional text. The number of RCAs is not fixed. The constitution specifies domain constraints within which the Commission operates.
4. No change to Schedule A requires a Constitutional Convention or any amendment procedure. Schedule A is an operational schedule updated by duly constituted Commissions.

**Schedule A: transitional RCA roster.** The following roster, drawn under the pre-ratification criteria, is the transitional Schedule A in force under subsection (s) until the first Boundary Delineation Commission ratifies its boundaries under subsection (f). It confers no permanence; the first Commission's ratified boundaries supersede it, and every population figure, ecosystem label, and strategic identity below is transitional data for the Commission to verify, not settled constitutional fact.

### A.1 Transitional 48 Regional Coordinating Assemblies

The Commission ratifies the following 48 RCAs, ordered approximately west-to-east across continental landmasses.

| # | RCA id | Name | Pop | Ecosystem |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | r-yellow-river | Yellow River Basin RCA | 410M | plateau |
| 2 | r-yangtze | Yangtze Basin RCA | 460M | basin |
| 3 | r-pearl-cantonese | Pearl River RCA | 150M | coastal |
| 4 | r-manchurian-korean | Manchurian-Korean RCA | 190M | boreal |
| 5 | r-japanese-arc | Japanese Archipelago RCA | 124M | island |
| 6 | r-taiwan-min | Taiwan-Min RCA | 68M | island |
| 7 | r-mekong | Mekong Mainland SE Asia RCA | 195M | basin |
| 8 | r-malay-sunda | Malay-Sunda Archipelago RCA | 320M | rainforest |
| 9 | r-philippine | Philippine Archipelago RCA | 115M | island |
| 10 | r-ganges-bengal | Ganges-Brahmaputra RCA | 540M | basin |
| 11 | r-indus | Indus Basin RCA | 340M | arid |
| 12 | r-peninsular-india | Peninsular India RCA | 520M | plateau |
| 13 | r-iranian-plateau | Iranian Plateau RCA | 130M | arid |
| 14 | r-aral-caspian | Aral-Caspian RCA | 110M | arid |
| 15 | r-mongolia-tarim | Mongolia-Tarim RCA | 18M | arid |
| 16 | r-nile | Nile Basin RCA | 165M | basin |
| 17 | r-maghreb | Maghreb Coast RCA | 100M | coastal |
| 18 | r-west-african | West African RCA | 475M | mixed |
| 19 | r-congo-basin | Congo Basin RCA | 125M | rainforest |
| 20 | r-great-lakes | Great Lakes RCA | 195M | mixed |
| 21 | r-horn-africa | Horn of Africa RCA | 22M | arid |
| 22 | r-southern-africa | Southern African RCA | 225M | mixed |
| 23 | r-madagascar | Madagascar RCA | 25M | island |
| 24 | r-rhine-atlantic | Rhine-Atlantic Europe RCA | 205M | mixed |
| 25 | r-mediterranean-europe | Mediterranean Europe RCA | 195M | coastal |
| 26 | r-north-atlantic-europe | North Atlantic Europe RCA | 115M | boreal |
| 27 | r-east-european | East European Plain RCA | 150M | mixed |
| 28 | r-danube-carpathian | Danube-Carpathian RCA | 60M | mixed |
| 29 | r-west-siberia | West Siberian RCA | 20M | boreal |
| 30 | r-central-east-siberia | Central-East Siberian RCA | 15M | boreal |
| 31 | r-atlantic-northeast-na | Atlantic Northeast N. America RCA | 135M | mixed |
| 32 | r-mississippi-plains | Mississippi-Great Plains RCA | 125M | basin |
| 33 | r-pacific-cordillera-na | Pacific Cordillera N. America RCA | 80M | coastal |
| 34 | r-mesoamerica | Mesoamerica RCA | 175M | coastal |
| 35 | r-caribbean | Caribbean RCA | 70M | island |
| 36 | r-andean | Andean RCA | 135M | plateau |
| 37 | r-la-plata | La Plata Basin RCA | 95M | mixed |
| 38 | r-amazon | Amazon Shield RCA | 145M | rainforest |
| 39 | r-northeast-brazil | Northeast Brazil RCA | 40M | mixed |
| 40 | r-anatolia | Anatolian Plateau RCA | 85M | plateau |

| # | RCA id | Name | Pop | Ecosystem |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41 | r-kurdistan | Kurdish Highlands RCA | 40M | mixed |
| 42 | r-levant | Levant Coast RCA | 90M | coastal |
| 43 | r-tibetan-plateau | Tibetan Plateau RCA | 12M | plateau |
| 44 | r-australia-nz | Australia-New Zealand RCA | 32M | arid |
| 45 | r-oceania | Oceania RCA | 13M | island |
| 46 | r-arabian-gulf | Arabian Gulf RCA | 55M | arid |
| 47 | r-yemen-oman | Southern Arabian RCA | 39M | arid |
| 48 | r-antarctica | Antarctic Custodial RCA | 0M (custodial) | ice |

### A.2 Transitional strategic identities

Each RCA is constituted as a distinct governance unit on the basis of watershed coherence, ecological continuity, infrastructure integration, and resource-basin integrity as defined in subsection (a). The following statements record the strategic identity, core endowments, and binding constraint that justify each boundary.

1. **r-yellow-river.** East Asia's energy-industrial core: the world's largest coal belt and rare-earth monopoly (Ordos, Bayan Obo), dominant shares of steel, refining, gold, bauxite, and uranium, Bohai offshore oil, and a grain belt producing one-third of the region's food. Constraint: extreme water scarcity; the basin holds 2 percent of the region's water resources for one-third of its grain, the North China Plain aquifers are depleted, and Yellow River outflow has declined more than 80 percent.

2. **r-yangtze.** Strategic minerals (V-Ti magnetite, ion-adsorption heavy rare earths, lithium, antimony, copper, phosphate), the planet's largest hydropower fleet, the regional rice bowl and freshwater-fishery heartland, ports and shipbuilding, and dense semiconductor and defense industries. Constraint: climate whiplash between extreme drought and flood on glacier-fed headwaters; a sinking, storm-exposed delta around the estuary; cadmium-contaminated paddy soils.

3. **r-pearl-cantonese.** The region's industrial and coastal core: electronics, electric-vehicle and shipbuilding clusters, the region's largest offshore-wind and nuclear fleet, nonferrous minerals (bauxite, manganese, tin, antimony), and the Pearl River's high runoff. Constraint: water scarcity in the delta core, dry-season saltwater intrusion, and typhoon-plus-sea-level-rise flood exposure on a low-lying megadelta.

4. **r-manchurian-korean.** Boreal forest and fertile black-soil plains spanning the Amur, Songhua, and Liao river basins and the Korean Peninsula: iron, coal, rare earths, and magnesite; advanced semiconductor and shipbuilding industries; the cereal breadbasket of northeast Asia. Constraint: legacy industrial pollution, extreme winter cold, infrastructure degradation in the northern interior, and concentrated advanced manufacturing in a single metropolitan corridor.

5. **r-japanese-arc.** Resource-scarce, industrially advanced archipelago: negligible domestic minerals except iodine and untapped deep-sea rare earths, fossil energy approximately 97 percent imported, but steel, semiconductor, automotive, shipbuilding, and pharmaceutical industries within a 4.47 million square kilometer exclusive economic zone. Constraint: mountainous

terrain limiting arable land to 12 percent, near-total fossil import dependence, seismic threat from the Nankai Trough, and population decline.

6. **r-taiwan-min.** Advanced semiconductor fabrication and electrochemical manufacturing concentrated along the Taiwan Strait, with dense precision-industry supply chains, heavy subtropical forest cover, productive rice, tea, and aquaculture agriculture, a major offshore-wind buildout, and the Kaohsiung-Xiamen port complex. Constraint: near-total energy-import dependence, recurring drought and water stress, tectonic and typhoon hazard, and coastal subsidence.

7. **r-mekong.** The world's largest inland fishery and a rice bowl producing approximately 50 million tonnes of paddy across the basin, rubber, coffee, sugarcane and aquaculture output, major rare-earth, tin, bauxite and potash deposits, and an electronics and automotive manufacturing core in Vietnam and Thailand. Constraint: Mekong Delta sea-level rise and saltwater intrusion, upstream dam-driven sediment and fish collapse, and the transboundary nature of every binding water problem.

8. **r-malay-sunda.** Strategic minerals (nickel approximately 61 percent of global supply, tin, copper-gold, bauxite), the planet's largest tropical forest-peat-mangrove carbon sink, and the region's industrial core spanning Singapore's refining hub, Malaysia's semiconductor back-end, and Indonesia's battery-nickel smelters. Constraint: coastal subsidence and sea-level rise on densely populated lowlands, recurring peat-fire haze, and primary-forest deforestation.

9. **r-philippine.** Nickel at 11 percent of world output, second-largest geothermal capacity, coconut and abaca production, a 2.26 million square kilometer exclusive economic zone, and a large English-speaking labor force in semiconductor exports and business-process services. Constraint: severe deforestation, typhoon vulnerability, archipelagic logistics costs, and unresolved maritime boundary disputes.

10. **r-ganges-bengal.** The world's most productive alluvial plain: 580,000 square kilometres of arable land producing rice, wheat, jute, tea, and sugarcane at global scale, combined with the Bay of Bengal's marine fisheries, Bangladesh's garment and pharmaceutical industries, and Nepal's untapped hydropower reserve exceeding 42 gigawatts. Constraint: water. Too much during monsoons (catastrophic flooding), too little clean groundwater (arsenic crisis, aquifer depletion), and too little control over transboundary flows.

11. **r-indus.** The world's largest contiguous irrigation system, fed by glacier-dependent Himalayan rivers, producing approximately 53 million tonnes of wheat, 25 million tonnes of rice, and 100 million tonnes of milk annually across 340 million people in an arid region. Constraint: the second-most overstressed aquifer system globally, with acute vulnerability to glacial-melt decline.

12. **r-peninsular-india.** A diversified resource base: iron, bauxite, coal, uranium, thorium, and rare-earth deposits; more than 90 percent of the region's wind capacity; cropland supporting rice, wheat, sugarcane, cotton, pulses, and spices for 520 million people; and a dense network of ports, refineries, steel mills, and information-technology hubs. Constraint: water stress from extreme monsoon seasonality, inter-basin river disputes, and groundwater depletion.

13. **r-iranian-plateau.** Hydrocarbon reserves at roughly 15 percent of global gas and 10 percent of oil (Iran and Turkmenistan together), an untapped mineral belt running from Afghan lithium and rare earths through Iranian copper-zinc-iron to Balochistan's gold-copper porphyry, and

an existing industrial base in steel, automotive, petrochemicals, and cement. Constraint: per capita water availability below the absolute scarcity threshold and still declining.

14. **r-aral-caspian.** The Aral Sea and Caspian shelf watersheds: the Amu Darya and Syr Darya systems supporting irrigated cotton and wheat across Central Asia, Caspian offshore oil and gas including the Kashagan super-giant field, and substantial uranium, copper, gold, and chromite deposits. Constraint: the Aral Sea has lost 90 percent of its volume; it is the worst anthropogenic environmental disaster on Earth. Rivers are overdrawn at 130 percent, glaciers are retreating, and the region is the most landlocked continental mass on Earth.
15. **r-mongolia-tarim.** Endorheic steppe and enclosed desert basins: Mongolian plateau pastoral economy, the Tarim Basin's oil and gas fields, significant copper-gold (Oyu Tolgoi) and coal (Tavan Tolgoi) deposits, and substantial rare-earth and uranium potential across southern Mongolia and the Gobi. Constraint: extreme aridity across the Gobi and Taklamakan, thin infrastructure, distance from maritime export routes, and economic dependence on raw commodity exports.
16. **r-nile.** Hydropower at 45 gigawatts Ethiopian potential, a major fossil fuel endowment (Egyptian gas and South Sudanese oil), the continent's largest agricultural workforce, and the Suez Canal carrying 12 percent of global trade. Constraint: 86 percent of the Nile's water originates in Ethiopia while the historic treaty beneficiaries (Egypt and Sudan) hold 100 percent of the allocation; this structural water conflict governs every other development possibility.
17. **r-maghreb.** Approximately 75 percent of the world's phosphate reserves, Africa's largest oil and gas reserves (Algeria and Libya: approximately 55 billion barrels of oil, 212 trillion cubic feet of gas), solar potential across the Sahara fringe, and olive, date, and citrus production. Constraint: chronic water scarcity, political instability, weak cross-border integration, and hydrocarbon dependence.
18. **r-west-african.** Bauxite, gold, oil and gas, and cocoa (exceeding 60 percent of world supply) across 475 million people, anchored by the Niger River (4,200 kilometres) and productive Gulf of Guinea fisheries. Constraint: climate-driven Sahel desertification, crippling energy and transport infrastructure deficits, and a demographic surge outpacing economic absorption.
19. **r-congo-basin.** The world's richest cobalt reserves, the second-largest rainforest, Africa's greatest hydropower potential (approximately 39 gigawatts at Inga), significant offshore oil and gas, and agricultural capacity that could feed billions. Constraint: 125 million people remain among Earth's poorest because infrastructure, governance, and value-addition lag far behind resource abundance; conflict in the eastern DRC persists.
20. **r-great-lakes.** The Lake Victoria basin and Rift Valley lakes: approximately 25 percent of Earth's unfrozen surface freshwater, major gold, coffee, and tea production, the continent's largest livestock herd, and Indian Ocean coastal access. Constraint: drought cycles, deforestation, infrastructure gaps, and the legacy of regional conflict.
21. **r-horn-africa.** The Red Sea and Gulf of Aden coast: arid pastoral economy, strategic maritime chokepoints (Bab el-Mandeb), offshore hydrocarbon potential, and remittance-dependent communities. Constraint: recurrent drought and famine, extremely high climate vulnerability, and chronic food insecurity across pastoral and agro-pastoral zones.
22. **r-southern-africa.** The world's richest concentration of platinum-group metals, chromium, manganese, and gem-diamonds, underpinned by the Bushveld Complex and Witwatersrand basin, the Copperbelt (Zambia), diamond fields of Botswana and Angola, Africa's largest

coal fleet, the Rovuma offshore gas basin (150 trillion cubic feet), and Zambezi hydropower. Constraint: coal-dependent power generation, severe water stress, extreme inequality, and commodity-export dependence.

23. **r-madagascar.** Vanilla production at 80 to 85 percent of world market, significant ilmenite, nickel, cobalt, and graphite reserves, the world's largest undeveloped heavy-oil deposit (Tsimiroro, 16.6 billion barrels in place), untapped hydropower, and unique biodiversity with extremely high endemism. Constraint: severe deforestation (approximately 330,000 hectares per year), fuelwood dependence, extreme poverty, and climate-exposed subsistence agriculture.
24. **r-rhine-atlantic.** The world's most industrially concentrated economic region, anchored by the Rhine-Ruhr-Randstad core: approximately 440,000 square kilometres of managed forest, Europe's largest agricultural output, the North Sea's offshore wind cluster, and an industrial base spanning automotive (approximately 14 million vehicles per year), aerospace, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and advanced semiconductor lithography equipment manufacturing. Constraint: approximately 65 percent energy import dependence, climate-driven water stress on the Rhine, an aging workforce, and the estimated 500 billion euro investment needed for industrial decarbonization.
25. **r-mediterranean-europe.** The northern Mediterranean watershed from the Iberian Peninsula through the Italian Peninsula to the Balkans and Aegean: Europe's largest solar endowment, olive oil (approximately 70 percent), wine, citrus, cork (approximately 50 percent), marble, and cruise-ship building, with a dense manufacturing base in automotive, machinery, and luxury goods. Constraint: acute water stress, demographic decline, and seasonal wildfire exposure amplified by rising temperatures.
26. **r-north-atlantic-europe.** Europe's largest remaining fossil fuel reserves on the Scandinavian shelf, the continent's densest hydropower and offshore wind capacity, the Baltic and North Sea agricultural belt, the most extensive managed boreal forest on Earth spanning Fennoscandia, and the globe's richest cold-water fisheries. Constraint: remaining coal dependence in the southern Baltic, declining North Sea hydrocarbons, and demographic aging.
27. **r-east-european.** The world's largest contiguous chernozem belt spanning the Dnieper, Don, and Volga watersheds (approximately 25 percent of world wheat exports), massive iron ore (Kursk Magnetic Anomaly), extensive gas reserves in the Dnieper-Donets basin, the world's third-largest potash deposits, the Donbas coal measures, and a dense inherited industrial base in steel, chemicals, aerospace, and information technology. Constraint: Chernobyl exclusion zone, soil degradation, demographic decline, and landlocked geography for the western and central reaches of the plain.
28. **r-danube-carpathian.** The Pannonian breadbasket, Europe's second-longest river, major lithium deposits (Jadar), a leading automotive manufacturing cluster, and the Carpathian arc's forest and freshwater resources across Central and Southeast Europe. Constraint: increasing Pannonian aridity, Carpathian deforestation, cross-border jurisdictional fragmentation, and demographic aging.
29. **r-west-siberia.** The West Siberian petroleum basin: the Ob-Irtysh watershed, the largest hydrocarbon province on Earth (Khanty-Mansi and Yamalo-Nenets, approximately 144 billion barrels discovered, roughly 70 percent of Russian oil), extensive boreal forest, and the Kuzbass coal basin. Constraint: extreme cold, permafrost thaw threatening infrastructure integrity, enormous distances, and over-reliance on raw hydrocarbon exports.

30. **r-central-east-siberia.** The Yenisei-Lena watersheds: the Norilsk nickel-copper-platinum-group-element complex (approximately 20 percent of global nickel, 40 percent of palladium), the Yakutian diamond fields, Lake Baikal (20 percent of global surface freshwater), untapped hydropower, and some of the world's richest Pacific fisheries. Constraint: permafrost and extreme cold, the world's largest continuous forest at risk from fire and thaw, legacy industrial pollution at Norilsk, and thin infrastructure.
31. **r-atlantic-northeast-na.** One of the most resource-endowed and industrially developed regions on Earth: the Great Lakes (20 percent of world surface freshwater), boreal and northern hardwood forests, iron-nickel-copper-gold mineral belts, the Marcellus Shale, the Gulf of Maine, Quebec's 37-gigawatt hydroelectric complex, and the planet's largest integrated industrial economy spanning Ontario-Quebec-US Midwest manufacturing and US Northeast financial and technology centers. Constraint: climate-driven Gulf of Maine warming, Great Lakes invasive species, legacy industrial pollution, and cross-border regulatory fragmentation.
32. **r-mississippi-plains.** The planet's largest contiguous agricultural breadbasket: the dominant North American corn-soybean-wheat belt, the northern Great Plains canola and wheat belt, Permian and Bakken oil, the Gulf Coast refining-petrochemical complex (world's largest), the Great Plains wind corridor, and the Mississippi-Missouri-Ohio inland waterway system draining 41 percent of the continental interior. Constraint: Ogallala Aquifer depletion, Gulf hypoxia from Corn Belt nutrient runoff, Mississippi Delta land loss from subsidence and sea-level rise, and extreme weather exposure.
33. **r-pacific-cordillera-na.** The world's most geologically diverse subnational region: copper, gold, lithium, and rare earths; hydropower (Columbia, Peace, Fraser); geothermal (the Geysers, Cerro Prieto); snowpack-dependent agriculture in California's Central Valley (more than 50 percent of US fruits, vegetables, and nuts); and the Silicon Valley technology cluster, aerospace manufacturing, entertainment production, and the Los Angeles-Vancouver port complexes. Constraint: water overallocation, catastrophic wildfire, and Cascadia-San Andreas seismic risk.
34. **r-mesoamerica.** The continental isthmus from southern Mexico to Panama: the world's largest silver and avocado production, gold and copper, major oil and gas (Mexico, Trinidad), the Panama Canal as a unique trade chokepoint, a 1,100-kilometre geothermal corridor, dual-ocean access, the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef, and premium coffee and cacao. Constraint: severe hurricane exposure, volcanic and seismic hazard, and the Dry Corridor drought belt.
35. **r-caribbean.** Island aquifers across the Caribbean archipelago: tourism-dependent economies, significant offshore oil and gas (Trinidad and Tobago), bauxite (Jamaica), and premium agricultural exports (sugar, rum, spices). Constraint: extreme hurricane exposure, sea-level rise on low-lying island nations, freshwater aquifer salinization, and archipelagic logistics costs.
36. **r-andean.** The Andes cordillera: copper and lithium reserves, the Humboldt Current's anchoveta fishery (world's most productive), the Orinoco Belt heavy oil, substantial natural gas, and origin-center crop diversity (potatoes, quinoa). Constraint: glacial retreat threatening water supply, extreme altitude, resource-extraction pressure on water and land, and commodity dependence.
37. **r-la-plata.** Collectively the world's largest soy complex, largest beef exporter, largest sugarcane exporter, largest coffee producer, and a major grains and oilseeds supplier; underpinned by the Guarani Aquifer (world's second-largest), the Paraná River cascade (Itaipú at 14 gigawatts), Vaca Muerta shale (16.2 billion barrels of oil and 308 trillion cubic feet of gas), and the Lithium

Triangle (approximately 54 percent of global lithium reserves). Constraint: Paraná River drought cycles disrupting both hydropower and shipping; Gran Chaco and Cerrado deforestation; Argentine macro instability.

38. **r-amazon.** The world's largest contiguous rainforest spanning eight nations: iron ore (Carajás), bauxite, 98 percent of world niobium, transformative offshore oil (Guyana-Suriname, potentially 10 billion barrels), and the planet's largest river system (7,280 cubic kilometres per year). Constraint: extractive wealth versus biome preservation approaching an ecological tipping point at 20 percent deforestation; fire-drought feedbacks accelerate the risk.

39. **r-northeast-brazil.** Wind at 87 percent of the region's capacity, the São Francisco hydropower cascade (10 gigawatts), the MATOPIBA soy frontier (approximately 15 million tonnes per year), and the coastal industrial chain (Camaçari petrochemicals, Suape shipbuilding and automotive, Pecém steel). Constraint: the Caatinga biome (850,000 square kilometres) is severely degraded, hosting 26 million people in chronic water poverty.

40. **r-anatolia.** The Anatolian continental heartland at 900 to 1,200 metres elevation: the world's largest boron reserves, the Afşin-Elbistan lignite basin, Tuz Gölü salt, the Ankara defense-industrial cluster, and the Konya-Eskişehir-Kayseri manufacturing spine. Constraint: erratic semi-arid precipitation, falling aquifers, and periodic Lake Tuz desiccation signal acute water scarcity by the 2030s.

41. **r-kurdistan.** The Zagros-Taurus arc spanning the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates: approximately 45 billion barrels of oil, more than 200 trillion cubic feet of gas, strategic control of downstream water supply, pastoral livestock, and dryland cereals across 392,000 square kilometres. Constraint: landlocked geography with export routes crossing multiple jurisdictions, upstream-downstream water disputes, and hydrocarbon dependence.

42. **r-levant.** The eastern Mediterranean littoral: the Dead Sea mineral complex (world's richest single-source potash and bromine deposit), the Levant Basin offshore gas province (more than 100 trillion cubic feet estimated), the Silicon Wadi high-technology cluster (one of the world's densest), the merchant fleet of Cyprus, and technologically intensive agriculture anchored by advanced desalination (approximately 86 percent of drinking water) and wastewater recycling (approximately 90 percent). Constraint: extreme economic disparity across the RCA, demographic pressure on shared water resources, and the Dead Sea dropping one metre per year; this shared hydrological crisis can only be managed at RCA scale.

43. **r-tibetan-plateau.** Asia's water tower: the world's largest and highest plateau (2.5 million square kilometres, average elevation exceeding 4,500 metres), headwaters of the Yellow, Yangtze, Mekong, Brahmaputra, and Indus rivers, Asia's largest hydropower potential, and significant lithium, copper, chromium, borax, and uranium extraction in the Qaidam Basin. Constraint: extreme altitude, permafrost thaw, glacial retreat, and jurisdictional fragmentation of the headwater territories.

44. **r-australia-nz.** A resource superpower dyad: Australia supplies the world's largest iron ore, bauxite, and lithium exports and is the top liquefied-natural-gas exporter; New Zealand complements with 85 percent renewable electricity from hydro and geothermal, the world's most efficient pastoral agriculture, and dairy and kiwifruit exports. Constraint: combined they hold two of the largest exclusive economic zones on Earth (15 million square kilometres) but face acute water scarcity and climate volatility.

45. **r-oceania.** The western and central Pacific from Papua New Guinea to French Polynesia: nickel (New Caledonia), major gold, copper, oil, and gas (Papua New Guinea), the globe's largest tuna fishery, and extensive tropical hardwood forests. Constraint: extreme disaster risk from cyclones and sea-level rise, geographic fragmentation, and limited domestic markets across dualistic cash-export and subsistence economies.

46. **r-arabian-gulf.** The planet's hydrocarbon heartland: the world's largest concentration of oil and gas reserves, some of the highest solar irradiance globally, massive desalination capacity (approximately 40 percent of world total), and a downstream industrial base of petrochemicals, aluminum, steel, and liquefied-natural-gas exports. Constraint: no permanent rivers, rapidly depleting fossil aquifers, and an energy-water nexus demanding a solar-powered transition before the fossil aquifer inheritance runs out.

47. **r-yemen-oman.** The hyper-arid southern Arabian peninsula: modest but significant oil (1.2 million barrels per day), substantial gas, high solar irradiance, 5,000 kilometres of coastline straddling the Bab el-Mandeb and Hormuz chokepoints, and niche oasis agriculture (dates, frankincense, coffee). Constraint: extreme water scarcity with no perennial rivers, qat-driven aquifer depletion, and hydrocarbon dependence.

48. **r-antarctica.** A custodial RCA with zero permanent population, governed as a planetary commons stewardship zone under direct Expert Body supervision. It holds approximately 70 percent of Earth's freshwater in its ice sheet and is the planet's primary climate regulator. Constraint: ice-sheet instability under warming, with grounding-line retreat in West Antarctica; responsibility for its stewardship is shared by all humanity but delegated to no single RCA.

### A.3 Transitional application determinations

The criteria in subsection (a) produced the 48 RCAs listed in subsection (b). The following determinations record the application of the methodology where watershed divisions or retentions required specific findings.

1. **Ob-Irtysh and Yenisei-Lena watersheds.** The Ob-Irtysh watershed (West Siberian hydrocarbon basin) and the Yenisei-Lena watersheds (Norilsk metals, Lake Baikal) are separate hydrological systems with no shared infrastructure corridor. The Commission designated West Siberian RCA (r-west-siberia) and Central-East Siberian RCA (r-central-east-siberia) as separate RCAs under criteria 1 and 3.

2. **Aral-Caspian and Mongolia-Tarim endorheic systems.** The Aral Sea and Caspian shelf watersheds (Amu Darya and Syr Darya systems) and the Mongolia-Tarim endorheic basins (Mongolian steppe, Tarim endorheic basin) are separate closed-basin systems. The Commission designated Aral-Caspian RCA (r-aral-caspian) and Mongolia-Tarim RCA (r-mongolia-tarim) as separate RCAs under criteria 1 and 2.

3. **Lake Victoria basin and Horn of Africa.** The Lake Victoria basin with Rift Valley lakes and Indian Ocean coast, and the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden coast, are separate watersheds. Ethiopia and South Sudan lie within the Nile watershed and are assigned solely to Nile Basin RCA (r-nile) under criterion 1. Ethiopia supplies 86 percent of Nile flow via the Blue Nile; South Sudan contributes the White Nile headwaters. The Commission designated Great Lakes RCA (r-great-lakes) and Horn of Africa RCA (r-horn-africa) as separate RCAs under criterion 1.

4. **Mesoamerican isthmus and Caribbean islands.** No shared water system exists between the continental isthmus watersheds and the island aquifers of the Caribbean archipelago. The Commission designated Mesoamerica RCA (r-mesoamerica) and Caribbean RCA (r-caribbean) as separate RCAs under criteria 1 and 3.
5. **Niger River watershed.** The Niger River flows from Guinea through Mali and Niger to Nigeria. Splitting the watershed across RCAs would create a trans-RCA water conflict on the core RCA competency. The Commission retained West African RCA (r-west-african) as a single RCA under criterion 1, which overrides population-size concerns.

Antarctica is designated a custodial RCA (r-antarctica) with zero permanent population under subsection (a), criterion 4, governed as a planetary commons stewardship zone under direct Expert Body supervision.

### A.4 Provisional six statistical regions

The Commission shall delineate exactly six Covenant statistical regions solely for global sortition, rotating representation, comparison, and administration. The six statistical regions are a layer separate from the 48 RCAs; they confer no sovereignty, identity, hierarchy, resource claim, or political boundary.

The Commission shall publish the following provisional six-region scheme for a 90-day review period. The Constitutional Court may ratify or remand on procedural grounds only.

1. **Americas:** North, Central, and South America plus the Caribbean (RCAs 31–39 and r-caribbean).
2. **Europe:** Continental Europe, the British Isles, and the Mediterranean basin (RCAs 24–28).
3. **Africa:** Continental Africa and Madagascar (RCAs 16–23).
4. **Asia-Pacific:** East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia (RCAs 1–15 and 40–44).
5. **Arabia-Persia:** Arabian Peninsula, Iranian Plateau, Levant, Anatolia, and Mesopotamia (RCAs 13, 40–42, 46, and 47).
6. **Oceania-Antarctica:** Australia, New Zealand, Pacific Islands, and Antarctica (RCAs 44, 45, and 48).

The Arabia-Persia region is subject to review for merger with Africa or Asia-Pacific. Affected communities shall submit comment during the 90-day review period. The six-region scheme shall account for population, geography, mobility, data continuity, and cultural legibility. Once operational, it replaces the Founding Macroregions under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.1).

### Section 1.0.2: Formation of Local Cultural Councils

**(a) Initiation.** An LCC may be initiated by a petition signed by at least 5% of the adult residents of a contiguous geographic area whose population lies between 10,000 and 10 million, or 5,000 residents, whichever is fewer. The petition shall identify the proposed boundaries, primary communities served, and a proposed initial selection method consistent with Section 1.0. Petitions for overlapping areas shall be consolidated by the relevant RCA.

**(b) Recognition.** The relevant Regional Coordinating Assembly shall approve the petition within 180 days unless the proposed boundaries, population count, or selection method materially fail the requirements of Section 1.0. A denial shall state specific reasons and permit revision and resubmission. The RCA shall publish all petitions, approvals, and denials.

**(c) Default LCC.** Until an LCC is formed and recognized for a given area, an interim LCC shall operate under the default composition rules in Section 1.0, administered by the relevant RCA with Constitutional Court review limited to legality. An interim LCC exercises the full lawful authority of an LCC under this Covenant immediately upon the area becoming subject to Covenant jurisdiction, and no territory shall lack Level 1 governance at any time.

**(d) Continuity.** A missed deadline under this Section does not suspend the formation function, and unfinished work transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7. No RCA may dissolve or absorb an LCC without the LCC's consent expressed through the same petition and referendum thresholds required for formation.

### Section 1.1: Composition and selection of the EB

The Global Expert Body shall consist of an uneven number of members, not fewer than 55 and not more than 87.

#### Phase 1: Open discovery (rolling)

Any person may submit a body of analytical work, in any medium and any language, that demonstrates original reasoning about a complex system. Each submission must declare a primary domain of expertise from the list in Section 1.5, and may declare a secondary domain. Submissions are evaluated blind by a rotating panel of 9 verifiers drawn from the Expert Reserve, renewed annually. Markers of identity, institution, and credential are stripped before review.

Demonstration routes shall include individual analysis, collective problem-solving, oral or visual explanation, practical construction or stewardship, longitudinal community record, and place-based or traditional knowledge presented with the consent required by its custodians. Each route shall be assessed by qualified bearers of the relevant form of knowledge together with cross-tradition reviewers. No candidate shall be penalized for lacking an academic credential, using a non-written medium, protecting knowledge that may not lawfully be disclosed, or reasoning through a culturally unfamiliar form. Every route must still permit a proportionate test of competence for the authority sought.

Submissions are scored on:

- **Reasoning depth:** Does the submission identify non-obvious causal structure?
- **Originality:** Does it deviate from consensus in a defensible direction?
- **Calibration:** Are claims proportional to evidence, and does the candidate identify what would change or defeat an empirical conclusion?

The top 5% of scorers in each 3-year cycle advance to Phase 2, subject to a hard cap of 400 candidates per cycle; if more than 400 would advance, the 400 highest-scoring candidates advance under the same thresholds. No person may advance more than once per cycle, and a candidate's Phase 2 eligibility lasts only for the cycle in which it is earned.

#### Phase 2: The crucible (adaptive testing)

A 3-day adaptive assessment, administered on a proctored platform. An independent Psychometric Commission designs the platform through open methods competition, and institutionally separate technical and fairness panels audit it; the Independent Sortition Secretariat draws both panels from qualified pools. The Constitutional Court may review legality and due process but may not design, operate, score, or audit the platform. Three metrics:

The platform may score or flag submissions only as a review aid. Any exclusion from the pipeline, and especially any permanent exclusion, requires a recorded human decision complying with Article XII, Section 12.6 and remains subject to the Metric Integrity Review in Section 4.7 where a metric materially determines the result. For non-permanent exclusions grounded solely in failure to meet a published, objective, pre-disclosed Phase 1 or Phase 2 threshold, a named human owner meeting Section 12.6 competence and liability standards may satisfy the recorded-human-decision requirement by validating, on the record, a batch of scoring audit logs against the published threshold and instrument, provided that: (i) the owner examines the underlying record for every excluded candidate whose result falls within a published margin of error or is flagged by an anomaly review; (ii) any excluded candidate may petition for individualized human review within 30 days on a showing of specific error, and such petition receives a recorded individualized decision by a different named human owner; and (iii) permanent exclusion, adverse behavioral finding, or any exclusion resting on discretionary judgment always requires an individualized recorded human decision.

- **Learning Velocity:** Candidate is presented with a novel domain they have not studied (adversarially selected each cycle) and must achieve predictive accuracy within 72 hours. Score is the complexity ceiling reached.
- **Calibration Accuracy:** 200 probabilistic forecasts on verifiable events. Score is Brier score: whether confidence matches accuracy.
- **Dimensionality Handling:** A complex dataset with known causal structure; candidate must identify the minimum variables needed to predict outcomes. Score is parsimony plus accuracy.

Submission under this Section is a contribution to the common analytical record, not a candidacy, and no person shall be deemed to have sought an Expert Body seat by submitting work, by advancing, or by being nominated. A person may decline or withdraw at any stage, including after selection or confirmation, without punishment, stigma, or adverse inference in any later process or cycle, and the declination shall be recorded as a declination and nothing more, with no effect on Expert Reserve eligibility under Article III. Reluctance or willingness to serve shall create no presumption of fitness or unfitness. Direct campaigning, solicitation of support, public self-promotion for a seat or for advancement, or knowing acceptance of third-party advocacy to that end shall be a disqualifying signal at every stage of this Section, and exclusion on that ground requires a recorded human decision under Article XII, Section 12.6 and is not excused by any score. Coercion in nomination and retaliation or adverse inference following a declination are process violations under Article III, Section 3.9(b) and Article XII, Section 12.8(d.1).

A good-faith error, honestly reported and corrected, is not a sanctionable event, does not constitute a material breach of a Governance Behavioral Contract, and does not affect honorable return to the Expert Reserve; deliberate concealment of a material error, knowing fabrication, corruption, and any knowing violation of Article X, Section 10.1 remain individually sanctionable under Section 10.2.4. Evaluation of a member's service and of the Expert Body's performance shall apply the published, precommitted standards of this Covenant, and no decision shall be judged by its outcome in hindsight; failure of the Expert Body is defined institutionally by missed deadlines, process violations, and non-compliance findings, and the function shall continue or transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7. A member whose term ends by ordinary expiration returns to the Expert Reserve in honorable status without any failed-member designation and remains subject to the standing conflict, certification, and capacity rules of Article III.

Candidates who score in the top quartile on any two metrics, or the top decile on any one, advance to Phase 3.

**Phase 3: Probationary evaluation**

Advancing candidates enter a 2-year non-governing probationary cohort attached to the EB. They receive the access necessary for the verifier and collaborator roles below, and a living stipend set at the global median income. They hold no EB seat or vote. They may not issue an order, authorize force, exercise monetary authority, make an appointment, administer selection, or bind the EB. Their work is advisory unless an authorized member separately adopts it and records independent reasons and responsibility.

Before entering the probationary cohort, each candidate must sign a **Governance Behavioral Contract** defining specific prohibited acts, including but not limited to:

- Directing or coercing subordinates to falsify, conceal, or destroy information
- Transferring public funds to any entity in which the member or their household holds a direct financial interest
- Refusing to record deliberations or directing others not to record
- Verifiable professional retaliation against whistleblowers

Each probationary candidate is assigned two roles:

- **Verifier:** Find errors, omissions, or weaknesses in the analysis produced by the sitting EB. Quarterly error reports are evaluated for precision (verified errors / total claims), recall (verified errors / total verifiable errors in the audited material), and impact (severity multiplied by domain importance, with domain-importance weights published by the Independent Metrics Council for each selection cycle) by rotating, conflict-free forensic panels drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from independently audited qualified pools.
- **Collaborator:** Serve on at least one active EB committee alongside sitting members, contributing to ongoing work.

At the end of 24 months, an independent Pipeline Records Office within the Independent Sortition Secretariat publishes a performance dossier for each probationary candidate: Verifier precision rate, committee contributions, and an independent assessment by a non-voting observer drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from the certified Expert Reserve. The Office compiles authenticated records but may not alter a panel finding or recommend an outcome.

**Phase 4: Shadow nomination (inversion channel)**

Independently of Phases 1-3, any member of the Expert Reserve who has completed 3 or more observation terms may submit a Shadow Nomination naming a specific person whose analytical capability exceeds that of the EB member they observed. The nomination must include specific evidence of superior reasoning and declare the nominee's primary domain. If a rotating, conflict-free qualification panel drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat certifies that the published evidentiary threshold is met, and 60% of the CGA confirms after considering evidence submitted by the Expert Reserve Assembly, the nominee enters directly at Phase 3. The Expert Reserve Assembly retains the nomination role under this Phase and may submit evidence and analysis, but does not vote on confirmation. If the CGA fails to confirm or reject within 90 days of the qualification panel's certification, a conflict-free Constitutional Court shall review and confirm or reject on the existing record within 30 days, applying the same published evidentiary threshold. If the Court is materially implicated or fails to rule within 30 days, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 to decide within a further 30 days on the same record and standard; the nomination shall not fail for want of a seated confirming body. Vote totals and rationale shall be published. The Constitutional Court may hear a procedural appeal but may not substitute its ranking or nominee. For the purposes of Phase 6 lottery weighting, Shadow Nominees receive the median Phase 2 score of the current selection cycle.

**Phase 5: Behavioral certification**

After completing Phase 3, each candidate enters a 60-day Behavioral Certification period.

**a) Contract Acknowledgment.** Each candidate reaffirms their Governance Behavioral Contract, confirming that their conduct during Phase 3 is subject to review under its terms.

**b) Citizen Review Panels.** The Independent Sortition Secretariat convenes three independent Citizen Review Panels, each consisting of 15 members drawn by lot from the Citizen Grievance Assembly. Panels are freshly drawn for each candidate; no CGA member serves on more than one panel per candidate. Each panel independently reviews:

- The candidate's Phase 3 performance dossier
- All Verifier error reports and committee contributions
- Any formal complaints filed against the candidate during Phase 3
- Any other relevant, authenticated evidence the candidate or the independent Pipeline Records Office submits

**c) Findings.** Each panel deliberates and votes. A finding of material breach requires a 2/3 majority of the panel's members.

**d) Removal.** If at least two of the three panels each find, by a 2/3 majority of their members, that a material breach of the Governance Behavioral Contract occurred, the candidate is immediately removed from the probationary cohort and disqualified from any Covenant office for 10 years. The candidate may appeal to a sub-panel of the Constitutional Court on procedural grounds, and on the narrow ground of clear error in a panel's factual finding supported by specific prima facie evidence or materially new evidence; the appeal does not reopen the full record.

**e) Certification.** If fewer than two panels find a breach, the candidate is certified as having completed behavioral certification and enters the candidate pool for Phase 6.

**Phase 6: Selection from the pool**

The Phase 6 pool consists of: (1) ordinary-path candidates who completed Phases 2 and 3 and were certified under Phase 5; and (2) Shadow Nominees admitted under Phase 4 who completed Phase 3 and were certified under Phase 5. The Independent Sortition Secretariat conducts a stratified lottery to fill available EB seats. Stratification weights are proposed by a temporary panel of conflict-free statisticians, domain-allocation specialists, and affected-community methodologists selected by lot, and must be confirmed by 60% of the CGA before each cycle. The Expert Reserve Assembly may submit written analysis to the proposing panel and to the CGA but does not vote on confirmation. If the CGA fails to confirm or reject within 90 days of the temporary panel's proposal, a conflict-free Constitutional Court shall review and confirm or reject on the existing record within 30 days, applying the published stratification standards. If the Court is materially implicated or fails to rule within 30 days, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 to decide within a further 30 days on the same record and standard. Pending confirmation, the most recently confirmed weight set continues under Article XII, Section 12.7; no selection cycle stops for want of confirmed weights, and no unconfirmed weight set may be used. A weight set confirmed after a draw has already occurred applies strictly prospectively to future draw cycles and does not invalidate seats already filled under the weight set in effect at the time of that draw. The

Constitutional Court may review legality but may not propose weights, operate or rerun the draw, or select auditors. Stratification is by declared primary domain, region, and a diversity index factoring in socioeconomic background, cognitive style, and life experience. The lottery is weighted by Phase 2 scores, using the assigned median score for Shadow Nominees under Phase 4. Higher scores yield higher probability. No candidate is guaranteed selection.

**Cascading Fill.** Every Phase 6 seat (domain seats, Open Seats, and any cross-domain surplus seats) is filled through one weighted stratified lottery conducted without replacement. Each time the lottery draws a candidate and assigns a seat, that candidate is removed from every remaining pool for the cycle, and the selection weights of the remaining candidates in the pool from which the draw was made are renormalized so their probabilities of selection continue to sum to one. If a domain has fewer certified candidates than its minimum seat requirement, the unfilled seats cascade to the Open Seats pool and are filled from that pool by the same weighted, without-replacement, renormalized lottery. If the Open Seats pool is exhausted, any remaining unfilled seats across all domains are filled from a combined cross-domain surplus pool by the same weighted, without-replacement, renormalized lottery, capped at each domain's maximum plus 2 and in no event exceeding the EB's overall maximum size under Section 1.1. If a domain has more certified candidates than seats allocated to it, the domain-restricted weighted stratified lottery required by this Phase continues, weighted and renormalized exactly as above, until every seat allocated to that domain is filled; no candidate is guaranteed selection by rank, score, or any other deterministic criterion. Certified candidates from a domain who are not selected enter an overflow pool for the next cycle.

**Phase 7: Confirmation and mentorship**

Lottery-selected candidates enter a confirmation vote by the sitting EB on the same published confirmation grounds for every candidate regardless of Phase 2 score. A candidate is confirmed unless the opposing votes include members from at least 7 distinct domain categories (as defined in Section 1.5) and constitute at least one third of the seated members. Confirmation is the default; rejection requires broad cross-domain opposition. This prevents a few large domains, or a small faction of any size, from blocking candidates who have already passed six phases of independent evaluation.

If confirmation fails, the seat returns to the Phase 6 pool and the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall redraw it from the remaining certified candidates under the same weighted, without-replacement procedure in Phase 6. If three consecutive confirmation votes fail for the same seat, the seat shall be filled by a temporary dual confirmation panel under the pattern of Article XI, Section 11.4(2.1), applying the published confirmation grounds through citizen process certification and qualified substantive certification; the panel dissolves once the seat is filled. A confirmation vote may not be used to remove, shorten, or threaten any seated member's term.

Confirmed candidates undergo a 2-year mentorship with a retiring EB member, during which they also shadow a different EB member than their mentor.

**Individualized Conditions of Service:** After Phase 6 selection and before assumption of a seat, a candidate, independent selection auditor, CGA, EC, ICPI, or conflict-free pipeline panel may petition for a candidate-specific condition necessary to address a documented conflict of interest, restricted-information risk, accommodation necessary to secure equal access under Article X, transition need, or function-specific duty. The sitting EB may submit relevant evidence but may not propose, negotiate, impose, remove, or benefit from a condition on a successor.

A condition is valid only if a conflict-free Constitutional Court, or an Article X substitute bench when the Court is implicated, finds after notice and hearing that it is tied to the actual office, based on clear and substantial evidence, no broader than necessary, compatible with equal authority of the seat, and the least restrictive effective safeguard. Permissible conditions include defined recusals, divestment or conflict separation, restricted access to a specific information compartment, additional independent audit, a disclosed mentorship or safety protocol, and an accommodation requested by the candidate.

No condition may require ideological loyalty; direct a vote or policy conclusion; waive Article X; restrict lawful criticism, belief, association, family life, bodily autonomy, or exit; alter the constitutional term, compensation, jurisdiction, or voting weight of the seat; create secret accountability to a person or institution; impose unrelated surveillance; or convert a personal vulnerability, protected characteristic, culturally unfamiliar practice, or lawful dissent into presumed unfitness.

The complete proposed condition, evidence, reasons, review route, and objective termination event shall be disclosed to the candidate before acceptance and published subject to necessary privacy and security redactions. Acceptance must be express. A candidate may decline and surrender that selection without punishment or general disqualification; the seat then returns to the Phase 6 draw, except that the first permanent cycle is governed exclusively by Article XI, Section 11.4(2.1). Consent does not cure an unlawful condition. The candidate or any person materially affected may seek review when facts change, and the condition expires automatically when its documented necessity ends. A material breach is adjudicated through ordinary due process and creates no penalty beyond what this Covenant otherwise authorizes.

**Self-Correction Clause:**

Every 5 years, the Expert Reserve Assembly commissions an independent statistical audit of the selection process, measuring:

- Correlation between Phase scores and parental socioeconomic status
- Correlation between Phase scores and subsequent EB performance
- Whether Phase 5 (Behavioral Certification) removal rates or Phase 3 Governance Contract violation rates show statistically significant correlation with candidate demographic characteristics, Phase 1 analytical style, or Phase 3 performance dossier scores
- Diversity distribution of confirmed candidates by domain, region, and cognitive style

If any metric shows a statistically significant correlation with parental socioeconomic status, or a significant deviation in Phase 3 or Phase 5 outcomes by demographic or analytical variables, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary correction commission of statisticians, psychometricians, affected-community representatives, and constitutional methodologists to propose modifications. A modification takes effect only upon approval by 60% of the CGA and conflict-free Constitutional Court review limited to legality. The Expert Reserve Assembly may submit evidence and analysis to the correction commission and to the CGA but does not vote on approval. If no proposed modification receives that 60% CGA approval and conflict-free Constitutional Court legality review within 2 years, the CGA may trigger a newly drawn correction commission; the CGA may not draft the modification itself.

**Epistemic Council Access:** The Epistemic Council (Article XIII) shall have access to anonymized candidate data from all phases of this selection process, as defined in Article XIII, Section 13.4(b). The Expert Body and Constitutional Court shall cooperate fully with any red-team analysis, pipeline examination, or plain-language justification request initiated by the Epistemic Council. Failure to cooperate within 90 days of a formal request shall constitute a material breach of governance duty, subject to Constitutional Court review and a published Epistemic Noncompliance Notice under Article XIII.

**Term Lengths:** Members shall receive single staggered terms of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, or 20 years under a pre-published allocation algorithm administered by the Independent Sortition Secretariat after selection. The algorithm shall preserve domain continuity while preventing more than 20% of EB seats from reaching ordinary expiration in any 2-year period. The 20% cap applies to all seat endings, including ordinary expiration, term shortening under Article IV, Section 4.4, seat reduction under Section 1.2, suspension, removal, disqualification, and any other event that terminates a member's service; no combination of events may cause more than 20% of the EB's seated membership at the start of the 2-year window to leave office within that window. Where a conflict between this cap and another constitutional obligation would otherwise prevent the obligation from being performed, the obligation shall be performed in tranches at the earliest lawful intervals consistent with the cap. Term length shall not depend on popularity, ideology, wealth, or an assessor's discretionary ranking and shall not be increased after the member takes office.

**Quorum and Voting Base.** The EB may take a decision only when a quorum of at least 60% of its seated members not lawfully recused from that matter is present or lawfully participating. Every percentage, fraction, or supermajority threshold for an EB vote in this Covenant shall be computed against all seated members not lawfully recused from that matter; absence, vacancy, another member's recusal, suspension, or temporary service on a Council, tribunal, or continuity body does not change the denominator. Votes may not be delegated or cast by proxy. A member lawfully recused from a matter is excluded from the quorum and the denominator for that matter.

**Reconvened quorum and verified absence.** If a quorum is not present at a scheduled sitting, the business shall be postponed and reconvened within 14 days. At the reconvened sitting, the quorum is 45% of the seated members not lawfully recused from that matter, and every percentage, fraction, or supermajority threshold for a vote on the postponed business is computed against all seated members not lawfully recused from that matter, not against the members present. If at the reconvened sitting a quorum is not present, or if any percentage, fraction, or supermajority threshold required for a vote on the postponed business exceeds the number of members present, each member absent from that sitting is treated as temporarily unable to serve under Section 1.3 for so long as the absence continues, and the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall activate the seat-specific substitute roster under Section 1.3 within 72 hours; a substitute so activated serves for the verified absence, and absence is presumed to continue until the absent member attends a scheduled sitting. Group, factional, or arranged non-attendance confers no benefit under Article XII, Section 12.7(a.1).

**Lawful recusal.** A member's recusal is lawful only as to a matter in which the member has a material personal interest, on the member's published disclosure. A dispute over the lawfulness of a recusal may be raised by the member, another seated member, or the Independent Sortition Secretariat and shall be decided within 30 days by a conflict-free Constitutional Court or, where the Court is conflicted, a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1; the recused member remains included in the quorum and the denominator for the matter pending that decision.

**Minimum lawful size and replenishment failure.** If replenishment under this Section fails and the EB falls below 55 seated members, the EB may continue to act for no longer than the next scheduled selection cycle, provided it remains above 37 members. At or below that threshold, the EB is dissolved and its remaining functions transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall publish the deficit and its causes within 30 days of the EB falling below 55 members. An evenly split vote of the EB is a failed vote; no additional tie-break mechanism is created, and no other body may cast or break an EB vote.

### Section 1.2: Epistemic expansion clause

Every 5 years, a temporary Frontier Sciences Commission shall publish a **Frontier Sciences Audit**. The Independent Sortition Secretariat draws the Commission from independently screened cross-domain experts and citizens. The Constitutional Court may review the process for legality but may not identify, rank, or exclude a field.

If a new field is identified:

1. The EB is constitutionally obligated to expand its membership to include up to 3 experts from that new field, OR
2. If the EB is already at its maximum size (87), the EB must rotate out an equal number of experts from fields whose global impact has demonstrably diminished over the preceding decade, as determined under pre-published metrics independently audited under Article IV, Section 4.7. No sitting body may design and adjudicate the metric used to remove a field.

The newly seated experts shall undergo the same 2-year mentorship transition required by Phase 7. Mentorship runs concurrently with lawful service and does not postpone assumption of the seat.

The Epistemic Council shall be consulted during each Frontier Sciences Audit. It may publish an independent assessment of whether proposed field allocations adequately address epistemic diversity, cultural breadth, and neglected knowledge traditions. The Epistemic Council shall publish its independent assessment within 60 days of receiving the Frontier Sciences Audit. The assessment is advisory and shall not delay the seating of experts required under this Section. If the assessment is adverse, finding that the proposed field allocations fail to adequately address epistemic diversity, cultural breadth, or neglected knowledge traditions, the EB shall publish a written response within 90 days identifying any corrective actions it will take or stating its reasons for declining to act. The assessment, the EB's response, and the Frontier Sciences Audit shall be published together.

### Section 1.3: Vacancies and substitutes

If a sitting member is temporarily unable to serve, authority passes immediately to the first available conflict-free person on a seat-specific substitute roster maintained by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from independently certified Reserve candidates. Each roster order is fixed by public lot before an absence. If the roster is exhausted, the cross-domain alternate pool and manual draw procedure in Article XII, Section 12.7 apply. A substitute serves only for the verified absence and receives no later selection preference.

### Section 1.4: Scope of authority and temporary reallocation protocol

The EB shall have sole authority over:

- Climate stabilization and carbon cycle management.
- Global pandemic prevention and response.
- Planetary resource allocation (energy, food, water at the macro scale).

- Inter-bioregional infrastructure (transoceanic cables, pipelines, satellite networks).
- Artificial intelligence and emerging technology governance.
- Space exploration and planetary defense (asteroid deflection, solar weather).
- Global peacekeeping and enforcement of Constitutional rulings.

**The EB shall not:**

- Dictate local cultural practices, religious traditions, or personal conduct.
- Intervene in regional infrastructure unless it affects another bioregion.

**Temporary Reallocation Protocol for Local or Regional Functions:**

The EB shall not temporarily assume or reallocate a function assigned to a Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly except under the following conditions and strict procedural safeguards. This procedure allocates function within one government; it does not recognize or invade lower-level sovereignty.

**1. Legitimate Grounds for Temporary Reallocation:**

a) **Planetary Threat:** A demonstrable, imminent threat to the global environment, climate system, or biosphere that cannot be adequately addressed at the regional level. For the purposes of this provision, "demonstrable" means supported by clear and substantial evidence of a specific, identified risk and not merely a general or hypothetical possibility; "imminent" means reasonably expected to materialize within 180 days absent intervention. The Constitutional Court shall certify both elements as part of the Compelling Interest ruling under paragraph 2(b).

b) **Systemic Human Rights Violation:** A demonstrable, systematic violation of the fundamental human rights defined in Article X, Section 10.1. Such violations include, but are not limited to:

- Genocide or systematic ethnic cleansing
- Enforced slavery or human trafficking
- Widespread, systematic torture or extrajudicial killing
- Deliberate starvation or denial of medical care to a targeted population
- Systematic imprisonment without charge or trial

**2. Temporary Reallocation Procedure:**

a) The EB must pass a **2/3 supermajority vote** authorizing the intervention.

b) The Constitutional Court must issue a **"Compelling Interest" ruling** within 72 hours, certifying that:

- The evidence of the threat or violation is clear and substantial, AND
- The lower governing body has been given a formal opportunity to respond (unless immediate action is required to prevent imminent loss of life). If the Court does not rule within 72 hours, the EB's authorization does not lapse; the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall immediately draw a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 from the Article II successor pools, which shall rule within 72 hours under the same standard the Court would have applied. If a substitute bench also fails to rule within 72 hours, a further substitute bench shall be drawn under the same procedure; adjudication of the authorization shall not fail for want of a seated bench, and the pool shall be expanded under Article II, Section 2.2 as needed. If three successive substitute benches fail to rule, the EB may proceed as follows: (i) for reallocation grounded in

a Section 1.4(1)(b) systemic human rights violation, under the alternative certification route in Article X, Section 10.2.2; or (ii) for reallocation grounded in a Section 1.4(1)(a) Planetary Threat, upon concurrent certification by the Independent Metrics Council by 5 of its 6 members that the threat as defined in Section 1.4(1)(a) is demonstrable and imminent on clear and convincing evidence, and by the CGA by 60% approval that the proposed reallocation is narrowly tailored and temporary as required by this Section. A reallocation under clause (ii) is subject to every narrow-tailoring, temporary-duration, periodic-certification, 180-day maximum, and automatic Section 10.2.1 legality-review requirement stated in Article X, Section 10.2.2 as though authorized under that Section, applied to the Planetary Threat finding in place of the rights finding, and is subject to the same rotation, two-of-three escalation, 1080-day cap, and continuity-transfer rules stated there. Where the Temporary Reallocation Protocol is invoked under Article X, Section 10.2.2, the certification required by that Section (5 of 7 justices, or 5 members of a substitute bench under Section 10.2.1) is the Compelling Interest ruling for the purposes of this Section, and the substitute-bench mechanism in this paragraph applies to that certification. An authorization denied on the merits by the Court or by a substitute bench under this paragraph bars re-invocation on substantially the same facts for 30 days after denial. Failure of the Court to rule within 72 hours is not a denial on the merits, does not lapse the authorization, and does not trigger the 30-day bar; the substitute-bench mechanism governs instead.

c) The temporary assumption or reallocation shall be **strictly temporary** and **narrowly tailored** to address the specific threat or violation. The function shall return automatically to the Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly as soon as the threat is neutralized or the violation corrected.

   **Certification and return clock:** The EB must certify to the Constitutional Court every 30 days that the threat or violation persists, publishing the specific evidence, the functions still reallocated, and the estimated restoration path. If the EB fails to certify by the deadline, the reallocation lapses and the function returns automatically without further order.

   **Independent neutralization certification:** The Constitutional Court shall independently certify neutralization of the threat or correction of the violation within 72 hours of receiving a petition from any affected person, the affected LCC or RCA, the Citizen Grievance Assembly, or the Epistemic Council. A petition may be renewed no more than once in 90 days on the same asserted facts.

   **Maximum duration:** A reallocation that exceeds 12 continuous months expires by operation of law unless the EB repasses the 2/3 supermajority vote and the Court reissues the Compelling Interest ruling on evidence that was not before the Court during the prior 12 months. Evidence of continued lawful reallocation under the prior ruling is not fresh evidence. A reauthorized reallocation is subject to every requirement of this Protocol as though newly invoked.

   The return of function under this paragraph is automatic, requires no further order, and may not be conditioned on any body's certification or approval.

   **Concurrent reallocation limit:** The EB shall not maintain more than three concurrent temporary reallocations under this Protocol at any time. A fourth or later reallocation may not be invoked unless the Constitutional Court certifies, before the EB's authorizing vote, that the existing reallocation load does not exceed the EB's demonstrated capacity to restore functions within the maximum duration permitted by this Section. The Court shall issue that certification within 72 hours of the EB's request; if the Court does not rule within 72 hours, the substitute-bench cascade in paragraph 2(b) of this Section applies to the capacity certification on the same terms and with the same terminal-condition handoff to Article X, Section 10.2.2 stated there. The Court's certification shall evaluate restoration capacity against the staffing, monitoring, and procedural demands of all active reallocations and shall be published. For the purposes of this limit, a reallocation that covers multiple functions within the same LCC or RCA counts as one reallocation if invoked in a single EB vote; separate invocations count separately.

### Section 1.5: Domain allocation

The EB's seats shall be allocated across defined domains of planetary governance. Each domain receives a dedicated allocation, so that no single field dominates the body and every area of the EB's authority has accountable experts. The initial allocations are:

| Domain | Minimum seats | Maximum seats |
|---|---|---|
| Climate and Earth Systems | 6 | 10 |
| Energy Systems | 5 | 8 |
| Technology and AI Governance | 5 | 8 |
| Public Health and Pandemic Response | 5 | 8 |
| Economics and Welfare Metrics | 5 | 8 |
| Natural Resources and Critical Minerals | 4 | 6 |
| Ecology, Biodiversity, and Ocean Systems | 4 | 6 |
| Food Systems and Agriculture | 4 | 6 |
| Space Exploration and Planetary Defense | 4 | 6 |
| Transportation and Logistics | 4 | 6 |
| Global Peacekeeping and Security | 4 | 6 |
| Education and Human Development | 3 | 5 |

Not fewer than 2 and not more than 4 seats shall be **Open Seats**, filled by experts whose work spans multiple domains or falls outside any listed category and drawn from the candidate pool after all domain seats are filled. Not fewer than 10% of confirmed candidates in each selection cycle shall be Shadow Nominees. For the first permanent cycle, the 10% requirement does not apply; any resulting shortfall shall be published with its causes and rolled into the next cycle's Shadow Nominee requirement.

Sitting members may shift between domains within the same seat allocation only by 2/3 vote of the EB, to respond to changing planetary conditions. Every 20 years, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary Domain Allocation Commission from conflict-free domain experts, systems methodologists, and citizens to review the allocation and propose adjustments. Adoption requires a simple majority of the EB, 60% of the CGA, and Constitutional Court review limited to legality. If a domain's allocation shrinks during a review, all sitting members in that domain are grandfathered for the remainder of their fixed terms, except that a sitting member is not grandfathered where the member materially participated in designing or advocating the allocation change that shrank the domain, on a published finding under Article IV, Section 4.7; the reduced range applies only to new selections after the review takes effect.

### Section 1.6: Epistemic diversity monitoring

(a) Every 3 years, the Expert Body shall submit to the Epistemic Council an Epistemic Diversity Assessment covering:

1. The cognitive style distribution of sitting EB members
2. The knowledge tradition diversity of the EB (cultural, disciplinary, methodological)
3. The socioeconomic background diversity of EB members (parental education, geographic origin, access to resources during development)
4. Trends since the prior assessment

(b) The Epistemic Council shall publish its evaluation of the EB's Epistemic Diversity Assessment, identifying gaps, risks, and recommendations.

(c) The EB's Assessment and the EC's evaluation shall be published jointly.

## ARTICLE II: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

### Section 2.1: Composition

The Constitutional Court shall consist of 7 members allocated as follows:

1. **Three unrelated-field experts:** Individuals from fields or knowledge traditions substantially outside professional governance, including deep-sea biology, paleoclimatology, archaeology, pure mathematics, astrophysics, linguistics, evolutionary biology, ecological custodianship, oral-history stewardship, or comparable practices. Their function is to contribute long-horizon and non-governance perspectives.
2. **Two constitutional and plural-law jurists:** Individuals with demonstrated expertise across at least two of constitutional law, comparative governance, customary law, indigenous law, religious jurisprudence, mediation traditions, legal philosophy, or the history of political institutions. The two seats may not be filled from the same legal tradition.
3. **Two forensic methodologists:** Individuals with demonstrated expertise in statistical auditing, forensic accounting, investigative methodology, evidentiary analysis, or error detection in complex systems.

No member may have held political office or sought elected position. No member may have served on the Expert Body during the preceding 15 years. All members shall disclose public ideological and institutional affiliations; no affiliation shall automatically disqualify a candidate unless it creates a direct conflict of interest. No member may use the Court as a pathway into the Expert Body.

### Section 2.2: Terms and succession

Court members shall serve single, non-renewable 21-year staggered terms. One seat shall reach ordinary expiration every 3 years. For the first permanent Court, the seven terms shall be 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, and 21 years, assigned after selection by public lot; the category attached to each seat remains unchanged when that seat is replaced. A member selected to complete an unexpected vacancy serves only the remainder of that term and may not receive a new full term.

A justice may be declared incapacitated by a vote of at least five of the other six justices, with the Court President presiding. The declaration requires clear and substantial evidence that the justice is unable to perform the duties of office due to physical or mental incapacity, and shall state reasons publicly. A justice declared incapacitated is suspended from all Court functions. If the incapacity persists for more than 180 consecutive days, or if the justice is demonstrably incapable of resuming duties, the seat shall be declared vacant by the same supermajority of the other justices, and a successor drawn under this Section shall serve the remainder of the term. A justice may be removed by a vote of at least five of the other six justices, with the Court President presiding, for demonstrated gross dereliction of duty, corruption, or sustained bad faith in the performance of judicial functions, after notice, a fair hearing, and published reasons. The justice subject to the proceeding is excluded from all votes, quorum, and denominator calculations for that proceeding. Removal under this paragraph does not bar a separate proceeding under Article X, Section 10.2.4 or any other provision.

The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall maintain a separate, continuously refreshed successor pool of no fewer than 20 qualified candidates for each composition category in Section 2.1. The floor of 20 per category is a minimum, not a cap; whenever substitute benches drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 require more conflict-free members than the pool then holds, the Secretariat shall expand the pool to the number needed to constitute every bench then concurrently required, and no complaint or matter may wait for want of pool depth. Candidates shall enter through open application and, where possible, blind threshold review. Rotating, conflict-free assessors selected by lot from independently audited professional pools shall conduct that review. Qualification is binary; no assessor may rank candidates who meet the threshold. The Secretariat shall stratify each pool across regions, knowledge traditions, employment sectors, and disclosed affiliations under published rules, and no single disclosed affiliation, institution, employer, funder lineage, or coordinated applicant cluster (defined as candidates sharing controlling organizational, financial, or familial ties) shall constitute more than one-fifth of a pool's candidates; related affiliations aggregate on the basis of the disclosures required by Section 2.1, the caps are administered ministerially by the Secretariat, and no candidate is excluded solely for affiliation. A candidate whose affiliation cluster already fills its cap is admitted to the pool but shall not be drawn for a seat while the cap is reached. Pool entries expire after 4 years and may be renewed only through the same threshold review; no candidate may be drawn for a bench that will decide a pending matter involving a disclosed affiliate, but the pending-matter bar shall not restrict draws for Court vacancy succession or for substitute benches constituted for unrelated matters. The flood-resistance of each pool shall be reported in every biennial administrative audit of the Secretariat, including the affiliation distribution of the pool and of each draw. Three independent auditors selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool shall reproduce each pool formation and draw. The Secretariat shall conduct a uniform public lottery from the pool for the expiring or vacant seat. For a plural-law jurist seat, the draw shall be constrained so the selected jurist does not share the same principal legal tradition as the continuing jurist. The Court may review legality through conflict-free justices but may not recruit, screen, rank, operate the draw, or select auditors; if fewer than 5 justices are conflict-free, the substitute-bench procedure in Article X, Section 10.2.1 applies.

The Court shall elect a President from among its members for a single 3-year term. The office is administrative and confers no additional vote, appointment power, or authority to direct another Covenant body. The President shall recuse from any function concerning an act in which that justice participated; a recused President is replaced for that function by public lot from the conflict-free justices.

**Denominator and Recusal.** Every percentage, fraction, or supermajority threshold for a Constitutional Court vote in this Covenant shall be computed against the full seven constitutionally authorized seats unless the provision imposing the threshold expressly states a different denominator. Where a provision states an absolute number (such as "5 of its 7 members"), a recused justice reduces neither the stated number nor the stated total. No recusal or combination of recusals shall render any threshold unreachable, whether stated as a percentage or an absolute number. If recusals would make a threshold unreachable under the applicable denominator, the substitute-bench procedure in

Article X, Section 10.2.1 is mandatory for that matter.

**Substitute Bench for Non-Rights Matters.** When the substitute-bench procedure is triggered under this Article for a matter other than a Section 10.1 complaint, the drawn bench exercises the Court's full jurisdiction for that matter, including forensic auditing, ethics investigations, public apology validation, compelling-interest rulings, Epistemic Council process review, and mission fidelity adjudication. The bench decides by simple majority of its seven members, publishes reasons, follows the Court's prior published decisions unless it states a reasoned departure, and dissolves after judgment and any ministerial enforcement. Where a specific provision governing the matter at hand imposes a different voting rule, that rule governs instead. The Article X, Section 10.2.1 procedural safeguards (conflict exclusion, no-participation, no-benefit, and dissolution) apply to every bench drawn under this paragraph.

**Obstruction of Correction.** Where a Constitutional Court supermajority is the route to correct or suspend a capture, a rights violation, or a selection-pipeline defect, and (a) an independent body has certified the predicate for that correction by its own required supermajority, including the Epistemic Council by at least 6 of its 9 members under Section 13.4(d) (Blind Spot Report), by at least 6 of its 9 members under Section 13.6 (formal pipeline examination), or by at least 6 of its 9 members under Section 13.11(d) (Epistemic Noncompliance Notice); the Citizen Grievance Assembly and the Expert Body jointly under Section 13.4(e) (decadal epistemic amendment) when both have satisfied their required 60% majorities; the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate under its dual-key of at least 7 Citizen Chamber and 8 Qualified Chamber members under Article VIII, Section 8.5.5; the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate together with the Citizen Grievance Assembly under Article X, Section 10.2.2 by the thresholds stated in that Section; the Metric Integrity Review Jury under Article IV, Section 4.7 by the 7 citizen and 6 qualified thresholds required for suspension under Section 4.7(e); or the Citizen Grievance Assembly under Article V, Section 5.4 (Mission Fidelity Petition) by its 60% finding threshold, and (b) at least three of the seven justices support the correction, no recusal has triggered a substitute bench, and the required Court supermajority is still not reached, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 from the Article II successor pools. That bench decides the correction de novo on the record under the same threshold and the same substantive standard the governing provision imposes on the Court. A justice's sincere vote is not a recusal and by itself triggers no bench; only an independent predicate together with an unreached Court supermajority triggers this paragraph. This paragraph lowers no threshold and no standard, and does not reach a rejection of the correction joined by a majority of the seven justices. If the substitute bench grants the correction and finds that a justice withheld support to preserve a capture the justice knew or should have known of, that finding is referred for removal and disqualification under Article X, Section 10.2.4.

### Section 2.3: Authority and limitations

The Constitutional Court shall have sole authority over:

1. **Forensic Auditing:** Comparing the EB's declared Decadal Pledges to independently collected planetary data, and certifying whether a material breach has occurred.
2. **Ethics Investigations:** Investigating formal ethics complaints against sitting EB members or Expert Reserve members.
3. **Public Apology Validation:** Judging whether a Public Apology issued by the EB is factually sufficient and submitted in good faith.

4. **Compelling Interest Rulings:** Certifying the EB's invocation of the Temporary Reallocation Protocol under Section 1.4.
5. **Epistemic Council Process Review:** Ruling on classified-information disputes, qualified subpoenas, mandate-boundary disputes, and pipeline-suspension recommendations arising under Article XIII.
6. **Mission Fidelity Adjudication:** Deciding Mission Fidelity Petitions, enforcing ministerial correction duties, and hearing the appeals assigned under Article V, Section 5.4 without selecting substantive policy.

The Court shall not propose policy, draft or unilaterally amend laws, design or operate a selection or operational system, choose an auditor, or intervene in operational matters. Its powers are adjudicative, declarative, forensic, and limited legality review. Court concurrence expressly required as one lock in a constitutional amendment or revision is an adjudicative approval or veto, not authorship or unilateral amendment power. An expressly assigned ministerial publication or convening act confers no discretion over participants, evidence, methodology, or outcome.

### Section 2.4: Red and yellow warnings

The Court shall issue Red and Yellow Warnings as defined in Article IV, Section 4.3.

### Section 2.5: Relationship with the Epistemic Council

The Court shall:

1. Certify the legal compliance of the constrained sortition process defined in Article XIII, Section 13.3. Administration and independent statistical audit shall be performed by bodies that are institutionally separate from the Court.
2. Rule on Epistemic Council subpoena appeals within 30 days.
3. Respond to formal pipeline-suspension recommendations within 90 days.
4. Participate in the joint annual session required by Article XIII, Section 13.10.
5. Provide records relevant to the Council's diagnostic mandate, subject only to the narrow classification protections defined in Article XIII.

The Court shall not edit, suppress, or pre-approve a Blind Spot Report. A ruling that material lies outside the Epistemic Council's mandate shall be published with reasons and shall not prevent publication of the disputed material as a dissenting institutional statement, provided classified information is removed.

## ARTICLE III: THE EXPERT RESERVE

### Section 3.1: Purpose and structure

The Expert Reserve is not a governing body. It is a distributed system of qualified individuals maintained ministerially by the Independent Sortition Secretariat to ensure continuity, provide independent perspective, and preserve institutional memory for the Global Expert Body. The Reserve possesses no collective authority during normal governance except as expressly provided in this Article.

### Section 3.2: Reserve pools

a) For each domain of expertise listed in Section 1.5, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall maintain a Reserve Pool of no fewer than twice the domain's maximum seat allocation under Section 1.5, and no more than four times that allocation. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall also maintain a cross-domain alternate pool sufficient to preserve continuity if a domain pool is exhausted or if conflicts, unavailability, or concurrent demand reduce a domain pool below the minimum needed for Shadow Rotation under Section 3.3.

b) Rotating, conflict-free qualified panels vet candidates under criteria equivalent to EB selection (Article I, Section 1.1). The Independent Sortition Secretariat draws those panels, and their work is independently audited. Standards must be cross-culturally validated and may consider practical record, community attestation, disclosed dissent, and demonstrated conduct without pathologizing culturally unfamiliar behavior. Competence is certified as a binary threshold; no panel ranks candidates who qualify. The Constitutional Court may hear a procedural or legality appeal but may not vet or score a candidate.

c) Reserve eligibility lasts 3 years and may be renewed once upon re-vetting. After two terms, a candidate must serve a 5-year cooling-off period before re-eligibility.

### Section 3.3: Shadow rotation

a) Each sitting EB member is observed by a rotating Shadow drawn from the corresponding Reserve Pool.

b) Shadows serve 3-month observation terms. At the end of each term, a new Shadow is drawn uniformly from all certified, conflict-free candidates in the corresponding pool. No candidate is guaranteed selection.

c) No Shadow serves consecutive terms. No Shadow observes the same EB member more than once per 2-year period.

d) During an observation term, the Shadow has real-time access to all non-classified information available to their matched EB member: meeting materials, data streams, policy drafts, and strategic assessments. Shadows do not attend closed EB votes or internal deliberations unless invited by the EB member.

### Section 3.4: Rights and responsibilities

a) During an observation term, a Shadow may:

- Access all non-classified information available to the corresponding EB member
- Submit written questions to the EB member, which must be answered within 14 days
- Request documents from the Constitutional Court related to EB activities

b) At the conclusion of each observation term, the Shadow shall submit a confidential Shadow Assessment to a tamper-evident Reserve Archive maintained by a separated records unit of the Independent Sortition Secretariat. The Assessment evaluates the EB member's reasoning quality, data handling, and decision-making process. It is not a judgment of policy outcomes. Individual assessments are released only to a conflict-free ethics tribunal or lawful renewal review. The Epistemic Council may receive anonymized and aggregated assessment data solely to identify recurring epistemic patterns; it shall not receive the identity of a Shadow or the identity of the member assessed.

c) A Shadow may recuse themselves at any time without penalty. The pool rotates to the next candidate.

#### Section 3.5: The shadow commentary

a) Each Shadow may publish one Shadow Commentary per observation term. A Shadow Commentary is a public document analyzing an EB policy decision or strategic direction.

b) The Commentary shall be:

- Published under the Shadow's name
- Limited to 5,000 words
- Restricted to analysis of published EB decisions and publicly available data
- Forbidden from disclosing non-public deliberations, internal disagreements, or classified information

c) The EB must publish acknowledgment of each Commentary within 30 days. Acknowledgment confirms receipt and consideration; it does not imply agreement.

d) The Commentary gives Shadow knowledge a public outlet and puts independent expert analysis into public debate.

#### Section 3.6: Reserve assembly

a) Once per year, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall convene a Reserve Assembly: a structured session in which all current Reserve members participate under anonymized identities.

b) The Assembly receives a scenario exercise simulating a leadership transition, crisis response, or multi-member incapacitation, and must coordinate a simulated response. Identities are masked so that factional relationships cannot form while teams still practice working together.

c) A temporary panel of conflict-free continuity planners, systems auditors, and citizens drawn by lot evaluates the Assembly for systemic weaknesses. Individual performances are not recorded; only systemic findings are published. The Court may review a complaint of illegality but may not design or score the exercise.

#### Section 3.7: Succession

a) Ordinary term expiration shall be filled through the Article I selection pipeline and shall be anticipated early enough to permit an orderly handover. When an EB seat is unexpectedly vacated by death, permanent incapacitation, removal, or resignation, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall initiate a uniform lottery from the corresponding certified Reserve Pool within 72 hours. The Constitutional Court may review legality but may not operate or rerun the draw.

b) The selected candidate assumes the vacated seat's authority immediately so that no vote, service, or command dependency is interrupted. A 90-day concurrent orientation shall include full information review, operational shadowing, and mentorship. During that period, any irreversible decision also requires recorded concurrence from a conflict-free EB member in another domain, unless delay would create an immediate threat to life.

c) The Reserve successor is a temporary continuity holder, not a permanent successor, and serves only until an Article I successor assumes office or for 18 months, whichever occurs first. If the permanent process remains incomplete, a new holder shall be drawn before the term expires; no person may repeat until the eligible pool is exhausted. Successive holders may preserve continuity until the unshortened Article I process concludes, subject after 3 years to the recurring public necessity review in Article XI, Section 11.4(2.2). Temporary service creates no preference, score, confirmation right, or exemption in a later selection cycle.

d) If the selected candidate is unable or unwilling to serve, the lottery is re-drawn from the remainder of the pool.

#### Section 3.8: Mass transition protocol

a) If 25% or more of EB seats are vacated simultaneously, or if the EB is collectively suspended under Article IV, Section 4.4, the Reserve Assembly mechanism is activated as an emergency measure. Collective suspension treats every suspended seat as vacated solely for continuity and successor selection; it does not erase pending liability, records, review, or reparation.

b) The Independent Sortition Secretariat automatically convenes an emergency Reserve Assembly within 48 hours. For each vacated seat, authority passes immediately through a published ladder: the current conflict-free Shadow who has completed at least one full observation term and whose most recent Shadow Assessment is not the subject of a pending ethics complaint; prior conflict-free Shadows in reverse order of service, each subject to the same conditions; the seat-specific substitute roster; the corresponding Reserve Pool; and the cross-domain alternate pool. Interim service lasts only until the Section 3.7 continuity holder assumes authority and no longer than 90 days for one person.

c) A 9-member Transition Executive Council (TEC) is formed. Three citizen continuity stewards shall be drawn from a standing CGA-certified pool, and 6 conflict-free Reserve members spanning at least 4 EB domains shall be selected by public lot; the chair shall be selected by lot from the 6 Reserve members. No person implicated in the vacancies may serve. The TEC coordinates interim government and directs the ministerial preparation of uniform Reserve draws; it may not choose, rank, or veto a successor. The Constitutional Court may provide expedited conflict-free legality review but no justice may serve in or direct the TEC.

d) The TEC holds no policy-making authority and transfers its functions after 90 days without renewal of any member's TEC term. Its sole functions are maintaining continuity and administering temporary succession. A fresh Article I selection process shall open within 30 days. Before Day 90, temporary continuity holders shall be drawn uniformly from the certified Reserve Pools under Section 3.7. If a draw or handover remains incomplete, unfinished ministerial and essential-service functions transfer on Day 90 to a freshly drawn continuity panel under Article XII, Section 12.7; the expired TEC and its members perform no further act. If permanent successors have not assumed authority when the TEC expires, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a 3-member Transition Command Council within 72 hours: one citizen from a standing CGA-certified pool; one conflict-free Reserve member from the cross-domain alternate pool; and one conflict-free member from the Article VIII, Section 8.5.2 Qualified Chamber pool. During the provisional period prior to the compulsory reset under Article XI, Section 11.4, peacekeeping command is governed exclusively by Section 8.1.1. No member of the Council may serve on any other body or continuity arrangement in the same transition, and no person may serve on the Council more than one 6-month term; the seats rotate every 6 months by fresh draw from the same sources so that no certification, order, or operation fails for want of a seated member. An order under category (i) below requires approval by at least two members of the Council with recorded dissent, subject to automatic post-hoc ICPI and Section 10.2.1 legality review within 72 hours. Notwithstanding Article XII, Section 12.7(f), an order under category (ii) below requires approval by at least two of the three Council members, subject to automatic verification within 24 hours by a conflict-free substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 that the order faithfully executes the prior Constitutional Court certification under this subsection; a verification finding that the order materially departs from the certification voids the order and the substitute bench may order corrective measures. The Council may order force only (i) under the defensive and humanitarian baseline in Article VIII, Section 8.1.2, or (ii) to enforce a binding Constitutional Court decision under Article VIII, Section 8.2, upon prior certification by the Constitutional Court by at least 5 of its 7 members, or by a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 where the Court is conflicted, that the decision is final, that enforcement is necessary, that the operation is proportional and limited to the decision's terms, and that no non-force alternative remains available. The Council holds no other authority, is subject to Article VIII, Section 8.5 in every operation, dissolves when a lawful Expert Body successor assumes authority, and no member of the Council may serve in any later command or continuity role in the same transition.

e) The Global Peacekeeping Corps answers to the TEC during the transition period. No military action beyond defensive operations may be ordered without a unanimous TEC vote.

### Section 3.9: Oversight and accountability

a) A 7-member Reserve Oversight Board shall oversee pool vetting, lottery integrity, Assessment custody, and Assembly conduct. Three citizen members and 4 qualified members with experience in audit, continuity planning, selection integrity, customary accountability, or public administration shall be drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from CGA-certified pools for single 3-year terms. Two seats are replaced each year for 2 years and 3 seats in the third year. For the initial Board, 2 members receive 1-year terms, 2 receive 2-year terms, and 3 receive 3-year terms, assigned by public lot within the citizen and qualified composition as nearly proportionally as possible. No member may be a Reserve candidate, EB member, justice, Secretariat employee, or recent participant in an operation under review.

b) An Independent Ombudsperson shall be drawn from a separately certified pool for a single 3-year term and shall receive and investigate complaints from Reserve candidates regarding process violations. A deputy selected in the same draw assumes immediately upon vacancy; records and complaint access continue under Article XII, Section 12.7 until a successor is installed.

c) Reserve operations are published in an annual Reserve Transparency Report, except individual Shadow Assessments and Assembly internal deliberations. The Constitutional Court retains conflict-free legality review but no appointment, administration, or outcome-control power.

### Section 3.10: Expert Reserve Assembly for selection oversight

For every purpose assigned to it by this Covenant, the Expert Reserve Assembly (ERA) shall refer to the collective vote of all current conflict-free Expert Reserve members, conducted by simple majority with vote totals and rationale published. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall administer the vote through tested digital and offline channels, and independent auditors shall verify integrity. Quorum is two-thirds of eligible members. If quorum fails, a second ballot shall occur within 14 days; if quorum fails a second time, a third ballot shall occur within a further 14 days at a quorum of at least 40% of eligible members. If the third ballot fails quorum, the matter is deemed decided in the negative: the motion or nomination fails and no further ballot on substantially the same matter may occur within 90 days. Until a lawful decision, the last valid non-personal procedure or weighting continues under Article XII, Section 12.7. A dispute over whether a member has a material personal interest shall be decided by a conflict-free Constitutional Court or substitute bench under Article IV, Section 4.7(i), not by the member alone. No Reserve member may vote on any matter in which they are currently a candidate in the EB selection pipeline or otherwise have a material personal interest.

## ARTICLE IV: THE DECADAL PLEDGE CYCLE

### Section 4.1: Pledge formulation

At the beginning of each decade, the EB shall publish a set of 10 to 15 **Decadal Pledges to Humanity**: quantifiable, globally trackable targets for human welfare and planetary health.

For the founding cycle, the independently selected provisional EB shall publish draft Pledges by Day 420 after promulgation. The Epistemic Council shall publish a non-binding review of framing, exclusions, and metric risk within 30 days. The provisional EB shall publish the final first Pledges within 30 days after final Rule Zero certification and no later than Day 520. If Rule Zero is not yet validly certified, the Day-520 publication is a continuity rendition based only on the fixed principles in Section 11.1. Each certification of Rule Zero, including any certification following a retry under Section 11.3(5), re-opens a 30-day review window for the continuity rendition without interrupting lawful services. The review shall assess whether the rendition remains consistent with the certified Rule Zero; amendments required by the review shall be published within 30 days of its conclusion. Each materially relied-upon metric must have a current Metric Passport and remain challengeable under Section 4.7. The first decade begins only upon Covenant ratification under the Ratification and Supersession Framework; no missed Pledge deadline extends a provisional office or delays the compulsory reset. Within 180 days after the first permanent EB assumes office, it may amend the founding Pledges by a two-thirds vote of its seated members, provided that the amended targets are not less ambitious than the targets they replace and that each changed metric receives a current Metric Passport; this one-time power expires at the end of that 180-day period and does not apply to any later decade.

Each Pledge must be at least 20% more ambitious than the prior 20-year average rate of improvement for that metric. Where the prior 20-year average rate of improvement for a metric is negative, the Pledge must reverse the trend by a margin at least 20% larger in magnitude than the prior average decline. Where no 20-year record exists, the baseline is the best comparable documented rate for a materially similar metric and population, published in the Metric Passport with the basis for comparability. The Epistemic Council shall independently validate the comparability basis within

90 days of publication. If the Council finds the basis not materially comparable, it shall publish its reasons and the EB shall adopt a Council-approved alternative baseline or, absent one, the ambition floor for that Pledge shall be a fixed improvement of 2% per annum over the decade's starting value until the Council certifies a validated baseline. A baseline found not materially comparable after the Pledge is adopted shall be treated as a Yellow Warning for that Pledge and corrected within 180 days. For a metric whose value is bounded by a physical or theoretical maximum (such as universal literacy at 100% or child mortality at 0%), the ambition floor shall be reduced to the maximum feasible progress toward the boundary within the decade, as certified by the Independent Metrics Council on published methodology; a target set at the certified maximum feasible progress meets this Section's floor for purposes of Section 4.4, and the Court shall address the Council's certification in the audit under that Section. The Epistemic Council shall publish an annual ambition review of the EB's Pledge targets against the ambition rule in this Section. A target the Council identifies as materially trivial shall be counted as unmet in the Year-10 audit unless the EB demonstrates that the target meets this Section's floor; the Court shall address the Council's finding in the audit under Section 4.4.

Pledges shall be encoded into the public ledger and may not be amended mid-decade except by a 90% EB supermajority in response to a verified force majeure, or under the first permanent EB's one-time review power in Section 4.1: a specific natural, astronomical, biological, technological, or externally caused event that could not have been prevented or incorporated through available rights-consistent measures identified in the Pledge and its Disconfirmation Record when the Pledge was adopted and that materially defeats its stated assumptions. Verification requires a public finding by a temporary conflict-free panel drawn from relevant domain experts, affected communities, and forensic methodologists, with the Disconfirmation Record and dissent published.

The Epistemic Council's authority to propose amendments to epistemic architecture under Article XIII is structurally separate from the Decadal Pledge Cycle. The Council may examine the framing, metric selection, and knowledge assumptions underlying a Pledge, but may not propose, veto, or alter the substantive policy target.

If the EB fails to publish the required Pledges by the applicable deadline under this Section, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary Pledge Formulation Commission of 12 members: 5 citizens selected by lot from CGA-certified pools and 7 conflict-free qualified members selected by lot from independently audited domain-expert, forensic-methodology, and constitutional-methodology pools. The Commission shall publish draft Pledges within 90 days, subject to the same ambition floor, Metric Passport, Epistemic Council review, and Rule Zero consistency requirements applicable to the EB's own drafting. Adoption requires 60% approval by the CGA; upon adoption, the Pledges take effect as though published by the EB. The Commission dissolves upon adoption and creates no continuing office. No provisional body, no member of the Epistemic Council, and no member of the EB may serve on the Commission or draft on its behalf. The Commission may not extend a provisional term, delay the compulsory reset, or alter the substantive scope of Article IV.

If the CGA does not reach the 60% adoption threshold within 60 days of the Commission's publication, the Commission shall publish, within 30 days, a revised draft addressing the specific objections stated by the CGA and, in a separate published response, the objections raised in the Epistemic Council's non-binding review. The CGA has a further 30 days to reach 60% on the revised draft. If 60% is still not reached, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall place the revised draft before a global referendum administered under Section 4.6; adoption requires a majority of valid votes cast, and adoption takes effect as though published by the EB. If the referendum rejects, the Commission dissolves and the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a fresh 12-member Pledge Formulation Commission under the same composition rules within 30 days, from which every member of every prior Commission constituted for the same decade is excluded on a cumulative basis, and the sequence in this paragraph repeats with the same cumulative exclusion applied to every further iteration. Throughout the sequence, and until Pledges are adopted for the current decade, each metric whose prior-decade Pledge remained under a current Metric Passport shall carry a continuity Pledge set at the Section 4.1 ambition floor applied to the most recent 20-year rolling average, published by the Independent Metrics Council under Section 4.2 and treated as the operative Pledge for the purposes of Sections 4.2 through 4.4, 4.7, and 13.11. For a metric whose prior-decade Metric Passport has lapsed, the Independent Metrics Council shall publish within 60 days an interim comparable-metric basis under the baseline procedures of this Section, to which the continuity Pledge applies on the same ambition-floor terms; pending publication of the interim basis, the fallback hierarchy of Article IV, Section 4.7(f) governs measurement, and the Section 4.4 audit shall apply that fallback hierarchy to any metric lacking an operative Pledge at audit close. A continuity Pledge is superseded immediately upon adoption of the decade's Pledges under this Section and creates no continuing authority; delay in adoption neither extends any provisional term nor delays the compulsory reset.

#### Section 4.2: Annual public dashboard

The Independent Metrics Council shall publish an annual Public Health Dashboard showing real-time progress toward each Pledge; the Constitutional Court shall certify that its metrics carry current Metric Passports but shall not design, select, or suppress its contents. The Dashboard shall be accessible to every citizen in plain language.

#### Section 4.3: Yellow and red warnings

- If any Pledge falls below 60% of target trajectory at the 5-year midpoint, the Court shall issue a Yellow Warning.
- If any Pledge falls below 75% of target trajectory at the 8-year mark, the Court shall issue a Red Warning.

The EB must submit a corrective action plan within 90 days of any Yellow or Red Warning, and the plan shall address every affected Pledge, identify specific corrective measures, interim milestones, and responsible officers, and estimate the trajectory recovery expected by decade end. The Constitutional Court shall approve the plan or return it once for specified revision within 30 days; a plan not submitted within 90 days, or a revised plan not approved, shall be treated as a Yellow Warning for each affected Pledge not yet under Red Warning, and as a Red Warning for each Pledge already under Red Warning. The Court shall monitor implementation and publish a compliance report at each subsequent bi-annual audit (or annually if no bi-annual audit is required). If the Court finds that an approved plan was not substantially completed, each affected Pledge shall be scored as below 60% of trajectory in the Year-10 audit regardless of its actual trajectory. The Constitutional Court shall notify the Expert Reserve of all Red Warnings.

#### Section 4.4: Year 10 audit

At the conclusion of each decade, the Constitutional Court shall conduct a 6-month forensic audit of all Pledges.

No result below takes effect until identified Constitutional Court justices have substantively reviewed and certified the evidence, the validity and operative status of each materially relied-upon metric under Section 4.7, and the resulting threshold. “Automatically” removes policy discretion after that human certification; it does not authorize a machine decision.

The Court shall score each Pledge as a percentage of its target trajectory achieved by the end of the decade: full credit at or above the target, proportional credit between 60% and 100% of trajectory, and zero credit below 60% of trajectory. If a Pledge’s materially relied-upon metric is suspended under Section 4.7 at audit close, the Court shall score the Pledge using the best available evidence from the fallback hierarchy in Section 4.7(f). If no fallback indicator supports a trajectory assessment, the Pledge is scored as below 60% of trajectory. If a metric has expired under Section 4.7(g) and has not been independently revalidated before audit close, the same fallback rule applies. The EB’s decade score is the mean credit across all Pledges.

- **≥80% mean credit:** The EB’s mandate is ratified for the next decade, without extending any member’s individual term.
- **60%–79% mean credit:** The EB is placed on Probationary Renewal. Every individual term is shortened proportionally to its remaining duration, with no term reduced by more than 2 years and no term reduced below 1 year. A term shortened under this subsection counts as reaching ordinary expiration for the purposes of Article I’s stagger cap, and the resulting vacancies shall be sequenced with the Article I selection pipeline to preserve staggered expiration. Bi-annual audits are required for the following 5 years.
- **<60% mean credit:** The EB is suspended, and every suspended seat is treated as vacated for continuity and successor selection under Article III, Section 3.8. Governance transfers for 90 days to the Transition Executive Council, while a fresh Article I selection process opens within 30 days. Temporary continuity after the transfer is governed by Article III, Sections 3.7 and 3.8 until the complete, unshortened permanent process seats successors. No suspended member may serve in the TEC, as a continuity holder, or in the fresh selection cycle.

If the EB is suspended under this Section or Section 4.5 mid-decade, the successor EB shall publish its own Pledges within 180 days of assuming office; the Year-10 audit then applies to the successor’s own decade and its own Pledges, and the suspended decade’s audit applies to the suspended EB.

### Section 4.5: The Public Apology provision

If the EB determines that a Pledge target is unfeasible due to unforeseen circumstances beyond its control, it may issue a **Public Apology** to humanity, explaining the circumstances and reasoning. Within 30 days of a Court certification under this Section, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall administer the referendum under the mechanism in Section 4.6; delay by any body neither cancels nor postpones the referendum. An apologized-for Pledge is scored on its actual trajectory like every other Pledge and is never excluded from the Year-10 computation under Section 4.4. No more than two Public Apologies may be issued in a single decade; a third may be issued only after verification under the force-majeure process in Section 4.1.

A Public Apology is deemed “garbage” and subject to EB suspension **only if** BOTH:

1. The Constitutional Court certifies the apology as factually insufficient or made in bad faith, AND
2. At least 60% of valid votes cast in a global referendum supports the Court’s finding.

**Referendum Administration:**

The referendum shall be administered and certified solely by the institutionally independent referendum mechanism established under Section 4.6. The EB, Constitutional Court, and any person whose tenure or authority could be affected may not control voter registration, ballot framing, official translations, logistics, code, counting, certification, recount, funding, or challenges. The Court's prior finding under this Section concerns only the factual sufficiency and good faith of the apology and confers no referendum-administration role.

#### Section 4.6: Independent referendum infrastructure

No later than 4 years after Covenant ratification, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall constitute a temporary design commission of citizens, election administrators, cybersecurity and privacy specialists, accessibility specialists, statisticians, customary or community-consent practitioners, and constitutional jurists through open application, blind threshold screening where possible, and constrained lot. The commission shall publish and test a permanent referendum architecture with institutionally and personally separated registration and logistics, technical certification, count audit, and challenge functions. The CGA shall approve, reject with reasons, or return the proposal once for specified correction within 180 days; conflict-free Constitutional Court review is limited to legality. Corrected text shall receive a final CGA decision within 90 days, and an approved architecture shall become operational no later than the fifth anniversary of ratification. The EB and Court may submit public comments but may not select commissioners, operate a referendum, or alter a technical or count finding.

If the adoption or operational deadline is missed, the temporary architecture below remains continuously available and the most recently tested protocols remain operative. Within 90 days, a newly drawn temporary referendum authority shall place the commission's last tested proposal and any CGA objection before a global vote. Approval requires a majority of valid votes cast and makes the proposal operational within 180 days; rejection triggers a newly drawn design commission without interrupting the temporary referendum mechanism. Delay therefore cannot veto referendum capacity, entrench temporary personnel, or interrupt a pending vote.

Until the permanent architecture is operational, each non-founding referendum shall be administered by a temporary authority drawn by the Secretariat from independently certified pools: an 18-member Citizen Chamber and a 12-member Qualified Chamber. Procedure and expenditure require a majority of the Citizen Chamber and two-thirds of the Qualified Chamber. Separate personnel shall perform logistics, technical certification, and count audit and challenges; no person or institution may serve in more than one function. The authority dissolves after publishing the final audit and may not become the permanent administrator.

The initial Rule Zero referendum shall be administered solely by the temporary Founding Referendum Authority under Article XI, Sections 11.3 and 11.4(0.7). Use of that founding-only mechanism neither satisfies nor extends the deadline for permanent infrastructure and gives no provisional body authority over referendum logistics, ballot framing, voter registration, counting, certification, recount, or challenges.

**Section 4.7: Metric Integrity, rights floors, and corrective review**

a) **Constitutional Floor.** Rule Zero and the rights recognized in Article X are absolute floors. No Pledge score, Welfare Standard output, formula, model, dashboard, audit, or other metric may legalize a rights violation, excuse irreversible planetary harm, or substitute measured performance for observed reality.

b) **Metric Passport.** Before a metric may materially affect a Covenant decision, its owner shall publish its construct definition, provenance, collection method, uncertainty and known limitations, distributional effects, gaming and manipulation analysis, alternative indicators, version history, and expiration or revalidation date. No metric may remain operative beyond 10 years without independent revalidation; a shorter period shall apply where drift risk is material.

b.1) **Claim-Type and Disconfirmation Record.** Every empirical, predictive, or causal claim materially supporting a consequential Covenant decision shall state, before action: (1) the exact claim and its type; (2) the initial conditions and forecast horizon; (3) an observation or pattern that would count against it; (4) data sources, measurement rules, and material auxiliary assumptions; (5) serious alternative explanations; (6) the evidence threshold that triggers review, modification, or rollback; and (7) the result after the horizon expires. The required specificity rises with coercion, scale, and irreversibility.

Falsifiability is a test of whether an empirical claim exposes itself to possible contradiction; it is not a truth score, worldview ranking, or automatic decision rule. Normative commitments, rights floors, spiritual meanings, customary obligations, identity claims, and interpretations shall be marked outside its scope rather than penalized. When any tradition or institution makes an empirical claim to justify coercion, deprivation, resource allocation, or irreversible action, that empirical claim is subject to this Record. No automated system may assign a final falsifiability score to a person, knowledge tradition, policy, or claim.

b.2) **Pre-Deployment Validation.** Before a metric owner deploys a metric to materially affect a Covenant decision, the Metric Passport shall be reviewed for facial completeness, methodological soundness under subsections (b) and (b.1), and non-derogation from Rule Zero and Article X by a conflict-free pre-deployment validation panel of 3 members drawn by lot from the conflict-free jurist and forensic methodologist pools drawn upon by subsection (i). The panel shall approve, remand for revision, or reject the Metric Passport within 60 days of submission and shall publish reasons. The panel may not select the metric's substantive construct, choose the underlying policy, or predict its policy outcome; it certifies only that the Passport meets subsections (b) and (b.1) and that the metric is not facially incompatible with Rule Zero or Article X. Approval confers no immunity from subsequent challenge under subsection (c) or from suspension, invalidation, repair, or replacement under subsections (e) through (g). Deployment of a metric without a current pre-deployment validation carries no legal weight: no EB ratification, probation, suspension, monetary issuance or contraction, funding penalty, infrastructure disconnection, rights-affecting decision, or other consequential Covenant action may rely on that metric, and any action that so relies is subject to the correction, rollback, and reparation procedures in subsection (g). A pre-deployment validation expires on the metric's next revalidation deadline under subsection (b); a metric that fails revalidation may not be redeployed until validated afresh under this subsection. The panel may remand a Metric Passport no more than twice for the same submission; a third submission of substantially the same Passport is deemed a rejection appealable under this paragraph. A rejection, or a third successive remand, may be appealed once by the metric owner or by any Covenant body that would materially rely on the metric to the conflict-free temporary mixed substitute tribunal under subsection (i), which shall decide within 60 days on the record and shall apply the same standard the panel applies under this subsection. No remand may extend the deployment prohibition in this subsection beyond the appeal period authorized by this paragraph.

c) **Standing and Threshold.** An affected person or community, the CGA, EC, Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, a Covenant auditor, or a qualified researcher with disclosed evidence may challenge a metric as plausibly invalid, gamed, non-invariant across affected populations, or detached from the construct it purports to measure. An independent intake clerk, selected by lot from qualified forensic-methodology personnel and barred from the challenged metric's design or use, shall open review only upon a showing of standing and specific prima facie evidence. A denial shall state reasons and may be appealed once to the Constitutional Court only if every participating justice is conflict-free under subsection (i); otherwise the appeal shall go directly to the temporary mixed substitute tribunal defined there. Repetitive claims presenting no materially new evidence may be summarily denied.

d) **Temporary Metric Integrity Review Jury.** An accepted challenge shall convene a temporary jury consisting of 12 citizens selected by stratified lot, with the maximum inclusion of affected experience permitted by the eligible conflict-free pool, and 9 persons selected by lot from independently audited pools of qualified statisticians, relevant domain experts, and forensic methodologists. Any shortfall in affected experience and the pool constraints causing it shall be published; no discretionary substitution may alter the pool or delay review. Members shall disclose conflicts and may not have designed, purchased, audited, or materially relied upon the challenged metric. A recused or unavailable citizen or qualified member shall be replaced within 48 hours by a fresh draw from the standing pools, so that the thresholds in this subsection remain reachable. The citizen panel determines whether continued reliance presents a credible legitimacy or lived-reality risk; the qualified panel determines technical validity. A final finding of material technical invalidity requires 6 qualified members, shall address the citizen panel's findings, and shall state uncertainty and dissent. Neither panel may set policy or select the substantive outcome.

d.1) **Pool-draw priority and capacity.** In the event of concurrent demand for citizen or qualified pool members under subsection (d) that exceeds available conflict-free capacity, priority order is: (1) Article X rights matters requiring expedited decision under Section 10.2.1 or Section 10.3; (2) active Metric Integrity Review Jury challenges under subsection (d); (3) continuity-panel draws under Article X, Section 10.2.2; (4) Article XIII, Section 13.12(a) Review Commission constitution; and (5) Article XIII, Section 13.12(d)(B) escrow refresh. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall expand the citizen and qualified pools under the same standards used for their ordinary formation until every priority-1 and priority-2 draw can be constituted; lower-priority draws shall be sequenced under the same expansion, and no lower-priority draw may delay a higher-priority draw. No draw at any priority shall fail for want of pool depth.

e) **Dual-Key Suspension.** Reliance on a challenged metric may be suspended only with concurrence of at least 7 citizen members and 6 qualified members. The order shall identify the evidence, scope, affected decisions, preserved alternative indicators, and expiration date. Suspension may last no more than 180 days and may be renewed once for no more than 90 days upon the same thresholds. No suspension or renewal may be timed to defeat a scheduled Year-10 audit: if a suspension order or its renewal would remain in effect later than 30 days before the scheduled audit start date, the suspension shall expire no later than 30 days before that date, and the Court shall score the affected metric under Section 4.4 using the best available evidence from the fallback hierarchy in Section 4.7(f). Appeal lies to the conflict-free temporary mixed substitute tribunal under subsection (i); appeal does not automatically stay the order.

f) **Effect of Suspension.** While reliance is suspended, no EB ratification, probation, suspension, monetary issuance or contraction, funding penalty, infrastructure disconnection, or rights-affecting decision may rely materially on that metric. Necessary administration shall continue through, in order: independently validated alternative indicators; direct observation and primary records; multiple independent qualitative and quantitative indicators; and recorded competent human judgment using the least rights-restrictive, least irreversible course. If none supports a new departure, the last lawful service level or policy continues. Only reliance on the defective metric pauses; the governed function does not.

g) **Repair, Replacement, Rollback, and Enforcement.** The metric owner shall preserve raw data, code, logs, and prior versions and shall repair or replace the metric within 180 days. A final finding of material invalidity triggers review of materially downstream decisions. The body that made each decision remains responsible for implementation and shall submit within 30 days a correction, rollback, and reparation plan identifying affected persons, deadlines, restoration measures, residual irreversibility, and funding. The temporary Metric Integrity Review Jury shall approve, reject, or require revision of that plan by the same citizen and qualified thresholds required for suspension. If the original jury cannot remain available, a conflict-free successor correction panel of 5 citizens and 4 qualified statisticians, domain experts, or forensic methodologists shall be drawn from the standing pools; approval requires 3 citizen and 3 qualified votes. The jury or successor panel shall monitor deadlines and publish compliance findings. If the responsible body resists, delays, conceals affected decisions, or materially departs from an approved plan, the panel shall seek an enforceable order from the conflict-free substitute tribunal under subsection (i), which may order preservation, disclosure, restoration, lawful rollback, and reparation but may not set substantive policy. The responsible body is never the final judge of its own correction. Irreversibility, administrative inconvenience, or fiscal cost alone shall not defeat correction. If repair or replacement is not completed by the deadline, the metric expires and may not be used until independently revalidated under this Section.

h) **Anti-Abuse and Dissolution.** Filing a knowingly fabricated challenge is sanctionable after due process, but error, dissent, or an unsuccessful good-faith challenge is not. Each jury or successor correction panel dissolves when its final order and monitored correction are complete. Its members may not convert service into a permanent metrics office or receive preferential eligibility for any Covenant position.

i) **Conflict-Free Review and Substitute Tribunal.** A Constitutional Court justice is conflicted and shall recuse if that justice or the Court designed, operated, commissioned, audited, certified, defended, or materially relied upon the challenged metric or the decision under review. Performance of the Court's mandatory duties under Section 2.3, its duty to issue Warnings under Section 2.4, and its mandatory passport-currency certifications under Section 4.2 is not alone a conflict; the conflict rule addresses personal or institutional design, operation, commissioning, certification, defense, or material reliance beyond the exercise of those duties. If recusals leave fewer than 5 conflict-free justices, or if the Court acted institutionally in any of those roles, a temporary 7-member substitute tribunal shall hear the matter: 3 citizens selected by lot and 4 conflict-free constitutional jurists or forensic methodologists selected by lot from independently administered standing pools. The substitute tribunal may review intake denials, procedural appeals, correction enforcement, and constitutional error, but may not design a metric or choose policy. Its members shall meet public competence thresholds, disclose conflicts, issue reasons, and dissolve after final enforcement. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall administer each draw, and neither the EB, CC, metric owner, nor challenged decision-maker may select the members. The affiliation-cluster cap in Article II, Section 2.2 applies verbatim to every independently administered standing pool from which a substitute tribunal, Metric Integrity Review Jury, correction panel, or intake clerk under this Section is drawn, and to the founding pools under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6) that supply any of the foregoing: no disclosed affiliation, institution, employer, funder lineage, or coordinated applicant cluster (defined as candidates sharing controlling organizational, financial, or familial ties) shall constitute more than one-fifth of the pool's candidates; related affiliations aggregate on the basis of the disclosures required by this Section; the caps are administered ministerially by the Independent Sortition Secretariat; no candidate is excluded solely for affiliation, but a candidate whose cluster already fills its cap shall not be drawn while the cap is reached. Three independent auditors selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool shall reproduce each pool formation and draw under the same procedure the Article II successor pools follow. Every other provision of this Covenant that constitutes a substitute tribunal, review panel, or intake clerk "under Article IV, Section 4.7(i)" or "under the pattern of Article IV, Section 4.7(i)" imports this cap by that reference. Where the importing provision vests draw administration in an institution other than the Independent Sortition Secretariat (including the conflict-free non-team external-registry institutions that administer the canonical-record dispute tribunal under Article XII, Section 12.7), that institution administers the cap ministerially in place of the Secretariat under the same non-discretionary standard.

## ARTICLE V: PUBLIC GRIEVANCE AND LEGITIMACY

### Section 5.1: Digital grievance portal

A permanent digital forum shall be maintained, accessible to every person. Any person may submit a specific grievance concerning any Covenant policy or body. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall also provide equivalent offline and in-person access to the Portal through at least one intake office per Regional Coordinating Assembly, supported by formula-based ISS funding sufficient to permit submission and support of grievances by persons without digital access or literacy. Local Cultural Councils may host additional intake points at their option and expense. Offline and in-person submissions are counted identically to digital submissions for every tally, threshold, and forwarding duty under this Section. The portal shall verify that each support is cast by a distinct registered adult and that no person supports the same grievance more than once per quarter. No person may submit more than five grievances per quarter, and no person may support more than 50 grievances per quarter. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall publish quarterly anomaly reports identifying support patterns inconsistent with organic individual participation; a finding of coordinated or automated manipulation shall disqualify the affected grievances from the top-100 count for that quarter. The top 100 most-supported grievances each quarter, after disqualification, shall be forwarded to the EB, which is constitutionally obligated to acknowledge each within 72 hours and to issue a public, plain-language written response within 21 days of acknowledgment.

### Section 5.2: The Citizen Grievance Assembly

a) **Purpose.** The Citizen Grievance Assembly (CGA) is a permanent body of randomly selected citizens. It is the voice of humanity in the Covenant. It holds no legislative or executive authority. Its power is investigatory, deliberative, and declarative. If the CGA fails to publish its annual Legitimacy Assessment within 90 days of the end of the assessment year, or fails to convene within 60 days of a scheduled sitting, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall notify the Constitutional Court, which shall issue a public finding on the failure and may direct the Secretariat to draw a temporary substitute panel to complete the delinquent function. A substitute panel dissolves upon completion and creates no continuing office or preferential eligibility.

b) **Composition.** The CGA shall consist of 500 members, randomly selected from the global adult citizen population as defined in Article X, Section 10.6(b) through a stratified lottery that produces proportional representation by region, age, gender, and education level. No person may volunteer or campaign for selection.

c) **Term and Staggering.** CGA members serve a single term of 2 years. Half the chamber is replaced each year. For the initial CGA, 250 members shall receive 1-year terms and 250 shall receive 2-year terms, assigned by public lot after seating; every later term is 2 years. Vacancies are filled promptly from standing stratified replacement pools for the remainder of the term, and outgoing cohorts transfer records before successors assume authority. If a replacement draw is delayed, the chamber continues at reduced strength while maintaining at least 340 members; below that floor, alternates assume immediately under Article XII, Section 12.7. No member may serve more than one full term. After their term, members are eligible for another Covenant office following a 5-year cooling-off period. All percentage thresholds for CGA votes under this Covenant are computed against the CGA's seated members not lawfully recused. A CGA member's recusal is lawful only as to a matter in which the member has a material personal interest, on the member's published disclosure. A dispute over the lawfulness of a CGA member's recusal may be raised by the member, another CGA member, or the Independent Sortition Secretariat and shall be decided within 30 days by a conflict-free Constitutional Court or, where the Court is conflicted, a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1; the recused member remains included in the quorum and denominator for that matter pending that decision. No vote is valid unless at least half of the seated non-recused members are present at the time of the vote. If fewer than half are present, the vote shall be postponed and reconvened within 14 days, at which reconvened sitting the quorum is one-third of seated non-recused members. At the reconvened sitting held under reduced quorum, all percentage thresholds for that specific vote are computed against the seated members not lawfully recused from that matter; the reduced quorum does not lower the base for a percentage threshold, and the base for all other CGA votes remains the seated non-recused membership. If a quorum is again not met, the matter shall be referred to the Constitutional Court for a public finding on the cause of the attendance failure and a directive to schedule a further sitting within 30 days; the matter is not deemed rejected by that referral. The Court's finding shall identify by lawful process any members whose verified chronic non-attendance materially contributed to the failure; upon that identification the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall immediately seat replacements for those members from the standing stratified replacement pool for the remainder of their term, treating verified chronic non-attendance as inability to serve for purposes of Article XII, Section 12.7. If, after replacement under this paragraph, a further reconvened sitting on the same matter again fails to reach the reduced quorum, the matter transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a freshly drawn 7-member substitute panel constituted under Article X, Section 10.2.1, which shall decide the matter on the existing record within 30 days under the threshold and standards this Covenant assigns to a CGA decision on the same matter and dissolve after judgment. For any transferable CGA matter for which this Covenant does not expressly assign a CGA decision threshold, the substitute panel shall apply the 60% supermajority stated in subsection (f)(3), computed on the panel's seated non-recused membership and rounded up. The annual Legitimacy Assessment under subsection (f)(7), any Mission Fidelity Petition under Section 5.4, and any request to the Epistemic Council under subsection (f)(6) are not transferable under this paragraph; they await the next lawful CGA sitting under Article XII, Section 12.7 and, if that sitting cannot be lawfully convened within the deadline the relevant Section assigns, the ordinary Section 12.7 continuity hierarchy governs the delinquent function in place of this paragraph's transfer. This transfer does not stay the respondent body's lawful authority and creates no continuing office or preferential eligibility.

d) **No Dual Service.** No person may serve simultaneously in the CGA and any other standing Covenant body, including the EB, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, or Epistemic Council. Temporary service by lot on a tribunal, jury, disclosure panel, certification panel, or review commission expressly assigned to CGA members by this Covenant is a CGA duty, not dual office, provided it confers no executive authority, separate continuing tenure, or preferential eligibility.

e) **Training.** Selected members shall undergo a 2-month paid training program covering the Covenant's structure, EB procedures, deliberation methods, and the rights defined in Article X. Training is administered by the independent CGA secretariat. A conflict-free Constitutional Court may review the published curriculum for legality but may not select instructors, direct content, certify individual members, or condition seating.

f) **Powers.** The CGA may:

1. Receive, aggregate, and prioritize citizen grievances submitted through the digital portal or in public hearings.
2. Convene public hearings on any matter within the EB's jurisdiction. The CGA may subpoena EB members, Reserve members, and expert witnesses to testify.
3. Issue findings and recommendations by a 60% supermajority vote after structured deliberation.
4. Refer evidence of systemic rights violations or EB misconduct directly to the Constitutional Court for ethics investigation. This referral bypasses all other channels.
5. Invite the Epistemic Council to present Blind Spot Reports, pipeline examinations, or other findings within its mandate. The Epistemic Council shall accept such invitations.
6. Request that the Epistemic Council investigate a specific epistemic concern. The Council must acknowledge the request within 30 days and either initiate an investigation or publish an explanation for declining.
7. Publish an annual Legitimacy Assessment covering the EB's performance, transparency, and responsiveness, together with the Epistemic Council's independence and effectiveness.

g) **EB Response Requirement.** The EB must issue a written response to every CGA finding and recommendation within 30 days. The response shall address each specific concern raised with particularity, stating for each: (1) the action taken or the reason for inaction; (2) the factual basis relied upon; and (3) any timeline for further consideration. A generic acknowledgment or explanation that does not engage the substance of each concern does not satisfy this obligation.

Agreement is not required. The Constitutional Court may review a response for sufficiency upon referral by the CGA and may order a compliant response within 30 days; a finding of persistent insufficient response constitutes a material omission under Section 5.3 for purposes of the Living Commentary correction obligation.

h) **Deliberation Structure.** All CGA proceedings shall follow a structured deliberation protocol:

   1. Expert testimony and cross-examination by randomly selected CGA members.
   2. Small-group facilitated discussion.
   3. Plenary debate.
   4. Final vote requiring a 60% supermajority for any finding or recommendation.

i) **Transparency.** All CGA proceedings (hearings, testimony, deliberations, and votes) shall be broadcast and permanently archived, except where the Constitutional Court certifies that classified information would be disclosed.

j) **Independent Secretariat.** An independent secretariat shall support the CGA, funded directly from the Covenant's administrative budget and not controlled by the EB. The secretariat handles member selection, training, logistics, and record-keeping. Its staff shall be bound by the independence, conflict, and post-service constraints applicable to the Epistemic Council's secretariat under Article XIII, Section 13.9(b); the secretariat's director shall serve a single 5-year term; no staff member may serve beyond 5 consecutive years without a new open competition; the secretariat shall be audited annually by an independent auditor; and it may never alter a draw, registry, or stratum.

k) **Limitations.** The CGA shall not:

   1. Propose or amend policy.
   2. Veto EB decisions.
   3. Issue findings on matters outside the EB's jurisdiction, except for a Mission Fidelity Petition expressly authorized by Section 5.4.
   4. Disclose classified information in public proceedings.

l) **Initial Seating.** The initial CGA shall be selected and trained under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6) and seated no later than Day 141 after promulgation. For the initial cohort only, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw from the broadest lawfully obtainable global adult civic registries, deduplicate persons, provide secure notice and refusal, and replace refusals by the same stratified draw. The Founder, provisional EB, and provisional Constitutional Court may not select members, trainers, secretariat staff, or pool certifiers. Training shall be delivered by the independent CGA secretariat; the Constitutional Court may later review legality but may not control curriculum, instructors, or certification.

### Section 5.3: Living commentary

For every major policy, crisis response, or decadal Pledge, the EB shall maintain a **Living Commentary**: a publicly accessible, plain-language document that explains the reasoning behind decisions, updated continuously and archived permanently. It shall identify which propositions are empirical, normative, precautionary, interpretive, or unresolved; include the Disconfirmation Record required by Article IV, Section 4.7 for material empirical claims; record credible alternatives and dissent; and state how correction will occur without interrupting essential service. Each Living Commentary and its incorporated Disconfirmation Record shall be subject to independent spot review by rotating, conflict-free forensic panels drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat, at least quarterly, with findings published; a material omission found shall be corrected within 30 days and recorded.

#### Section 5.4: Mission fidelity and public purpose review

a) **Public-Purpose Duty.** Every Covenant body shall exercise its authority as an instrument for persons, affected communities, humanity, future generations, and Earth under the Foundational Commitments and Rule Zero. Expertise, measurement, institutional capacity, and continuity are necessary means; they shall not become independent constitutional ends. Equal dignity does not make every person fit for every office, and role-specific competence does not create a superior class entitled to reproduce or expand its own power. An LCC or RCA exercises Covenant authority at its allocated level; all of its conduct remains governed by Articles I, VI, and X, and conduct involving authority delegated by a global Covenant body is also subject to this Section.

b) **Annual Mission Fidelity Record.** The CGA's annual Legitimacy Assessment shall include a Mission Fidelity Record examining public grievances; affected-person and community testimony; distributional consequences; rights, access, and service records; Living Commentaries; EC, ICPI, audit, and Metric Integrity findings; conflicts and institutional incentives; ignored alternatives; correction history; and contrary evidence offered by each body reviewed. No poll, popularity measure, Pledge score, metric, profession, tradition, or knowledge system is independently dispositive.

c) **Standing and Intake.** An affected person or community, LCC, RCA, the CGA, EC, ICPI, Covenant auditor, or qualified researcher presenting disclosed evidence may allege systemic mission drift. No person or entity may file more than one Mission Fidelity Petition per calendar year concerning the same respondent body; the intake clerk shall consolidate filings raising substantially the same factual pattern and treat the consolidation as a single Petition. The CGA, EC, ICPI, and Covenant auditor are not subject to the per-year limit when filing in their institutional capacity. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a conflict-free intake clerk from existing forensic and plural-law pools. The clerk shall open review only upon standing and specific prima facie evidence of a persistent institutional pattern. Repetitive filings without materially new evidence may be denied with reasons. A denial receives one conflict-free procedural appeal under the substitute-tribunal model in Article IV, Section 4.7(i).

d) **Diagnosis.** After public hearing and examination of contrary evidence, the CGA may issue a Mission Fidelity Petition under its existing 60% finding threshold. The Petition shall identify the institution, affected functions and populations, time period, causal mechanism, contrary evidence, specialized remedies attempted, and correction failure alleged. If the CGA is implicated, lacks lawful capacity, or fails to decide an accepted filing within 90 days, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary diagnostic body using the existing 12-citizen and 9-qualified Metric Integrity chamber structure, with qualified members drawn for forensic, plural-law, public-administration, institutional-design, and relevant domain competence. Transmission to adjudication requires approval by at least 8 citizen and 6 qualified members. It diagnoses only whether the record warrants adjudication. It dissolves after transmission unless the CGA is the respondent; in that case it retains only the monitoring function in subsection (k) and dissolves after final monitoring and enforcement.

e) **Adjudication and Conflict.** A conflict-free Constitutional Court shall decide the Petition within 90 days of transmission. If the Court or any participating justice is materially implicated, the substitute-bench procedure in Article X, Section 10.2.1 applies. Where the Petition alleges concordant institutional misconduct by both the Expert Body and the Constitutional Court, or by the Expert Body together with any body whose accountability channel materially depends on the Constitutional Court's forensic-audit authority under Article II, Section 2.3, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall on the intake clerk's transmission of the Petition automatically draw a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 without requiring a prior Court finding of Court conflict, and the substitute bench decides every subsequent step of the Petition under this Section, including the merits, the correction plan approval under subsection (i), the monitoring under subsection (k), and the appeal under subsection (l). The substitute bench shall exclude every justice, alternate, or successor drawn from any pool over which either the Expert Body or the Constitutional Court exercises selection, promotion, or removal authority; the bench draws from the Article II successor pools together with pool entries independently reproduced under the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network. The Expert Body and the Constitutional Court may not modify the bench's composition, funding, or record custody, and may not issue any Peacekeeping order against the bench or against the officers, staff, or facilities supporting it; the Enforcement Command Panel under Section 8.2 shall execute any Corps order the bench issues to enforce its ruling. This paragraph creates no new adjudicative body and no expansion of substantive jurisdiction; it directs which existing conflict-free reviewer decides a concordant-misconduct Petition. If the Court is conflict-free and available but misses the 90-day deadline, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a fresh substitute bench under the same Article X, Section 10.2.1 procedure; the original Court's authority over that Petition ends upon transfer. In every case the Petition shall be finally decided no later than 180 days after original transmission. A substitute bench receiving a transfer shall decide within 90 days of transfer, subject to the 180-day outer deadline. A missed decision deadline does not toll the respondent's Mission Correction Plan duties under subsection (i), does not suspend interim protection of the record or of affected persons, and does not validate or excuse the conduct the Petition concerns. A transfer under this subsection does not restart that outer deadline: the substitute bench's own decision period is whatever time remains until the 180th day, not a fresh period. If the 180-day outer deadline expires without a final decision by the Court or any substitute bench, the Petition is not thereby granted, rejected, or otherwise resolved, and the conduct the Petition concerns is neither validated nor excused by that failure alone. The 180 days already elapsed does not reset, and no further deadline or fresh decision period runs under this subsection; the Petition remains permanently overdue until decided. If the Petition remains undecided 180 days after becoming permanently overdue, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall publish a notice of delay identifying the responsible bench and the elapsed period, and shall immediately draw a freshly conflict-free 7-member substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 to decide the Petition on the existing record within 30 days; Mission Correction Plan obligations under subsection (i) attach only upon a merits finding of mission drift by the Court or by that substitute bench, and do not run before then. The Constitutional Court, drawing a conflict-free panel if necessary, shall issue a public order requiring the substitute bench to complete its decision within the 30-day period, with non-compliance constituting a material breach of judicial duty. In that event: the complete record, evidentiary findings, and any dissent already compiled transfer intact under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a freshly drawn conflict-free bench constituted under the same Article X, Section 10.2.1 procedure, which inherits the Petition as already overdue, decides on the existing record without relitigation, and receives no new decision period of its own. Interim authority over the record passes to that freshly drawn bench for preservation and evidentiary custody only; it may order preservation, protection, and correction of the record but may not adjudicate substantive policy or select a remedy before deciding the Petition. The respondent body's lawful authority and substantive mandate continue unstayed and unsuspended throughout, and this subsection neither displaces nor limits Article X or any other provision of this Covenant independently authorizing suspension, emergency limitation, or interim relief; where such a provision applies on its own terms, it remains fully controlling. Pending a final decision, only the least harmful, most reversible interim measure may be taken on any matter the unresolved Petition concerns, and no repetition of Court or bench failure under this subsection may extend a term, renew an appointment, or otherwise be treated as validating, curing, or excusing the conduct the Petition concerns. The diagnostic body shall not adjudicate; the Court or substitute bench shall not design or execute correction.

f) **Decision Standard.** Systemic mission drift exists only upon clear and substantial evidence that: (1) the conduct forms a persistent or institution-wide pattern rather than an isolated decision or ordinary implementation error; (2) the pattern materially displaces constitutional beneficiaries or correction channels; (3) it is caused or maintained by metric substitution, expert or professional insulation, undisclosed organized interest, institutional self-preservation, suppression of affected knowledge, caste formation, or refusal of effective correction; (4) it is not adequately explained by good-faith policy disagreement, temporary resource constraint, lawful plural-tradition accommodation, genuine uncertainty, or a rights-consistent trade-off within delegated authority; and (5) existing specialized remedies are inadequate or have materially failed.

g) **Protected Disagreement.** A dispute over a policy's merits, ambition, distribution, timing, or technical means is not mission drift merely because the policy is unpopular, burdensome, unsuccessful, rejects a CGA or EC recommendation, or departs from an expert or majority view. Every finding shall address the strongest good-faith alternative explanation and identify evidence that would defeat the finding.

h) **Rights, Pluralism, and Role Fitness.** No finding may weaken Article X, rank civilizations or knowledge traditions, compel ideological conformity, allocate a function to a level lacking the competence, participation, or correction capacity the function requires, treat popularity as competence, or treat specialized competence as general human superiority. Empirical, professional, practical, physical, care-based, customary, indigenous, spiritual, relational, and place-based evidence shall receive scrutiny proportionate to the claim and authority sought.

i) **Effect and Correction Plan.** A finding does not itself void, stay, veto, or replace a substantive policy. Within 90 days, the respondent body shall publish a Mission Correction Plan identifying the affected process, access or representation defect, institutional incentive, records to disclose, decisions to reconsider, specialized referrals, responsible human officers, reversible corrective actions, continuity protections, milestones, and Disconfirmation Record. The respondent retains its substantive mandate and remains responsible for the lawful outcome.

j) **Permissible Orders.** A correction order may require disclosure, a new affected-person hearing, restoration of grievance or participation access, conflict removal, reconsideration through a lawful process, and referral to Metric Integrity, ICPI, rights, ethics, selection, amendment, or other existing procedures. No diagnostic or adjudicative body may choose the resulting policy, target, budget allocation, scientific conclusion, operational method, or officeholder.

k) **Monitoring and Enforcement.** The CGA, or the temporary diagnostic body when the CGA is the respondent, shall monitor published milestones and transmit evidence of compliance or noncompliance to the conflict-free adjudicator. The adjudicator may order performance of ministerial correction duties and initiate an otherwise applicable ethics or breach procedure. A Mission Fidelity finding alone shall not remove an officer, suspend a body, extend a term, transfer substantive policy authority, or create disqualification.

l) **Appeal.** Petitioner or respondent may take one appeal for constitutional, evidentiary, conflict, or mandate error. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a fresh 7-member substitute bench from the Article II successor pools, matching Section 2.1 and excluding every participant in the intake, diagnosis, original adjudication, correction design, and monitoring. The bench decides by simple majority within 90 days, follows prior published decisions of the Court or of earlier substitute benches unless it states a reasoned departure, and dissolves after judgment and ministerial enforcement. Appeal does not stay essential services, ordinary rights-compliant policy, grievance access, evidence preservation, or correction independently required under another Article.

m) **Anti-Abuse.** Knowing fabrication, undisclosed material coordination, retaliation, destruction of evidence, or use of review to obtain a substantive policy result is sanctionable after due process. Error, dissent, an unsuccessful good-faith filing, expert testimony, minority status, physical or intellectual occupation, cultural difference, or criticism of a Covenant body is not sanctionable.

n) **Continuity and Dissolution.** Pending review does not suspend the respondent body's lawful authority. If intake, diagnosis, adjudication, monitoring, or record custody becomes unavailable, the records and narrow function transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a conflict-free operator. Every temporary panel dissolves after final transmission or enforcement and creates no continuing office, policy jurisdiction, caste, or preferential eligibility.

o) **Enforcement escalation for non-implementation.** Where the respondent body materially fails to implement the Mission Correction Plan by the milestones the Plan identifies, the conflict-free adjudicator or, upon its unavailability, a fresh substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 may find constitutional breach of the correction-plan duty on the record already before it. Upon that finding, the consequences in Article XIII, Section 13.11(e) apply as though the finding had issued under that Section. This subsection creates no new substantive-policy authority; the respondent body's substantive mandate continues, subject only to the discretionary-budget freeze and to compelled correction-plan performance under Section 13.11(e). Subsection (k)'s limitation on the effect of a Mission Fidelity finding alone applies to the initial diagnosis of mission drift and does not restrict the consequences that flow from a separately triggered finding of constitutional breach for non-implementation under this subsection.

## ARTICLE VI: CULTURAL AUTONOMY WITHIN ONE SYSTEM

### Section 6.1: Continuous autonomy and formal charter process

Peoples and cultural communities possess a continuous, non-negotiable right within the Covenant to preserve and develop language and local culture, shape education subject to global minimum standards, govern local land use and resource stewardship subject to planetary health constraints, and maintain local dispute resolution subject to Article X. These rights do not depend on a petition, referendum, Charter, population threshold, territorial title, or EB grant. The EB shall protect and give effect to these rights in every administrative area regardless of whether a Charter has been adopted; the formal Charter process in this Article is a supplementary mechanism for specification, correction, and allocation of Covenant authority, not a precondition to enjoyment. A person or community may petition the Constitutional Court directly to enforce these rights without first exhausting the Charter process. No person, community, cultural bloc, LCC, RCA, or other body has a right to territorial secession, withdrawal from the Covenant, or physical closure of an administrative boundary.

A unified cultural bloc representing a geographically contiguous population of no fewer than 10 million citizens may petition the EB to invoke the formal Cultural Autonomy Charter process for specification or correction of these rights.

A formal autonomy referendum shall trigger only the Charter machinery below, and shall never condition the underlying autonomy rights. It requires approval by 60% of valid votes cast by registered adult voters whose principal residence was within the petitioning administrative area on the registry-freeze date. The registry shall freeze 180 days before voting. Administration, certification, recounts, and challenges are governed by the independent mechanism in Article IV, Section 4.6. The EB, Court, petitioning leadership, and the Regional Coordinating Assembly or other expressly delegated Covenant regional authority then administering the petitioning administrative area may submit equally limited public statements but may not operate or certify the vote. No vote under this Article may authorize secession or transfer sovereignty.

### Section 6.2: Cultural Autonomy Council

Within 30 days of a successful autonomy referendum, the EB shall convene a **Cultural Autonomy Council** composed of:

- 50 citizens from the petitioning bloc drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat under the stratified-lottery, registry-integrity, and independent-reproduction standards applied to the Citizen Grievance Assembly under Article V, Section 5.2, adapted to the bloc's population and administered ministerially by the ISS with three independent auditors selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool reproducing the pool formation and the draw; petitioning leadership shall have no role in eligibility, notification, or selection
- No fewer than 10 and no more than 25 sitting EB members, and in no event more than one quarter of the EB's seated members

The Council shall decide by two-thirds of its members present, provided that at least half of the Council's total members are present at the time of the vote. If fewer than half are present on a scheduled voting day, the presiding officer shall adjourn the vote and reconvene within 14 days; at the reconvened sitting, the quorum is one-third of the Council's total members. EB members are excluded from every quorum calculation under this Section, though they retain their vote when present; an EB boycott therefore cannot fail a quorum. If a quorum is again not met at the reconvened sitting after applying this exclusion, the Council is deemed to have failed to produce a Charter and the dispute escalates under Section 6.3. A bloc may not convene another Cultural Autonomy Council until 5 years after its prior Council concluded, and no more than one such Council may be in progress at any time.

This Council shall have 90 days to negotiate and produce a Cultural Autonomy Charter specifying the bloc's in-system self-government over:

- Local culture and language preservation
- Education curriculum (subject to global minimum standards)
- Land use and resource management (subject to planetary health constraints)
- Local dispute resolution

The negotiation occurs within one government and is not a negotiation between sovereigns.

The Charter is an allocation of Covenant authority within one government. It creates no sovereignty, territorial title, resource claim, power to exclude, or right of secession.

#### Section 6.3: Binding arbitration

If the Council fails to produce a Charter within 90 days, the internal allocation dispute shall escalate to the Constitutional Court for binding arbitration. The Court shall issue its arbitration decision within 120 days of escalation. The Court shall apply the continuous rights in Section 6.1 and the listed autonomy fields and planetary constraints in Section 6.2; it may not recognize secession, create a separate sovereign, or convert policy preference into territorial withdrawal. The Court's decision is final and enforceable. If the Court fails to decide within 120 days, the dispute shall transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a conflict-free substitute bench, which shall decide within 90 days of transfer; the 2-year implementation clock in Section 6.4 runs from the final arbitration decision regardless of which body renders it.

#### Section 6.4: The binding commitment

The EB is constitutionally obligated to address every specific, documented grievance raised during the Cultural Autonomy Council proceedings, with a written response to each within 30 days of the Council's conclusion. Failure to implement Council-adopted or Court-ordered Charter provisions within 2 years constitutes a material breach of the EB's duties. The Constitutional Court shall investigate and issue a public finding within 90 days. A Court finding that material non-implementation has occurred independently satisfies the certification basis under Article VIII, Section 8.4, engaging the escalation ladder without requiring any bloc conduct. Article VIII, Section 8.4 also applies on independent bases to a cultural bloc's unlawful refusal to cooperate with this process (subsection (a)) or physical closure of an administrative boundary (subsection (b)). Neither basis recognizes secession or suspends the underlying autonomy rights.

### ARTICLE VII: EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

#### Section 7.1: Purpose and philosophy

Education under the Covenant shall develop independent judgment. Every person is entitled to the knowledge and capacities defined in Sections 7.2 and 7.3, taught in conditions that respect their autonomy and accommodate their differences as required by Section 7.5.

### Section 7.2: Global minimum standards

Every educational institution operating under the Covenant shall ensure competence in the following foundational domains:

1. **Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning:** Numeracy, logic, statistical literacy, and the ability to reason from data.
2. **Language and Communication:** Proficiency in at least one global working language and the local spoken language of their bioregion, including reading, writing, and analytical discourse.
3. **What It Means to Be Human:** History, philosophy, ethics, literature, and the study of human societies, taught as an ongoing conversation across time and culture rather than as dogma.
4. **Critical Thinking and Epistemology:** How to evaluate claims, identify bias, distinguish evidence from assertion, and change one's mind in the face of better arguments.

### Section 7.3: Cultivated capacities

Beyond minimum standards, every educational institution shall actively cultivate in its students:

1. **Exploration:** The habit of asking questions, venturing into the unknown, and tolerating uncertainty.
2. **Desire and Purpose:** The ability to discover what one wants to build, become, or contribute, and the discipline to pursue it.
3. **Emotional Empathy:** The practiced capacity to understand the inner lives of others, across difference and distance.
4. **Intellectual Humility:** The recognition that one's own knowledge is provisional and that being wrong is the beginning of learning, not its end.

No standardized test shall measure these capacities. They are assessed through demonstrated practice, peer reflection, and portfolio, never through a single examination.

### Section 7.4: Voluntary subjects

Every student shall have the right to pursue subjects of their own choosing beyond the minimum standards, at a depth appropriate to their age and ability. Schools shall offer a broad and diverse range of voluntary subjects and shall not steer students toward or away from any field based on perceived economic utility, gender, origin, or any other external factor.

### Section 7.5: Learning differences

No student shall be required to conform to a single pedagogical protocol. Educational institutions must accommodate neurodivergence, learning disabilities, physical disabilities, and differing paces of development. The system adapts to the student; the student is not required to adapt to the system. Accommodation plans shall be designed collaboratively with the student, their family, and qualified educational professionals, and shall be reviewed annually.

### Section 7.6: Institutional structure

1. **Local Cultural Councils** shall administer schools within their jurisdiction, set local curriculum for language, culture, and regional history, and employ teachers.
2. **Regional Coordinating Assemblies** shall oversee teacher certification and training, set standards for accommodation plans, and manage cross-jurisdictional educational resources.
3. **The Expert Body** shall define the global minimum standards (Section 7.2) and review them every 10 years. It shall not prescribe pedagogy, textbooks, or ideological content.
4. **The Constitutional Court** shall hear complaints that an institution has failed to meet the minimum standards or has violated Section 7.5.

### Section 7.7: Teacher certification and autonomy

Teachers shall be certified by Regional Coordinating Assemblies based on demonstrated competence in their subject, pedagogical skill, and the ability to develop the capacities listed in Section 7.3. "Demonstrated competence" means: (a) a publicly documented record of subject-matter knowledge, verified by an independent assessment body that is not the certifying RCA and that publishes its methodology; (b) supervised classroom practice evaluated by at least two qualified evaluators, at least one from outside the certifying RCA, against published criteria; and (c) evidence of the ability to develop the Section 7.3 capacities, assessed through portfolio, peer observation, and student reflection; a single examination or ideological screen is insufficient. An RCA may supplement but not replace these elements. Certification denials shall state specific reasons with reference to the published criteria and are appealable to a temporary 5-member tribunal: 2 conflict-free educators selected by lot from a standing pool, 2 CGA members selected by lot, and 1 constitutional jurist selected by lot. A certification granted in violation of this Section is voidable by the Constitutional Court upon a complaint under Section 7.6(4). Certification is a public, time-limited credential subject to renewal every 7 years upon demonstration of continuing competence and professional development; it is not a political, ideological, or permanent status. Within the minimum standards, teachers have professional autonomy over their methods, materials, and classroom environment.

### Section 7.8: Funding

All public education shall be funded by the Covenant's administrative budget, allocated to Local Cultural Councils by formula based on student population and demonstrated need. No student shall be charged fees for access to the minimum standards. No private educational institution receiving public funds may charge fees for the minimum standards. Education funding shall never be conditional on standardized test performance.

## ARTICLE VIII: ENFORCEMENT AND THE USE OF FORCE

### Section 8.1: The Global Peacekeeping Corps

A standing Global Peacekeeping Corps shall be maintained, composed of volunteers from all populations, under unified Covenant command. The Corps shall be governed by the following structural constraints, which the command-chain procedure enacted under Section 8.1.1 shall implement and may not relax:

(a) Size Cap: The Corps' standing personnel shall not exceed 0.05% of global population without a specific authorization by two-thirds of the EB and two-thirds of the CGA, renewed every 4 years.

(b) Commander Term: No Supreme Commander or operational commander above brigade level shall serve more than 8 consecutive years in command of the same formation or echelon. Rotation between formations of comparable authority is not a reset of the term clock.

(c) Rotation Cycle: At least one-quarter of senior command positions shall rotate every 2 years. No officer may hold the same command billet for more than one rotation cycle.

(d) Reconstitution: Every 12 years the Corps' command structure, recruitment pathways, doctrine, and force composition shall be independently reviewed by a commission of 4 CGA members selected by lot, 4 conflict-free qualified peacekeeping or humanitarian-law specialists selected by lot, and 3 affected-community representatives selected by lot. The commission shall publish findings and may recommend structural changes; the EB shall respond in writing within 180 days. Reconstitution shall not interrupt active protection, destroy records, or terminate pending review.

(e) Demobilization: The EB shall maintain a published demobilization plan updated every 6 years. At no time shall the Corps' standing personnel exceed the size necessary to fulfill the purposes in Section 8.2, as certified by the ICPI in each biennial audit.

(f) No Autonomous Command: Article XII, Section 12.6 binds every Corps system and decision chain; no lethal or custodial decision may be made by an automated system.

(g) Protected Appropriation: The Global Peacekeeping Corps shall receive funding sufficient to maintain the personnel, training, equipment, and readiness required to fulfill Section 8.2, as certified by the ICPI in each biennial audit. The EB shall not reduce, delay, or condition the Corps' appropriation below the prior year's level, adjusted by the global median inflation rate, without approval by 60% of the CGA. If the CGA does not decide before the fiscal year begins, the prior year's appropriation shall continue, adjusted by the global median inflation rate. An EB reduction shall be accompanied by a published finding, subject to conflict-free ICPI legality review, that Section 8.2 mandates remain fulfillable at the reduced level; if the ICPI finds the reduction incompatible with mandate performance, the reduction is void and the prior appropriation continues under this subsection. From promulgation until the first published ICPI biennial audit under this subsection certifying the Corps' funding requirements under Section 8.2, an initial appropriation equal to the funding requirement published by the initial ICPI within 90 days of its operational installation shall vest automatically and shall be released through the transparent founding trust without Founder, provisional EB, provisional Constitutional Court, or Provisional Command Council discretion. If the initial ICPI fails to publish that funding requirement within 90 days, minimal funding necessary to preserve any then-existing Corps personnel, custody, and readiness continues under Article XII, Section 12.7 until the ICPI acts or a lawful successor performs the certification, drawn on the same transparent founding trust and without provisional-body discretion. Thereafter, the prior appropriation, adjusted for global median inflation, continues if a later CGA decision is delayed. This subsection sets a mandate-adequacy floor; the size cap in subsection (a) and the necessity ceiling in subsection (e) remain independently binding.

All force is under Covenant authority, and all weapons are held in Covenant custody as the property of humanity. At ratification, every national military, private army, militia, intelligence-controlled armed unit, and other armed formation outside the Covenant is abolished. No public, private, communal, corporate, religious, or territorial body may maintain an independent armed force or custody weapons outside express Covenant authorization.

A formation that has not completed dissolution, verified disarmament, and lawful transfer of weapons to Covenant custody within 2 years after ratification loses all Covenant legal protections for its personnel, assets, and operations from that deadline forward: its members and commanders forfeit eligibility for any Covenant governance, command, oversight, or service role; its assets are not entitled to the due-process or property protections of Articles VI, VII, or X; and force used against it to compel dissolution or to enforce a binding Constitutional Court decision is per se lawful under Section 8.2 without further certification. The Constitutional Court shall certify, within 90 days of the deadline, which formations have failed to dissolve, upon a public evidentiary record compiled by the ICPI and independently audited.

No private ownership of weapons capable of lethal force shall be permitted. Certified, screened personnel may carry weapons temporarily, and only when specifically authorized. Prior military rank, national office, inherited office, or command status confers no Covenant rank or authority.

#### Section 8.1.1: Command chain (deferred permanent procedure) and Provisional Command Council

*The specific procedures for the appointment, tenure, and removal of the Supreme Commander of the Global Peacekeeping Corps, as well as the precise chain of command for operational orders, shall be enacted by the first sitting Expert Body within the first 3 years of operation, subject to public review, full ICPI audit, and conflict-free Constitutional Court review limited to legality. The Court may ratify or remand with stated reasons but may not choose a commander, draft an operational rule, or direct the chain of command. The single frozen 180-day bridge below is the sole exception to the 3-year completion deadline.*

*Until such procedures are enacted, and only after the compulsory reset under Article XI, Section 11.4, the permanent EB shall appoint a temporary Supreme Commander by a 2/3 supermajority of its seated non-recused members, subject to removal by the same vote. The Constitutional Court shall be notified of all appointments and removals.*

*During the provisional period from promulgation until the compulsory reset under Article XI, Section 11.4, the provisional EB shall exercise no command, appointment, removal, operational, or force-authorization authority over the Global Peacekeeping Corps. Peacekeeping command during that period vests in a 3-member Provisional Command Council: (i) one member drawn by lot by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from the initial Citizen Grievance Assembly seated under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6); (ii) one member drawn by lot from the provisional Constitutional Court; and (iii) one member drawn by lot from the ICPI Qualified Chamber applicant pool established under the screening thresholds in Section 8.5.2 or, before that pool is operational, from the Bootstrap Qualified Integrity Panel under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6). The Council convenes upon seating of the initial CGA and installation of the provisional CC and rotates every 6 months, with all three seats redrawn ministerially by ISS from the same sources. No individual may serve more than one 6-month term on the Council during the entire provisional period, and no provisional founding officeholder in any other body may serve on the Council. The Council decides routine ministerial orders by majority; a tie fails and prevents the proposed order. Any authorization of force under Section 8.2, any appointment or removal of a temporary Supreme Commander, and any order outside the defensive and humanitarian baseline defined in the paragraph below shall require unanimity* *of all three Council members. A recused or unavailable member shall be replaced within 48 hours by a fresh draw from the same source under this Section so that the unanimity threshold remains reachable; an order shall not fail for want of a seated third member. The Council may appoint or remove a temporary Supreme Commander from qualified serving officers who are not and have not been provisional founding officeholders, subject to the unanimity requirement in this paragraph. Every order, appointment, removal, and record is subject to full ICPI access and audit under Section 8.5. The Council may not enact or alter the command-chain procedure this Section requires, may not initiate offensive operations, may not authorize any use of force outside Section 8.2, and may not extend its own membership or the provisional period. Between promulgation and seating of the initial CGA and provisional CC, the Corps operates under the defensive and humanitarian baseline defined in the paragraph below, with orders certified as provided in that paragraph.*

*Any command-chain procedure enacted by the permanent Expert Body but not yet ratified by the Constitutional Court is provisional. At the compulsory reset, every provisional commander and command appointee shall leave office and is ineligible for permanent command under the restrictions in Article XI. If the permanent EB and Constitutional Court have not yet ratified or replaced the procedure, its text may continue unchanged for a single frozen caretaker bridge not exceeding 180 days solely to preserve defensive continuity. Interim command functions shall pass under a pre-published succession order to independently screened, qualified serving officers who were not provisional founding officeholders, with selection and every order subject to full ICPI access and audit.*

*No later than Day 900 after promulgation, the Independent Sortition Secretariat, on the record compiled by the ICPI Qualified Chamber and the Bootstrap Qualified Integrity Panel, shall publish and maintain the succession order, objective competence thresholds, authentication rules, and incapacity replacements; the Provisional Command Council may comment but may not draft, edit, or veto them. The ICPI shall audit them before Day 960. The order may identify offices and qualification classes but may not reserve a role for, name as successor, or confer preference on any provisional founding officeholder.*

*During the bridge, no authority may initiate offensive operations, expand mission or jurisdiction, alter the procedure or succession order, conceal or destroy records, make irreversible command appointments, or use the bridge to postpone permanent command selection. The permanent EB and Constitutional Court shall ratify, replace, or terminate the procedure within 180 days after reset. The frozen bridge may not be renewed or extended beyond that single 180-day period for any reason; at its expiry, the defensive and humanitarian baseline under this Section applies without further extension. "Defensive and humanitarian baseline" means operations strictly necessary to protect life, prevent atrocity, secure humanitarian corridors, and defend Covenant personnel and infrastructure from active armed attack. The Constitutional Court shall certify, within 30 days of the bridge expiry, the scope of operations permitted under the baseline, upon a public evidentiary record compiled by the ICPI; the Court shall review and may narrow the scope every 90 days thereafter. No operation under the baseline may be self-classified as defensive by its commander. At that deadline every bridge officeholder rotates out. If no permanent procedure is lawful and operational, the frozen office-based succession text continues solely as a defensive and humanitarian command baseline under Article XII, Section 12.7, administered by newly drawn or independently screened qualified officers and subject to continuous ICPI access. The function continues; no person, offensive authority, expanded mission, or provisional preference does.*

**Section 8.1.2: Defensive Classification.** An operation or use of force classified as "defensive", whether under this Article, Article III, Section 3.8(e), or any other provision, shall not be self-declared by its commander, the EB, or the TEC. A defensive classification requires certification by the Constitutional Court or, during active operations where delay would defeat the defense, by the rapid mixed tribunal under Section 8.5.6, upon specific evidence that: (a) an armed attack is occurring or is objectively imminent; (b) the operation's scope, duration, and means are limited to repelling that attack; and (c) no non-force alternative remains available. The certifying body shall rule within 24 hours of receiving the classification request and supporting evidence. An operation conducted under a defensive classification before certification shall be reported within 6 hours to the Court or tribunal with the factual basis; a classification rejected after review voids the operation's lawful-authority basis retroactively and subjects the classifier to removal and disqualification under Section 8.5.8. No provision of this Covenant that distinguishes defensive from non-defensive operations, including the TEC unanimity requirement in Article III, Section 3.8(e) and the ICPI pause bar in Section 8.5.5, may be satisfied by a self-declared defensive classification.

### Section 8.2: The principle of restraint

Force shall be used only:

- In defense against immediate physical threat, where "defense" and "immediate" are certified by the Constitutional Court or rapid mixed tribunal under Section 8.5.6 upon specific, contemporaneous evidence that an armed attack is occurring or is objectively imminent and no non-force alternative remains available. Self-classification by the operator is insufficient; the operator shall report the factual basis for the classification within 6 hours to the Court or tribunal, which shall confirm or reject it within 24 hours. A rejected classification voids the operation's lawful-authority basis retroactively.
- To prevent catastrophic environmental damage, where "catastrophic" is certified by the Constitutional Court upon clear and convincing evidence, after consultation with the Independent Metrics Council or its temporary equivalent, that the damage would cause irreversible planetary-scale harm, and where no non-force alternative remains available. The certification shall identify the specific harm, causal mechanism, irreversibility finding, and less-restrictive alternatives considered.
- To enforce binding Constitutional Court decisions

All force shall be proportional, and all non-violent alternatives must be exhausted before any escalation.

**Enforcement Command Panel.** When any binding Constitutional Court decision, or a conflict-free substitute-bench decision under Article X, Section 10.2.1, requires Peacekeeping Corps enforcement against the Expert Body as a body, against a majority of the Expert Body's seated non-recused members, against the Supreme Commander appointed by the Expert Body, or against any officer, formation, or unit whose obedience to the decision is materially controlled by the Expert Body's appointment, promotion, removal, or funding authority, command of the Corps for the sole purpose of executing that decision transfers automatically under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a temporary Enforcement Command Panel. Within 48 hours of the decision, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw the Panel ministerially: 2 conflict-free flag-rank or brigade-rank officers drawn by lot from a standing pool certified by the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate Qualified Chamber under Section 8.5.2 (no member of which was appointed, promoted, or preferentially retained by the Expert Body during the preceding 8 years); 1 Citizen Grievance Assembly member drawn by lot; 1 conflict-free constitutional jurist drawn from the Article II successor pool; and 1 Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate Qualified Chamber member drawn by lot. The affiliation-cluster cap in Article II, Section 2.2 applies verbatim to every standing pool from which this Panel is drawn. The Panel decides by simple majority; a tie fails and prevents the proposed order. Its jurisdiction is strictly limited to executing the ruling in question. During the transfer the Expert Body may not appoint, remove, redeploy, reassign, discipline, communicate operationally with, or condition the funding of the Panel's members, the officers under the Panel's command for the execution, or the units directly executing the decision; may not modify the Corps chain of command, deployment, logistics, or communications implicated in the execution; may not invoke Section 8.2's defensive-classification route to shield the target of the decision; and may not withdraw or condition Corps funding for the execution. Any Expert Body order in violation of this paragraph is void and creates no obedience obligation; issuance of such an order is a §12.6 breach and subjects the identified voting members to removal and 15-year Covenant ineligibility under Article X, Section 10.2.4. The Panel dissolves automatically on full execution of the ruling or on the ruling's final vacation on appeal, and creates no continuing office, promotion, or preferential eligibility. During the transfer the Expert Body retains command of every Corps operation under Section 8.1.1 not implicated by the ruling; the transfer is narrow to the enforcement task, not a general assumption of Corps authority. If a further binding decision extends the enforcement or issues against the same target within 90 days of the Panel's dissolution, the same Panel may be reconstituted under this paragraph on the existing draw record, subject to fresh conflict certification.

### Section 8.3: Constitutional authority and operator fitness

Authority to enforce Covenant law derives from this Covenant, not from performance, national succession, possession of force, or Decadal Pledge results. Demonstrated success in meeting Decadal Pledges controls the EB's continuing fitness to exercise that authority under Article IV. A suspended EB (under Article IV) loses all authority to command the Peacekeeping Corps, which shall answer to the Transition Executive Council (TEC) during the caretaker period, as defined in Article III, Section 3.8, and, after the TEC expires without seated successors, to the Transition Command Council constituted under that Section until a lawful successor Expert Body assumes authority.

### Section 8.4: Unlawful refusal and physical boundary-closure escalation ladder

The following escalation ladder shall apply on independent bases, each engaging the ladder at the stage indicated:

(a) Unlawful Refusal: When a cultural bloc, acting through identifiable leadership, unlawfully refuses to cooperate with the in-system Cultural Autonomy Charter process, and the Constitutional Court after notice and hearing certifies, by clear and convincing evidence, persistent material non-compliance with that process, stages 1 through 3 shall apply. "Persistent" means continuing after a specific Court order to comply; "material" means substantially defeating the Charter process's purpose of allocating Covenant authority within one government. The respondent may appeal the certification under subsection (a), or a certification of physical boundary closure under subsection (b), to a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1. Appeal stays every stage of this Section from the date of filing through the substitute bench's final decision, which shall issue within 90 days of filing and in no event later than 120 days. If the substitute bench has not decided by the 120th day, the stay lapses automatically, the stages of this Section resume without further order, and the appeal transfers to a freshly drawn substitute bench under Section 10.2.1, which shall decide within 60 days of transfer. A final decision on appeal reversing the certification voids every stage measure executed under it, triggers automatic staged rollback administered ministerially by the Secretariat, and entitles the affected population to reparation on the model of Section 10.2.3; reversal triggers immediate de-escalation without requiring the 12-month compliance period below. A later certification against the same respondent or successor leadership of the same cultural bloc does not reopen a stay that has lapsed or concluded; a stay on a later certification may run only where the certification states that it relies on materially new conduct, and in no event may stays under this Section exceed 180 days in the aggregate against the same cultural bloc (defined by population, territorial area, or organizational continuity regardless of leadership changes) within any 24-month period. The Article X floors stated in the stages below bind at every stage while an appeal is pending. If an imminent risk of irreparable harm to persons or planetary systems exists during an appeal, the conflict-free Section 10.2.1 substitute bench may authorize temporary execution of Stage 1 or 2 pendente lite upon clear and convincing evidence, while Stages 3 and above remain stayed until final decision. The 2-year implementation obligation in Article VI, Section 6.4 remains independently enforceable and its breach independently justiciable; the process-noncompliance certification under this subsection is an additional enforcement path, not a replacement for the EB's own compliance duties.

(b) Physical Boundary Closure: When a cultural bloc, acting through identifiable leadership, physically closes an administrative boundary to assert separate authority, stages 1 through 3 shall apply upon certification by the Constitutional Court after notice and hearing that the closure has occurred and is not a temporary public-health, disaster-response, or equivalent administrative measure. No further finding of process non-compliance is required.

(c) Armed Conduct: Stages 4 and 5 require the certifications of armed conduct or systematic rights violations stated in those stages, whether reached from subsection (a) or (b).

A Court certification of persistent material non-compliance under subsections (a) or (b) of this Section constitutes an aggravating predicate: if the same bloc is also found in verified violation of Section 10.1 rights, the process-defiance certification satisfies the 72-hour notice element of Section 10.2.2 and the EB may invoke reallocation without the two-thirds supermajority, subject to the narrow-tailoring and temporary-duration requirements of Article I, Section 1.4. A process-defiance certification standing alone is not a 10.1 rights violation and does not independently engage Section 10.2.2. Application of this ladder never recognizes secession, sovereign equality, territorial withdrawal, or inherited-border jurisdiction:

1. **Cooling Off Period:** 90-day mandatory in-system negotiation extension.
2. **Supply Rerouting:** The bloc is notified that global supply chains will be rerouted. They may trade internally, but no external resources shall enter. Humanitarian exceptions for food, medicine, and essential medical equipment shall be monitored by the ICPI, with disputes decided by the rapid mixed tribunal and constitutional appeal to a conflict-free Court or substitute bench. Article X floors for food, clean water, shelter, essential medical care, hospital energy, evacuation, and neutral humanitarian communication apply at this and every later stage. No order under this ladder may impose collective punishment.
3. **Targeted Infrastructure Isolation:** The EB shall disconnect the bloc from global financial clearing systems, government communications networks, and military supply chains. Civilian humanitarian infrastructure shall be maintained, including:
    - Energy supply for hospitals, water treatment, and essential civilian facilities

- Food and medical supply corridors, monitored by the ICPI with disputes decided by the rapid mixed tribunal
- A neutral-facilitated civilian communication channel for humanitarian coordination The extent of isolation shall be proportional to the bloc's refusal to negotiate and shall be reviewed every 90 days by the ICPI and rapid mixed tribunal, with constitutional appeal to a conflict-free Court or substitute bench.

4. **Total Disconnection:** If the bloc initiates armed aggression against EB personnel or humanitarian operations, or is certified by the Constitutional Court to be engaged in systematic human rights violations under Article X, the EB may order total disconnection of military, coercive-government, and non-humanitarian infrastructure. The protections for food, water, essential medical care, hospital energy, civilian shelter, evacuation, and neutral humanitarian communication in the preceding stages and Article X remain fully operative. No declaration that a bloc's leadership bears responsibility may transfer legal or moral responsibility for the EB's own choices, defeat individualized proportionality review, or authorize collective punishment.
5. **Defensive Counter-Force:** If the bloc fires upon humanitarian convoys, civilian infrastructure, or initiates armed aggression against global forces, the Global Peacekeeping Corps shall disable military assets only. No civilian targets shall ever be engaged.

**De-escalation.** A bloc subject to any stage under this Section is entitled to automatic de-escalation by one stage upon: (i) compliance with every outstanding Constitutional Court order concerning the underlying certification; (ii) cessation of any physical boundary closure certified under subsection (b); and (iii) 12 consecutive months without a material breach of Covenant obligations that could support a new certification under this Section or a Section 10.1 rights finding. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall certify that these conditions are met, ministerially, on public evidence and without a vote by any body; the certification is subject to substitute-tribunal appeal under Article X, Section 10.2.1 by the EB, ICPI, or any affected LCC or RCA. A material breach at any time during the 12-month period restarts the clock from the date of the breach.

At 24 consecutive months of compliance meeting the same conditions, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall ministerially certify full normalization and every remaining restriction under this Section terminates automatically. Full normalization does not extinguish liability for prior violations, restore any authority barred by Article XII, Section 12.1, or defeat a pending Section 10.1 complaint. A new certification under this Section based on new conduct after normalization proceeds under the ordinary procedure of this Section without prejudicial weight given to the prior escalation history.

Every infrastructure-disconnection order and coercive action under this Section is subject to Sections 8.5 and 12.6. No automated system may issue the final order.

#### Section 8.5: Independent coercive-power inspectorate

**8.5.1 Establishment and independence.** An Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate (ICPI) shall audit the exercise of force and coercive governmental capacity. It shall not report to, receive instructions from, or share leadership with the EB, Constitutional Court, Peacekeeping command, or any intelligence chain. The EB shall neither appoint nor remove its members nor reduce, delay, or condition its appropriation. The ICPI shall receive not less than 0.08% and not more than 0.30% of the Covenant administrative budget; the amount within that range shall be approved by the CGA after legality review by a temporary panel of conflict-free public-finance jurists selected by lot. From promulgation until the CGA's first approval, an initial protected appropriation of 0.15% shall vest automatically and shall be released through the transparent founding trust without Founder, EB, or CC discretion. The prior appropriation, adjusted for global median inflation, continues if later approval is delayed.

**8.5.2 Hybrid composition and selection.** The Inspectorate shall contain two equal chambers of 12 members:

a) a Citizen Chamber selected by stratified global sortition for independence, affected-community experience, and lived legitimacy; and

b) a Qualified Chamber selected by constrained lot, after blind evaluation where possible, from applicants meeting public minimum thresholds in forensic investigation, constitutional or humanitarian law, human rights, intelligence oversight, detention review, or peacekeeping operations.

The Independent Sortition Secretariat established under Article XIII shall administer the draws as a ministerial function but shall not screen qualified applicants, direct the ICPI, or review its findings. Qualification screening shall be conducted by rotating, conflict-free methodologists selected by lot from public professional pools and independently audited. For the initial selection, the Secretariat shall create by Day 120: (1) a citizen pool of at least 300 adults selected by stratified lot from the founding civic registry, excluding persons selected for the CGA or another founding body; and (2) a qualified pool of at least 120 applicants meeting the published professional thresholds, evaluated blind where possible. The Bootstrap Civic Certification Panel and Bootstrap Qualified Integrity Panel under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6) shall jointly certify these pools until the CGA acts; three independent audit teams under Section 11.4(0.4) shall reproduce the draws and qualification audit. Before the Ratification Panel may certify condition 2 (ICPI full operational installation), the Constitutional Court or a conflict-free substitute bench shall independently certify that the ICPI's complaint intake, protected disclosure, field and records access, distributed-pause, and rapid-tribunal functions are operationally capable of receiving and acting on a complaint without dependence on any body the ICPI is charged with auditing. The Court's certification is a substantive precondition; the Ratification Panel may not find condition 2 satisfied without it. Members serve single non-renewable 6-year terms, with one-third of each chamber replaced every 2 years. For the initial Inspectorate, one-third of each chamber shall serve 2 years, one-third 4 years, and one-third 6 years, assigned by public lot after selection. The initial Inspectorate shall be selected by Day 150; its complaint intake, protected disclosure, field and records access, distributed-pause, and rapid-tribunal functions shall become operational immediately upon selection, and all remaining staffing and audit functions shall be operational no later than Day 180. Neither the Founder nor a provisional Covenant body may nominate, rank, appoint, or remove its members. No member may have served during the preceding 10 years in the EB, CC, Peacekeeping command, an intelligence service, or an entity under an active ICPI audit. All candidates and screeners shall disclose financial, familial, operational, and institutional conflicts. The 10-year bar is assessed at the time of selection; a member who later serves in a body under active ICPI audit recuses from the affected matters, which does not by itself remove the member. The affiliation-cluster cap in Article II, Section 2.2 applies verbatim to every ICPI Citizen Chamber and Qualified Chamber applicant pool, to the Rapid Mixed Tribunal standing pools under Section 8.5.6, and to the founding qualified pool under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6) that supplies any of the foregoing: no disclosed affiliation, institution, employer, funder lineage, or coordinated applicant cluster (defined as candidates sharing controlling organizational, financial, or familial ties) shall constitute more than one-fifth of the pool's candidates; related affiliations aggregate on the basis of the disclosures required by this subsection; the caps are administered ministerially by the ISS; no candidate is excluded solely for affiliation, but a candidate whose cluster already fills its cap shall not be drawn while the cap is reached. Pool flood-resistance shall be reported in every biennial ICPI audit under Section 8.5.10, including the affiliation distribution of the pool and of each draw, and three independent auditors selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool shall reproduce each pool formation and draw under the same procedure the Article II successor pools follow.

**8.5.3 Jurisdiction and access.** The ICPI shall receive direct complaints and protected whistleblower disclosures and shall have prompt, direct field and records access necessary to audit force, detention, surveillance, infrastructure disconnection, humanitarian corridors, and emergency coercion. Affected persons and communities have standing to submit evidence, seek a pause under subsection 8.5.5, and appear in proceedings concerning them. The ICPI may inspect facilities, interview personnel and affected persons without command supervision, preserve evidence, and compel production subject to subsection 8.5.6.

**8.5.4 Required operational record.** Every coercive operation shall have a unique public operation identifier and contemporaneous records identifying the human requester, legal authorizer, operational executor, intelligence basis, proportionality finding, civilian-harm monitoring, de-escalation criteria, and restoration plan. Intelligence collection, legal authorization, operational execution, and final review shall be institutionally and personally separated. No person or body may perform more than one of these functions in the same operation, and no requester or executor may conduct the final review. The ICPI shall publish a public after-action report promptly after operational risk ends, with only the narrow redactions permitted by subsection 8.5.7.

**8.5.5 Distributed pause authority.** The ICPI may initiate a temporary pause only for a non-imminent coercive operation. A pause requires both: (1) approval by at least 7 Citizen Chamber members upon a specific, evidence-based finding of credible rights, legitimacy, or affected-community harm; and (2) approval by at least 8 Qualified Chamber members upon a finding that the operation is non-imminent and presents a substantial question of legality, necessity, proportionality, evidentiary integrity, or restoration feasibility. A pause lasts no more than 72 hours unless upheld by the tribunal under subsection 8.5.6; the 72-hour clock is tolled during any record-withholding dispute under subsection 8.5.7 from the filing of the written showing through 24 hours after the tribunal resolves access to the disputed record. No ICPI member or chamber may pause, redirect, or tactically supervise an imminent defensive operation necessary to protect life. "Imminent" means that the threat will materialize before the rapid mixed tribunal can complete a pause review under the 72-hour clock in Section 8.5.6; the operator bears the burden of demonstrating imminence to the tribunal upon request. Imminence shall not be manufactured by avoidable delay or conclusory classification. A commander who classifies an operation as imminent defensive shall contemporaneously record the specific evidence of imminence and transmit it to the ICPI and the tribunal within 6 hours; a classification found after review to be manufactured or without reasonable basis subjects the classifier to removal and disqualification under Section 8.5.8. A recused or unavailable Citizen or Qualified Chamber member shall be replaced within 48 hours by a fresh draw from the standing pools under subsection 8.5.6, so that the thresholds in this subsection remain reachable; a pause may not fail for want of a seated member.

**8.5.6 Rapid mixed tribunal.** A dispute concerning a pause, affected-community standing, or classified access shall be decided by a temporary 7-member tribunal: 3 citizens selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool, 2 conflict-free constitutional or humanitarian jurists selected by lot, and 2 conflict-free experts in the relevant operation or intelligence discipline selected by lot. By Day 120, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall establish initial standing pools of at least 150 citizens drawn from the founding civic registry, 80 qualified jurists, and 80 qualified operational or intelligence experts screened under the public qualification process in subsection 8.5.2. The Bootstrap Civic Certification Panel and Bootstrap Qualified Integrity Panel shall jointly certify those pools. Their certifications remain lawful subject to the replacement and revalidation deadlines in Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6), and shall not lapse during a pending dispute. Three independent founding audit teams shall reproduce the pool formation. No operational pause, access dispute, or affected-community claim may fail for want of a seated CGA or certified pool. No tribunal member may belong to the ICPI or any body involved in the operation. The tribunal shall convene within 24 hours and rule within 72 hours after receiving protected access to the evidence. It may uphold, narrow, or dissolve a pause; order access under protective conditions; and require preservation of evidence. It may not redirect tactics, originate an operation, set policy, or serve as final after-action reviewer. Its reasoned decision shall be public with narrow security redactions.

An appeal on constitutional error may proceed only after the immediate dispute is resolved. Every justice who authorized, issued, reviewed, or whose ruling is enforced by the operation shall recuse. If the operation enforces a CC ruling, the CC acted institutionally concerning the operation, or recusals leave fewer than 5 justices, the appeal shall be heard by a temporary 7-member substitute bench independently drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from conflict-free candidates meeting the Article II composition and competence thresholds. No CC involved in an operation may be its final appellate reviewer. The substitute bench shall publish reasons, follow prior published decisions unless it states a reasoned departure, and dissolve after judgment.

**8.5.7 Confidentiality and anti-leakage.** Access shall be compartmented to what each review requires. A specific record may be withheld only upon a written showing that disclosure would create a concrete and severe risk to an active operation, protected source, or person; the tribunal shall review any dispute in camera. Operational details shall not be publicly released while the risk remains. Deliberate unauthorized disclosure of protected information is grounds for removal and legal liability; confidentiality may not be used to conceal illegality, civilian harm, or evidence from authorized review.

**8.5.8 Whistleblower protection and removal.** Retaliation against a complainant, witness, whistleblower, ICPI member, or staff member is a material constitutional breach. A member may be removed only for corruption, knowing fabrication, serious rights violation, deliberate protected-information disclosure, undisclosed material conflict, abuse of pause authority, or sustained non-performance. Initiation requires two-thirds of the chamber in which the member does not serve, the rapid mixed tribunal, or a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 on petition by the Constitutional Court, the Citizen Grievance Assembly by 60% supermajority, the Epistemic Council by 6 of its 9 members, or the Independent Metrics Council by 5 of its 6 members. Final removal requires two-thirds of the member's own chamber after the member is recused; if the tribunal or the substitute bench initiated, it also requires two-thirds of the other chamber. Notice, a hearing, and written findings are mandatory. No member may be removed for a good-faith investigation or finding.

**Chamber-wide capture and reconstitution.** When either chamber of the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, considered as a body, is found on clear and convincing evidence by a conflict-free Constitutional Court or by a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 to have (i) engaged in a persistent institutional pattern of the conduct that grounds individual removal under this Section, (ii) colluded or coordinated with the other chamber to defeat the two-chamber mutual accountability structure this Section establishes, or (iii) failed for 90 continuous days to exercise a duty this Article assigns to it, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall reconstitute that chamber from its standing certified pool under Section 8.5.2 without requiring the concurrence of the other chamber, the Inspectorate's leadership, or any member implicated in the finding. The petition may be filed by the Constitutional Court on its own motion, the Citizen Grievance Assembly by 60% supermajority, the Epistemic Council by 6 of its 9 members, the Independent Metrics Council by 5 of its 6 members, or any 5 members of the other chamber. Every member implicated in the finding vacates on the date of the order and is subject to the individual sanctions in the preceding paragraph. The reconstituted chamber inherits every ongoing function, record, and pending matter of the outgoing chamber under Article XII, Section 12.7, and no operational pause, audit, dispute resolution, or protected-disclosure protection lapses during the reconstitution. Members not implicated in the finding retain their seats and their remaining term. This route addresses institution-wide capture that the two-chamber removal process cannot reach and does not lower the standards, evidentiary thresholds, or procedural protections that govern removal of any individual member not implicated in the chamber-wide finding.

**8.5.9 Mandate limits.** The ICPI shall not command forces, collect intelligence for operational use, choose policy, prosecute offenses, impose punishment, or micromanage tactics. Its powers are inspection, evidence preservation, reporting, initiation of a distributed pause, and application for corrective or restorative orders. Final remedies beyond the temporary pause shall be ordered by a competent court or tribunal independent of the requester and executor.

**8.5.10 Transition, review, and reconstitution.** Suspension of the EB or activation of the Mass Transition Protocol does not suspend or transfer the ICPI. The TEC and every temporary commander are subject to this Section; defensive command remains governed by Article III, Section 3.8, with each order identifying its competent human owner. Every 6 years, a temporary review commission of 4 CGA members selected by lot, 4 conflict-free qualified inspectors or human-rights jurists selected by lot, and 3 affected-community representatives selected by lot shall review mandate performance, capture risk, confidentiality, false-pause rates, and civilian-harm correction. Every 12 years the Inspectorate shall be reconstituted: all secretariat leadership shall rotate, selection pools and procedures shall be independently revalidated, and no sitting member may continue. Reconstitution shall not interrupt active protection, destroy records, or terminate pending review. Any amendment or dissolution requires two-thirds approval of the CGA and the Constitutional Court after public review and may neither occur during an active mass transition nor eliminate independent coercive-power inspection.

### Section 8.6: Criminal jurisdiction

**8.6.1 Allocation.** Criminal jurisdiction is an allocated function of Local Cultural Councils and Regional Coordinating Assemblies within their respective levels. Each LCC and RCA shall maintain or establish courts, procedures, and trained personnel competent to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate criminal offenses within its jurisdiction, subject to this Section and Article X. Investigation, prosecution, and adjudication shall be institutionally separated; no person or body may perform more than one of these functions in the same case.

**8.6.2 Covenant minimum standards.** Every exercise of criminal jurisdiction shall comply with:

a) The rights in Article X, Section 10.1, including the right to due process, freedom from bodily harm, and freedom from discrimination.

b) Presumption of innocence until proven guilty by clear and specific evidence after a fair, timely, and public hearing before an independent and impartial tribunal.

c) The right to competent and independent legal representation at public expense where the accused cannot provide it.

d) Proportionality between the offense and the sanction.

e) The right to appeal a conviction or sentence to an independent tribunal that did not participate in the original proceeding.

**8.6.3 Prohibited punishments.** No criminal sanction under this Covenant may include capital punishment, torture or cruel treatment, corporal punishment, collective punishment, punishment of thought or belief or peaceful expression, indefinite detention without periodic review, or any sanction designed to destroy the convicted person's capacity for eventual reintegration.

**8.6.4 Cross-regional and covenant-level offenses.** Offenses that cross LCC or RCA boundaries, offenses committed by or against Covenant officers in their official capacity, offenses against planetary systems or the Covenant itself, and offenses specifically designated under the deferred clause in Section 8.6.5 shall fall under Covenant-level criminal jurisdiction.

**8.6.5 Intentional placeholder (covenant criminal court and code)**

*The specific structure of the Covenant Criminal Court, its procedural code, the enumeration of Covenant-level criminal offenses, sentencing principles, appellate procedure, and the relationship between Covenant-level and LCC/RCA criminal jurisdiction shall be enacted within 5 years of the compulsory reset, subject to 60% CGA approval and conflict-free Constitutional Court review limited to legality. A missed deadline does not suspend criminal jurisdiction; the unfinished work transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7.*

*Until the Covenant Criminal Court is operational, pre-Covenant criminal law may continue as a revocable Covenant administrative rule under Article XI, Section 11.4, subject to the minimum standards in this Section and Article X. A cross-regional or Covenant-level offense shall be heard by a temporary tribunal constituted under Article VIII, Section 8.5.6, with the two qualified-expert seats filled by conflict-free criminal-law jurists selected by lot, applying the minimum standards in this Section; the appeal route under Section 8.6.2(e) shall be heard by a second such tribunal that did not participate in the original proceeding. Interim substantive law applied to a cross-regional or Covenant-level offense shall be the law of the jurisdiction in which the conduct materially occurred; where conduct spans jurisdictions, the tribunal shall apply the least punitive of the applicable codes and publish reasons. The ICPI retains its full access and audit authority over any criminal enforcement that involves the use of force, detention, or coercion.*

### Section 8.7: Intelligence oversight

**8.7.1 Abolition and Covenant Authorization.** At ratification every pre-Covenant intelligence agency, service, directorate, and covert-action capability is abolished. An intelligence function may exist only under express Covenant authorization: a published enabling charter approved by conflict-free Constitutional Court review limited to legality, full ICPI access, a prohibition on domestic political surveillance, a sunset of no more than 7 years with mandatory independent revalidation, and an institutional separation between collection, analysis, and covert action. No charter may be renewed without independent revalidation under the Article IV, Section 4.7 challenge process.

### Section 8.8: Disarmament transition

**8.8.1 Schedule and Verification.** The dissolution, verified disarmament, and lawful transfer of weapons to Covenant custody required by Section 8.1 shall be completed within 2 years after ratification. The ICPI shall publish a phased disarmament protocol within 180 days of ratification, specifying verification milestones, weapons collection and destruction procedures, base conversion, and personnel demobilization. Every former military base and facility shall transfer to the Global Peacekeeping Corps, an RCA for civilian reuse approved by the Constitutional Court and the CGA, or ecological restoration under an independently verified covenant with nature. The Constitutional Court shall certify, within 90 days of each milestone deadline, which formations, bases, or stockpiles have not been lawfully dissolved, disarmed, or transferred. A missed protocol deadline does not extend the 2-year outer limit, and unfinished verification, custody, or demobilization transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7.

**8.8.2 Non-Compliance.** A formation that has not completed dissolution, verified disarmament, and lawful transfer to Covenant custody by the 2-year deadline loses every Covenant legal protection as provided in Section 8.1. The ICPI shall maintain and publish a verified non-compliance register quarterly. Force used against a non-compliant formation shall be per se lawful under Section 8.2 without further certification.

## ARTICLE IX: THE CURRENCY AND GLOBAL FINANCIAL STABILITY

### Section 9.1: The Welfare Standard

9.1.1 The global currency shall serve two equal purposes: to track genuine human and planetary welfare, and to maintain economic stability by expanding during contractions and moderating during expansions.

9.1.2 For the purposes of this Article, the currency's minimum value means the total real purchasing power of the money supply over the basket's goods, services, and welfare outcomes, and shall be determined by a weighted basket of planetary health metrics (the Welfare Standard), including:

- Human lifespan and health-adjusted life years
- Biodiversity and ecosystem integrity indices
- Atmospheric carbon concentration
- Ocean acidity and sea-surface temperature
- Soil health and agricultural productivity
- Literacy and educational attainment
- Equitable access to clean water and nutrition
- Wealth and asset-distribution equality index

9.1.3 The Welfare Standard establishes a floor, not a ceiling. The money supply may exceed what the Standard warrants only into a warranted gap certified by the Constitutional Court under a published finding that the expansion is consistent with the Stability Mandate and not grounded in a manipulated or suspended metric, and shall never fall below it. While a Welfare Standard metric is under a pending manipulation challenge under Section 4.7, the floor it would otherwise imply does not mandate or authorize expansion; the last unchallenged floor value governs until the challenge is resolved. No expansion beyond the floor may proceed while the operative metric set includes a suspended metric whose suspension materially alters the warranted floor.

### Section 9.2: The Dual Mandate

9.2.1 The Expert Body shall conduct monetary policy according to a Dual Mandate: a) Welfare Mandate: The money supply shall always be at least equal to the value implied by the Welfare Standard (Section 9.1), subject to the expansion gate and suspension rules in Section 9.1.3. b) Stability Mandate: The money supply shall include an automatic counter-cyclical buffer that expands when global output falls below sustainable potential and contracts when output exceeds sustainable potential or asset-price growth exceeds the global median inflation target, provided that contraction never reduces the money supply below the Welfare Standard floor in Section 9.1.

9.2.2 The counter-cyclical buffer shall be calculated as $B = \alpha \times (Y - Y) / Y$, where B is the buffer multiplier, Y*is estimated sustainable global output, estimated by the Independent Metrics Council under a published, Passported methodology; the EB supplies only the coefficient α, Y is current output, and α is a dampening coefficient not to exceed 0.75. The Independent Metrics Council shall propose α after public modeling and uncertainty analysis; adoption requires a recorded two-thirds vote of identified EB members demonstrating relevant competence, followed by conflict-free Constitutional Court review limited to legality. Before the permanent Metrics Council seats, a temporary panel of 9 conflict-free macroeconomists, monetary-system specialists, and forensic methodologists drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from independently certified pools shall propose the initial coefficient. The temporary proposal is subject to the same EB vote, legality review, Metric Passport, and Section 4.7 challenge. It remains operative until a lawful permanent proposal takes effect; if its evidentiary basis becomes invalid, monetary continuity shifts to the manual and multi-indicator hierarchy in Articles IV, Section 4.7 and XII, Section 12.7 rather than ceasing. If the estimation of Y* is suspended under Section 4.7, the buffer shall be recomputed from the least-favorable defensible estimate published with the suspension order until a revalidated estimate is operative.

9.2.3 During a recession defined as two or more consecutive quarters of global output below Y*, the buffer shall be positive, may be increased by up to 0.15 per quarter until output returns to Y*, and shall not decline. During an expansion, the buffer shall be reduced proportionally to prevent overheating, but shall not decline by more than 0.15 in any single quarter.

9.2.4 No discretionary printing shall occur outside the Dual Mandate. The EB shall publish its buffer calculations quarterly with full methodological transparency.

9.2.5 The formula and any automated system may calculate or recommend a monetary action but may not issue or contract currency. Each action requires a recorded decision by identified EB members demonstrating relevant competence, accepting legal responsibility under Article XII, Section 12.6, and confirming that the operative metrics have not been suspended under Section 4.7.

9.2.6 **Exclusive Issuance and No Private Money Creation.** Currency, deposits used as money, and settlement money may be issued or contracted only through the recorded EB authority required by Section 9.2.5 and Article XII, Section 12.6, subject to Article IV, Section 4.7. No private, cooperative, regional, local, banking, financial, digital-asset, or other entity may create money through fractional-reserve lending, deposit creation, token issuance, book entry, or an economically equivalent device. Lending may transfer only funds already issued under recorded EB authority; it may not create a new deposit, settlement balance, or money claim. A contract or accounting form cannot convert unauthorized issuance into lawful credit. Existing deposits and claims at ratification shall transition under a published plan no later than 2 years after ratification; ordinary commercial trade credit and receivables between operating enterprises are not money creation. The first construction of 'economically equivalent device' shall be given by the Constitutional Court with published reasons.

### Section 9.3: Metric review and governance

9.3.1 The Welfare Standard metric basket shall be reviewed every 10 years. At each review, a global open-source competition shall be held for proposed revisions. Submissions shall be ranked by four objective criteria: a) Verifiability: the metric must be independently auditable from at least two distinct data sources. b) Welfare correlation: the metric must have a demonstrated statistical relationship with genuine improvements in human or ecosystem well-being. c) Trend-responsiveness: the metric must respond meaningfully to policy changes within 5 years, not be dominated by noise. d) Manipulation-resistance: the metric must be costly to game or falsify, with a documented vulnerability assessment.

9.3.2 The top 10 ranked proposals, as determined by an Independent Metrics Council, shall be published for a 180-day global public comment period. After the comment period, the Metrics Council shall adopt a final basket by 2/3 majority.

9.3.3 The Independent Metrics Council shall consist of 6 members, one selected from each of the six Covenant statistical regions established through the plural boundary process in Article I, Section 1.0.1. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall administer eligible-pool formation for each region under the pattern applicable to the Epistemic Council pool under Article XIII, Section 13.3 and to the Boundary Delineation Commission pool under Article I, Section 1.0.1: open application through the Grievance Portal under Article V, Section 5.1 and equivalent offline channels; binary competence-threshold review by rotating, conflict-free assessors drawn by lot from independently audited public, academic, community-accounting, indigenous, ecological, and other competent statistical institutions; publication of the qualification standard, the applicant list under privacy-preserving identifiers, and every qualification determination; and independent reproduction of the pool formation by three auditors drawn by the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network under Article XII, Section 12.7(b.1). No assessor may rank candidates who meet the published threshold; no region may reduce, condition, or bypass the ISS-administered pool-formation procedure. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall then draw the member by constrained lot from the certified pool, and the Constitutional Court may review only legality and published qualifications. Members serve single non-renewable 12-year terms, with one seat replaced every 2 years. For the initial Council, terms of 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 years shall be assigned by public lot. A vacancy is filled from the same regional pool for the remainder of the term; if that pool is exhausted, a cross-regional alternate meeting the same competence and conflict standards serves until the pool is restored. No member may hold a material interest in an entity whose metrics fall under the Welfare Standard basket.

9.3.4 **Emergency Metric Review.** Evidence that a Welfare Standard metric has been systematically manipulated, scientifically invalidated, rendered non-invariant, or detached from its construct shall be submitted through Article IV, Section 4.7. Neither the Constitutional Court nor the Independent Metrics Council may bypass that hybrid process, suspend or restore a metric unilaterally, or install an unreviewed replacement. A next-ranked alternative from the most recent competition is only a candidate replacement: before use it must receive a current Metric Passport, independent reproduction, conflict-free technical validation, review of distributional and rights effects, and approval by the temporary Metric Integrity Review Jury or successor correction panel. Emergency review shall conclude within 180 days subject to Section 4.7's suspension and limited-renewal rules.

9.3.5 Every Welfare Standard metric and monetary-policy estimate is subject to Article IV, Section 4.7. The Independent Metrics Council may design and maintain metrics but may not adjudicate a challenge to its own work. The independent Metric Integrity Review controls suspension, replacement validation, downstream correction, rollback, and reparation. Constitutional Court conflicts are governed by Section 4.7(i). No Welfare Standard output may override Article X or Rule Zero.

### Section 9.4: Safeguards

9.4.1 An independent audit team drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from a standing, CGA-certified pool shall conduct a full annual audit of all monetary operations (Welfare Standard calculations and buffer determinations). No team member may have designed, executed, or benefited materially from an operation under review. The audit shall be published in full. The Constitutional Court may adjudicate a legality dispute but may not appoint the auditor or alter a finding.

### Section 9.5: Capture-Resistant Transition from the old financial order

9.5.1 **Hard Deadline for Sovereign Debt Phase-Out.** Sovereign debt is abolished. All sovereign debt instruments existing at the time of the Covenant's ratification (including but not limited to government bonds, treasury bills, sovereign credit default swaps, and any derivative whose value depends on sovereign credit) shall be extinguished within 2 years after Covenant ratification. After this deadline: a) No entity may issue, trade, hold, or structure any instrument whose value depends on the repayment obligation of any government or government-guaranteed entity. b) All existing sovereign obligations that have not been reconciled within the deadline shall be automatically reconciled at the default values of the locked conversion formula published under subsection (c) and are then extinguished on the same terms as reconciled obligations; non-reconciliation is not a release, extinguishment, or reduction of any obligation and confers no advantage over timely reconciliation. c) The transition schedule and conversion formula shall be encoded in a locked schedule appended to this Article, published in full before the first EB sits, and amendable only under the rules and 10-year absolute lock in Section 9.5.4(d). d) The 2-year extinguishment deadline is absolute. Section 9.5.1(c), Section 9.5.4(d), an emergency, institutional vote, continuity clause, reconciliation, appeal, or administrative necessity may not extend it. Only the formal constitutional amendment process may alter the deadline. Schedule amendment may govern reconciliation within the fixed period but may not postpone extinction or revive an extinguished obligation. Extinguishment shall not deny any Article X, Section 10.1(6) sustenance or essential medical care to a beneficiary who depended on the extinguished instrument for that care; the transition framework under Section 9.5.4 shall include a rights-preservation schedule that converts such obligations, before extinguishment, into equivalent Covenant-administered protections continuous with the beneficiary's protected access. Failure to include such a schedule is a material Sprint defect subject to Article IV, Section 4.7 challenge and does not extend this deadline; any short-term liquidity bridge necessary to preserve the protected access shall be funded from the Covenant administrative budget under Section 9.6.1.

9.5.2 **Prohibition on Monetary Authority Independence.** No Global Reserve Authority, central bank, monetary agency, private institution, public institution, LCC, RCA, legacy body, or other entity shall possess monetary authority independent of the Expert Body. All monetary policy decisions and all issuance or contraction of currency shall be the direct and recorded decisions of the EB, published with full methodological transparency. An unauthorized monetary act is void. Any official who exercises monetary discretion or authorizes money creation not explicitly authorized by the EB shall be subject to immediate removal and permanent disqualification.

9.5.3 **Conflict-Based Personnel Integrity.** Prior experience in private, public, cooperative, community, central-bank, treasury, multilateral, academic, or market institutions is not disqualifying by origin, nationality, or civilizational association. The required competence shall be drawn from academic, post-transition advisory, multilateral research, community-accounting, non-market monetary tradition, or independent forensic practice, not from the institutions barred below, whose senior personnel are categorically conflicted during the transition. A person exercising monetary or transition authority shall be barred while that person: a) holds a material financial interest, compensation right, fiduciary duty, confidential mandate, or promised position in an entity that could materially gain or lose from the decision; b) served during the preceding 5 years in a senior decision-making role for any private bank, state-owned bank, sovereign wealth fund, finance ministry, central bank, debt adviser, asset manager, creditor committee, multilateral lender, cryptocurrency issuer, pension fund, insurer, payment network operator, credit rating agency, securities exchange, clearinghouse, or equivalent entity with a material interest in the transition; or c) received material undisclosed funding or direction from any interested government, company, foundation, trust, family office, political network, or other organized interest. These rules apply equally across every country, ownership form, and institution. Public disclosure, recusal, divestment, and independent conflict audit are mandatory. A knowing material violation results in removal and proportionate disqualification after due process; no employer's name alone establishes guilt or innocence.

9.5.4 **Pre-Committed Transition Framework.** The complete transition framework (including the Welfare Standard valuation model, the asset registration system, the capital flow rules, and the sovereign debt conversion formula) shall be fully designed before the first provisional EB member is seated. The transition framework shall be drafted during the independent founding selection period (Article XI, Section 11.4) through a mandatory Transition Design Sprint: a) Duration: 90 days from the seating of the Founding Selection Authority, ending no later than Day 135 after promulgation. b) Participants: A mixed drafting body selected through open application, blind threshold evaluation where possible, and constrained sortition shall include experienced financial and public-monetary practitioners free of current conflicts, independent economists and accountants, affected debtor and creditor communities, productive-economy operators, and non-market or community-accounting traditions. No interest group may hold more than one quarter of seats. Every model, assumption, dissent, and conflict shall be public and independently verified. Affected debtor and creditor participants shall act as witnesses and reviewers of the operative terms and may not draft the reconciliation or conversion terms in which they hold an interest. No Sprint participant may trade or transfer any instrument affected by the transition from the Sprint's opening until 6 months after its conclusion. c) All design work shall be published in real-time with open-source global comment. d) The final framework shall be encoded as a locked schedule to this Article. During the first 10 years it may be amended only by a 90% EB supermajority with unanimous, conflict-free Constitutional Court concurrence. No amendment may bypass Article IV, Section 4.7 or Article X. After the first 10 years no route under this Section, Section 9.5.1(c), or any other bespoke or streamlined route may amend, replace, or reinterpret the schedule; Section 9.5.1(c) does not survive this lock. Subject to Rule Zero and Section 12.1, the schedule remains amendable only through a Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4. e) Ownership and Renewal. The Welfare Standard valuation model and basket weights produced by the Sprint shall be owned, maintained, and published by the Independent Metrics Council upon its seating, with full records and methodology transferred at the Sprint's conclusion. Before taking effect, the initial valuation model shall receive a conflict-free Constitutional Court certification limited to legality and freedom from manipulation; the model may not operate without this certification. The Council shall renew the valuation model at each 10-year basket review under Section 9.3.1, applying the same open-source competition, public comment, and adoption process; the existing model remains operative during renewal. A renewed model takes effect only upon a new Court certification under the same standard.

9.5.5 **Plural Transition Debt Council.** Any temporary body established to reconcile existing sovereign obligations during the 2-year transition period shall be: a) selected by constrained lot from independently screened accountants, auditors, economists, public-finance practitioners, debt-operation specialists, affected-community representatives, and productive-economy operators meeting Section 9.5.3; b) structured so that no creditor, debtor government, financial sector, region, profession, or political bloc controls either deliberation or a decision threshold; c) required to publish its reconciliation methodology in advance. A material departure triggers independent review and correction of the affected reconciliation rather than automatic destruction of otherwise lawful work; and d) stripped of discretionary reconciliation authority at the 2-year deadline. Unresolved records, payments, claims, and appeals transfer automatically to a pre-certified ministerial successor office with no power to create debt, alter the locked formula, or reopen a final reconciliation. The deadline ends policy discretion, not administration or remedy.

9.5.6 **No Automatic Financial Carryover.** No pre-Covenant financial instrument, institution, charter, license, privilege, authority, or personnel appointment carries over automatically at ratification. Continued administrative use requires express Covenant authorization and conflict clearance under Section 9.5.3, remains revocable and reviewable, and creates no inherited monetary, debt, property, licensing, employment, or institutional right. Nothing in this Section permits private or fractional-reserve money creation, extends the 2-year deadline, or validates an instrument void under Section 9.5.1.

### Section 9.6: Covenant revenue and administrative budget

9.6.1 The Covenant administrative budget shall be the sole lawful source of the appropriations this Covenant assigns to that budget, including the CGA secretariat (Article V, Section 5.2(j)), public education (Article VII, Section 7.8), the Global Peacekeeping Corps (Article VIII, Section 8.1(g)), the ICPI (Article VIII, Section 8.5.1), the Independent Sortition Secretariat and Expert Reserve administration (Article XIII, Section 13.3(k)), and the Epistemic Council (Article XIII, Section 13.9(c)). It shall be funded only from: (a) a planetary transaction levy on settlement and clearing activity denominated in the Covenant currency, set at not more than 0.01% per transaction and adjusted only under the recorded process in Section 9.2.5; (b) a commons stewardship fee on the commercial use of planetary commons and critical natural resources, proposed by the Independent Metrics Council and adopted by 60% of the EB and 60% of the CGA; and (c) voluntary transfers already placed under the irrevocably transparent founding trust terms in Article XI, Section 11.4. No other revenue source is authorized.

9.6.2 The EB may not fund the administrative budget by monetary issuance beyond the Dual Mandate in Section 9.2, and the budget may not be financed by debt, by external money claims, or by any levy structured to create private seigniorage or to burden basic necessities disproportionately. A levy or fee may not be imposed or altered without a current Metric Passport and remains subject to Article IV, Section 4.7. The budget and its sources shall be published annually and audited under Section 9.4.1.

9.6.3 Until the first levy and fee become operational, the administrative budget shall be funded from the transparent founding trust at the levels of the published provisional cost models under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.6) and (0.7). The trustee shall transfer funds on a published, fixed schedule matching the phased cost models; no transfer may be accelerated, delayed, sequenced, or conditioned on any body's composition, decision, or progress. A departure from the published schedule is a material breach of trust and is void; funds shall be drawn by automatic pre-authorized transfer from an independently administered escrow where the trust terms permit direct Covenant control. A shortfall shall be published with its cause and remedy, and no shortfall, funding dispute, or delay may suspend, condition, or direct the mandate, findings, or independence of any Covenant body. No body may condition another body's appropriation on a selection outcome, finding, or policy decision. The Founder, trustee, or any donor may not recall, reclaim, or divert a scheduled transfer.

## ARTICLE X: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

### Section 10.1: Definition of rights

The following protections are **inviolable**. They bind the Covenant whether understood as inherent rights, sacred obligations, reciprocal duties, ancestral law, communal responsibilities, natural law, or another tradition. Their non-derogable core may never be abridged, suspended, or infringed. Only the limited incidents expressly identified in Section 10.3 may be temporarily restricted, and no such limitation may destroy the essence of a protection.

**The Inviolable Rights:**

1. **Freedom from Bodily Harm:** No person shall be subjected to torture, extrajudicial killing, enforced disappearance, or arbitrary detention.
2. **Freedom from Enslavement:** No person shall be held in slavery, servitude, or forced labor.
3. **Freedom of Thought and Expression:** No person shall be punished for their beliefs, opinions, or peaceful speech. Dissent is not a crime.
4. **Freedom from Discrimination:** No person shall be denied rights or opportunities based on ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, or any other innate characteristic.
5. **Right to Due Process:** No person shall be deprived of liberty or a claimed or recognized stewardship interest without a fair, timely, and public hearing that determines whether the stewardship claim or interest is lawful. Inherited or absolute-title labeling creates no presumption of lawfulness. Reclassification of absolute title as stewardship does not erase the hearing right or any remedy for a stewardship interest adjudicated lawful.
6. **Right to Basic Sustenance:** No person shall be deliberately starved, denied clean water, or refused essential medical care.
7. **Right to Personal Relocation:** Any person may peacefully relocate between Covenant administrative areas. Only published, non-discriminatory Covenant administration necessary to establish identity, residence, or a limitation expressly permitted by Section 10.3 may condition movement. No inherited border, claim of sovereignty, local preference, wealth test, property claim, or cultural difference creates a right to exclude.
8. **Right to Privacy:** No person shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful surveillance of their communications, movements, associations, or data, whether by any Covenant body, any actor operating under Covenant authorization or with material Covenant support, or any private actor. The Expert Body, Local Cultural Councils, and Regional Coordinating Assemblies within their respective jurisdictions shall adopt and enforce protections against private surveillance that meet or exceed this right; failure to do so is enforceable through the mechanisms of this Article. Lawful investigation, protection of life, and proceedings under this Covenant may require narrowly tailored surveillance that is individualized, evidence-based, proportionate, subject to independent authorization, and subject to ICPI audit; a determination by any body

that coercive capacity is not involved is itself subject to ICPI review. No content-of-thought inference derived from surveillance may be used against the person.

9. **Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association:** Any person may peacefully assemble with others and form, join, or leave associations, cooperatives, religious communities, cultural bodies, mutual-aid groups, unions, or political-formation groups within one Covenant government. No condition may be imposed on assembly or association except as strictly necessary under Section 10.3, and no such condition may impose ideological conformity, compel loyalty, or convert peaceful assembly or association into evidence of unfitness for a Covenant office or benefit.

10. **Rights of the Child:** Every person under the age of majority, defined as 18 years or the age of majority under an applicable Covenant administrative rule, whichever is lower, is entitled to protection from violence and exploitation; to equal access to the minimum educational standards under Article VII; to family unity except where a competent human authority finds, after due process and applying the best-interests standard, that separation is necessary to protect the child from harm; and to have their views heard, and given weight appropriate to their age and maturity, in every proceeding materially affecting them. No decision affecting a child's rights, welfare, education, custody, or protection may be made by an automated system in place of the competent human decision owner under Article XII, Section 12.6.

11. **Right to Language Access:** Any person subject to a Covenant proceeding, hearing, notice, or protected access under this Article shall receive, at no cost to that person, notice and material communications in a language the person understands, and shall have the assistance of a qualified interpreter during any hearing where the person's rights or obligations are at stake. Written and audio material shall be available in at minimum the six Covenant working languages: Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), English, French, Russian, and Spanish. Additional accommodation shall be provided for other languages spoken by materially affected persons or communities, proportional to the affected population's size and geographic distribution.

12. **Right to Disaster Shelter, Family Unity, and Return:** During an evacuation, disaster, mass displacement, or public-health emergency, every affected person is entitled to temporary shelter meeting basic dignity and safety, to remain with immediate family members throughout evacuation and shelter placement except where an individualized best-interests finding under paragraph 10 for a child, or an individualized emergency necessity finding under Section 10.3 for any person, requires separation, to the least-restrictive means of relocation, giving weight to cultural, linguistic, community, and economic continuity, and to a lawful path of return or to resettlement with reparation where safe, dignified return is not feasible within a reasonable time. No displaced person shall be denied protected access to Covenant rights, grievance procedures, or humanitarian services by reason of displacement.

**The Non-Derogable Core:** No emergency, metric, order, or claimed necessity may legalize torture, extrajudicial killing, slavery or servitude, enforced disappearance, deliberate denial of the minimum food, clean water, shelter, or essential medical care necessary for survival, punishment or coercion of a person's thought or belief, or the exploitation of persons under the age of majority. These prohibitions bind every Covenant and non-Covenant actor exercising authority under this Covenant without exception.

### Section 10.2: Enforceability and game-theoretic safeguards

These rights are **self-enforcing** through the following structural mechanisms:

**10.2.1: Constitutional court jurisdiction** The Constitutional Court has **original and exclusive jurisdiction** over any complaint alleging a violation of Section 10.1 rights. Any person, group, or governing body may file a complaint directly with the Court, bypassing all other grievance channels. Complaints shall be received by an independent intake clerk drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from the forensic-methodology pool used for Article IV, Section 4.7(c); the clerk shall open a complaint upon a showing of standing and specific prima facie evidence, may summarily deny repetitive complaints with published reasons, and may not reject a complaint on the merits. The Court or substitute bench shall finally decide an opened complaint within 180 days of intake; a complaint alleging imminent irreparable harm shall be expedited and decided within 72 hours. If the Court's docket is overloaded, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw additional substitute benches from the Article II successor pools so that no complaint is delayed or denied for want of capacity.

If a complaint concerns an act or omission of the Court, a justice, or a body whose challenged action the Court authorized, directed, or materially reviewed, every involved justice shall recuse. If the Court acted institutionally or fewer than 5 conflict-free justices remain, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary 7-member substitute bench from the independently maintained Article II successor pools, matching the composition in Section 2.1. No substitute may have participated in or benefited from the challenged act. When constituted under this Section, the substitute bench exercises the Court's jurisdiction for the matter that triggered its constitution, shall publish reasons, shall follow the Court's prior published decisions unless it states a reasoned departure, and dissolves after judgment and enforcement. "Exclusive jurisdiction" includes this conflict substitute and never requires a body to adjudicate its own alleged rights violation.

**10.2.2: Automatic reallocation trigger** A verified violation of Section 10.1 rights shall **automatically constitute grounds** for the EB to invoke the Temporary Reallocation Protocol (Article I, Section 1.4) for the function exercised by the offending Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly. No 2/3 EB supermajority is required *if* the Constitutional Court certifies by at least 5 of its 7 justices (or 5 members of a substitute bench under Section 10.2.1 when the Court is conflicted) that:

- A violation has occurred, AND
- The offending body has failed to cease the violation within 72 hours of a notification that stated the violation and gave the offending body a reasonable opportunity to respond in good faith. The 72-hour period does not run while a good-faith compliance dispute is pending before the Court.

A Court certification of persistent material non-compliance with the Cultural Autonomy Charter process under Article VIII, Section 8.4, when combined with a verified 10.1 rights violation against the same bloc, satisfies the 72-hour notice element of the preceding paragraph and permits the EB to invoke reallocation without the two-thirds supermajority under the same narrow-tailoring and temporary-duration requirements.

In such a case, the EB **shall** intervene, and the 2/3 supermajority requirement is suspended; the implementing EB vote is by simple majority of the seated members not lawfully recused, taken within 72 hours of the Court's certification. If the EB fails to reach that simple majority within 72 hours, ties the implementing vote, or fails to schedule the vote within that window, the Independent

Sortition Secretariat shall immediately draw a conflict-free 7-member substitute panel under Article X, Section 10.2.1 empowered to authorize the narrowly tailored reallocation directly on the Court's certified record within a further 72 hours; the substitute panel decides by simple majority of its seven members, applies the same narrow-tailoring and temporary-duration standard the EB would apply, and its authorization has the same legal effect as an EB authorization under this Section. Neither the substitute panel nor any EB vote taken after the 72-hour window may narrow the Court's underlying rights finding. The temporary reallocation is still subject to the narrow tailoring and temporary duration requirements of Article I, Section 1.4. The Court's certification under this Section satisfies and is the same legal act as the Compelling Interest ruling required by Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b); it is subject to the substitute-bench mechanism in that provision, which runs from the Court's receipt of the notification described in the certification conditions above. An authorization denied on the merits by the Court or by a substitute bench under Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b) bars re-invocation under this Section on substantially the same facts unless new, material facts are certified by the Court or a substitute bench by at least 5 of its 7 members. Failure of the Court to rule within 72 hours triggers the substitute-bench procedure, is not a denial on the merits, and does not lapse the authorization. Pending certification of new material facts required for re-invocation after a merits denial, the function remains with the original holder.

**Alternative certification (Inspectorate and Assembly route).** Where the substitute-bench cascade under Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b) has terminated without a merits ruling by the Constitutional Court or by any substitute bench drawn in that cascade, in accordance with the three-successive-bench terminal condition stated in that Section, the EB may invoke the Temporary Reallocation Protocol upon: (a) an ICPI certification of a verified Section 10.1 violation approved by at least 7 Citizen Chamber members and at least 8 Qualified Chamber members on clear and convincing evidence, identifying the specific right, the specific violation, the responsible LCC or RCA, and the least rights-restrictive effective remedy; and (b) 60% approval by the CGA that the proposed reallocation is that remedy. The alternative route is subject to every narrow-tailoring, temporary-duration, periodic-certification, and 180-day maximum requirement in Article I, Section 1.4 and in this Section. If at any renewal point the Constitutional Court and every substitute bench drawn under Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b) remain unable to certify continuing violation because the substitute-bench cascade has again terminated without a merits ruling, the EB may renew the alternative-route reallocation for an additional 180-day period upon renewed ICPI certification at the same 7 Citizen Chamber and 8 Qualified Chamber thresholds finding continuing violation on clear and convincing evidence, and renewed 60% CGA approval that the reallocation remains the least rights-restrictive effective remedy. Renewal under this paragraph is subject to the same automatic Section 10.2.1 legality review, the 360-day rotation and 720-day two-of-three escalation and 1080-day absolute cap in this Section, and the automatic-return-on-neutralization rules. A reallocation authorized under the alternative route shall receive automatic conflict-free legality review by a substitute bench drawn under Section 10.2.1 within 30 days of authorization; the bench may narrow the reallocation to preserve narrow tailoring, order preservation of evidence, vacate the reallocation for demonstrated procedural or evidentiary defect in the ICPI or CGA certifications, or, where the ICPI's rights finding rests on a right whose application requires interpretive judgment under paragraphs 8, 9, 11, or 12 of Section 10.1, review that rights finding on the merits and vacate or narrow the reallocation accordingly. The bench may not stay the reallocation while both certifications remain in effect, may not overturn a rights finding resting on the non-derogable core of Section 10.1 or on paragraphs 1 through 7 or paragraph 10 of Section 10.1 except on demonstrated procedural or evidentiary defect, and may not set substantive policy. The ICPI certification under this route is a finding for reallocation-triggering purposes only and does not resolve any complaint under Section 10.2.1; the Court's exclusive jurisdiction over Section

10.1 complaints under Section 10.2.1 is preserved. No certification under this route may authorize a reallocation whose implementation would breach Article XI, Section 11.1, Article XII, Section 12.1, or the non-derogable core of Section 10.3(b). A merits denial by the Constitutional Court or by a substitute bench under Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b) that issues after the alternative route has activated does not void the ICPI and CGA authorization but shall be transmitted to and considered by the Section 10.2.1 legality-review bench under this Section; the review bench may narrow or vacate the reallocation on the merits-denial record only for demonstrated procedural or evidentiary defect in the ICPI or CGA certifications.

A reallocation under this Section may not exceed 180 days. Before expiry, the EB may renew the reallocation for an additional 180-day period only by a 2/3 supermajority vote with a new Constitutional Court certification under the same 5-of-7 standard confirming that the violation continues and the reallocation remains narrowly tailored. After 360 continuous days of reallocation, further renewal requires, in addition to the EB 2/3 vote and CC 5-of-7 certification, a fresh certification of continuing violation by at least one of: the ICPI under its dual-key of at least 7 Citizen Chamber members and 8 Qualified Chamber members; the Epistemic Council by 6 of its 9 members; or the CGA by 60%. No independent body may issue the fresh certification for two consecutive 180-day renewals under this Section; each body may serve as the sole fresh certifier no more than once before every other named body has served. After 720 continuous days of reallocation, renewal requires concurrent fresh certification by at least two of the three named bodies at the same thresholds, together with the EB 2/3 vote and CC 5-of-7 certification. Each renewal after the 360-day mark is limited to an additional 180 days. The Constitutional Court's 5-of-7 certification at every renewal beyond 360 days shall include an explicit finding, on published evidence, that narrow tailoring remains satisfied, that less-restrictive alternatives have been tried and specifically failed, and that a return path with named milestones exists for the following 180 days; a failure of the return path to progress against the prior renewal's milestones is a specific fact defeating renewal on substantially the same evidence.

**Absolute cap and transfer.** No reallocation under this Section may exceed 1080 continuous days from the initial authorization, regardless of renewal history. Upon expiry of the 1080th day, the EB's reallocation authority under this Section terminates. If a verified Section 10.1 violation continues to be certified by the Constitutional Court under the 5-of-7 standard, the reallocated function does not return to the original Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly but transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7(b) to a freshly drawn conflict-free continuity panel of 7 citizens and 6 qualified members constituted by the Independent Sortition Secretariat from the standing pools under Article IV, Section 4.7(d), which operates the function subject to ICPI oversight, ordinary Section 10.2.1 review, and every substantive Covenant standard that governed the function in the hands of the original holder. The function returns to the LCC or RCA upon neutralization or correction certified under this Section. The EB may not re-invoke reallocation under this Section on substantially the same facts against the same LCC or RCA for 5 years after the transfer, and no member of the EB, Expert Reserve, or Constitutional Court that authorized any prior renewal in the same cascade may serve on the continuity panel. This cap does not restrict any independent Article VIII criminal referral, any Article X individual reparation, any Section 10.2.4 disqualification, or the LCC's or RCA's own liability for a continuing violation. No mechanical extension, automatic rollover, or transfer of the reallocation to another authority in lieu of these renewal requirements is permitted. The reallocated function shall return automatically to the original holder at the earlier of neutralization, correction, or expiry of the maximum intervention period; the Court shall certify neutralization or correction within 30 days of application by the original holder or the ICPI, and the reallocation expires automatically if the Court does not so certify. The Court's certification under this paragraph is independent of and additional to the certification under Article I, Section 1.4(2)(b); a failure to certify neutralization does not extend the 180-day maximum.

**10.2.3: Individual reparation** Any person whose rights under Section 10.1 have been violated shall be entitled to:

- Full restoration of liberty or of a stewardship interest adjudicated lawful. While lawfulness is pending, the interest and relevant property, records, access, and control shall receive interim preservation sufficient to prevent the hearing or remedy from being defeated, without limiting return, replacement, compensation, reparation, or correction otherwise required by this Covenant
- Public acknowledgment of the violation by the offending body
- Compensation determined by the Constitutional Court, drawn from the offending body's budget allocation

**10.2.4: Disqualification of violators** The persons listed below shall be immediately removed from delegated authority and permanently disqualified from every future Covenant governance, oversight, command, adjudicative, inspection, contracting, or delegated-authority role, upon a finding after notice, a fair hearing, and conflict-free adjudication that they knowingly participated in or enabled a violation of Section 10.1 rights. For purposes of this Section, "enabled" means the person had actual authority to prevent or stop the specific violation and, knowing of the violation, failed to take reasonable and available steps to do so; mere institutional proximity, supervisory status without contemporaneous operational awareness, association with a violator, or post-violation knowledge is insufficient. A disqualification finding under this Section is appealable de novo to a freshly drawn 7-member substitute bench under Section 10.2.1, which shall publish reasons and whose decision is final: every Covenant officer or employee; EB, Expert Reserve, Constitutional Court, Epistemic Council, CGA, ICPI, Metric Integrity, temporary tribunal, jury, or review-panel member; peacekeeper or commander; founding custodian, authority member, auditor, secretariat worker, or other founding functionary; contractor exercising delegated public authority; and LCC or RCA official. Ordinary civil or criminal liability and the victim's right to reparation remain unaffected. No office, temporary status, contract, command relationship, or institutional affiliation creates immunity.

### Section 10.3: Narrow emergency limitations

a) **Permitted Subject Matter.** During a verified, immediate, existential threat to an administrative area's population, a competent human authority may impose only: (1) a temporary limitation on movement or personal relocation necessary to prevent immediate transmission, exposure, or entry into an active danger zone; (2) a temporary adjustment to hearing timing where ordinary timing is physically impossible, without eliminating access to counsel, notice, impartial adjudication, or habeas review; or (3) a temporary delay in public operational disclosure where disclosure would create a concrete and immediate threat to life. No other incident of a Section 10.1 right may be limited under this Section.

b) **Absolute Core.** No emergency may authorize torture, extrajudicial killing, slavery or servitude, enforced disappearance, deliberate denial of minimum sustenance or essential medical care, punishment or coercion of thought or belief, collective punishment, or discriminatory targeting. Emergency conditions do not convert arbitrary detention into lawful detention or permit secret detention without prompt registration and review.

c) **Necessity and Means.** Every limitation shall identify the named competent human decision owner, specific evidence, persons or narrowly defined class affected, causal connection to the threat, less restrictive alternatives considered, and objective termination condition. It must be individualized wherever an individual determination is possible, use the least restrictive effective means, preserve the practical essence of the right, and comply with Article XII, Section 12.6.

d) **Duration and Renewal.** A limitation takes effect for no more than 30 days and expires automatically sooner when necessity ends. It may not be renewed on substantially the same facts. A proposed renewal requires new, specific evidence of continuing existential necessity and conflict-free approval before the prior order expires; administrative continuity, generalized risk, or failure to build a lawful alternative is insufficient.

e) **Conflict-Free Review.** Every limitation shall receive substantive review within 72 hours. Any Constitutional Court justice who declared, advised on, authorized, operationally reviewed, or materially relied upon the emergency measure shall recuse. If the Court acted institutionally or fewer than 5 conflict-free justices remain, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw temporary substitute justices from independently audited pools meeting Article II composition and competence thresholds. The reviewer may void, narrow, or order immediate corrective protection and shall publish reasons subject only to the operational-disclosure limitation in subsection (a).

f) **ICPI Access and Remedy.** The ICPI retains direct field, records, detention, surveillance, and classified access throughout the emergency and may use the distributed pause procedure for non-imminent coercive measures. Every limitation requires contemporaneous logs, notice as soon as safely possible, restoration of the ordinary right immediately upon expiry, review of downstream harm, and reparation where the limitation was unlawful, excessive, or based on invalid evidence. No emergency may suspend ICPI access, human responsibility, judicial review, evidence preservation, restoration, or reparation.

Any measure exceeding this Section is void from inception, and responsible officials are subject to Section 10.2.4 after due process.

#### Section 10.4: Legitimate qualifications

Notwithstanding Section 10.1(4), kinship restrictions necessary to prevent dynastic capture of Covenant bodies, as defined in Article XII, Section 12.5, shall not constitute discrimination.

#### Section 10.5: Rights cannot be Metricized away

The rights in Section 10.1 are minimum guarantees owed to each person, not aggregate targets. No favorable average, Pledge result, Welfare Standard output, risk score, model, formula, or audit finding may offset or legalize their violation. Any automated recommendation affecting a right is governed by Article XII, Section 12.6; any materially relied-upon metric is governed by Article IV, Section 4.7. Emergency acceleration under Section 10.3 does not remove named human responsibility, meaningful review, retrospective audit, correction, or reparation.

### Section 10.6: Person, citizen, and access to remedies

a) "**Person**" in this Article means every human being subject to Covenant authority, or materially affected by a specific Covenant act or omission, regardless of citizenship, residence status, prior nationality, statelessness, or immigration status. Every right in this Article is guaranteed to every person.

b) "**Citizen**" under this Covenant means any person whose principal residence, established by continuous residence for at least 90 days or since birth for persons under 90 days of age, is within Covenant territory, or any person who holds recognized refugee or stateless-person status under Covenant law. Where a Covenant provision expressly conditions a right or role on citizenship, the definition in this subsection controls. Citizenship confers eligibility for participation in Citizen Grievance Assembly sortition, referendum voting under Article IV, Section 4.6, and any other role a Covenant provision reserves to citizens; it never restricts the rights guaranteed by this Article.

c) No person may be denied access to a Covenant grievance procedure, Grievance Portal submission, Constitutional Court complaint under Section 10.2.1, ICPI complaint under Article VIII, Section 8.5.3, Metric Integrity challenge under Article IV, Section 4.7, Mission Fidelity Petition under Article V, Section 5.4, or humanitarian service on the ground that the person lacks citizenship, documentation, digital access, literacy, or a fixed residence. Reasonable non-discriminatory administrative identification may be required only where necessary to prevent fraud and to distinguish distinct participants for a threshold count, and shall be provided at no cost. Personal identification records collected solely for fraud prevention under this subsection shall be minimized, protected, and destroyed after final use; institutional records of verified participation are preserved under Article XII, Section 12.7.

## ARTICLE XI: RULE ZERO AND CONSTITUTIONAL GENESIS

### Section 11.1: Definition of Rule Zero

**Rule Zero** is the foundational, unamendable core of this Covenant. It consists of the following three principles, which may never be altered, suspended, or repealed:

1. **The Principle of Human Dignity:** All human beings possess inherent worth and inviolable rights, as defined in Article X, Section 10.1.
2. **The Principle of Planetary Stewardship:** The Earth's biosphere, climate systems, and biodiversity shall be preserved for future generations. No policy may knowingly cause irreversible planetary harm.
3. **The Principle of Epistemic Humility and Non-Restoration:** No governing body, expert, or institution is infallible. All systems of governance must include built-in mechanisms for their own amendment, review, and peaceful dissolution. No amendment, review, replacement, or dissolution may restore the nation-state order, inherited territorial sovereignty, non-Covenant armed force, outside monetary authority, private money creation, inherited office, or absolute property title.

These three principles are **non-negotiable**. They exist above all other provisions of this Covenant. No amendment, override, or constitutional convention may violate them.

### Section 11.2: The Noah's Ark exception

If the planet is on course to be destroyed in the near future, it is fair to take what is needed to preserve humanity and flee. Invocation of this exception requires a certification by the Constitutional Court, by at least 5 of its 7 members, that clear and convincing scientific evidence establishes a specific, imminent, and planet-wide existential threat; the certification shall identify the threat, the projected timeline, the scientific bodies whose consensus supports the finding, and the specific resources and extraction plan whose necessity is certified. The Epistemic Council shall publish an independent assessment of the Court's certification within 90 days. The certification expires after 10 years and may be renewed only by the same process; a lapsed certification terminates all authority under this Section and requires restoration of extracted resources where physically possible. The Council shall re-review any active certification at 5-year intervals and publish its findings. No extraction plan may proceed without identifying the specific beneficiary population and the governance structure for off-world continuity; blanket authorization or open-ended delegation is void. The principles of Section 11.1 are not suspended; this Section waives only the prohibition on drawing resources necessary for the certified purpose, and the waiver is strictly limited to what the certification identifies.

### Section 11.3: Creation of Rule Zero

The first operational rendition of Rule Zero shall be established by the independently selected provisional Expert Body and provisional Constitutional Court under Section 11.4 through the following process. No drafting choice may narrow the principles already fixed by Section 11.1:

1. **Drafting Phase:** All members of the provisional EB and the 7 provisional Constitutional Court justices shall convene from no later than Day 151 through Day 240 to draft the full text of Rule Zero.
2. **Public Comment Phase:** The draft shall be published by Day 241 for public comment through Day 300, during which any citizen may submit feedback, objections, or alternative formulations through digital, accessible, multilingual, and offline routes maintained independently of the provisional bodies.
3. **Epistemic Review and Final Text Phase:** The initial Epistemic Council shall publish by Day 325 a non-binding Blind Spot Memorandum identifying assumptions, cultural exclusions, translation failures, or internal contradictions in the proposed text. The provisional EB and provisional Constitutional Court shall respond publicly to each material concern and transmit one final proposed text to the Founding Referendum Authority by Day 345. They are not required to accept the Council's recommendations but may not alter the transmitted text after that deadline except to correct a manifest clerical or translation error identified publicly by the Founding Referendum Authority and applied identically across every version.
4. **Ratification Phase:** The final Rule Zero must be ratified by:
   - A 90% supermajority of the provisional EB
   - A unanimous vote of the provisional Constitutional Court
   - A global referendum of 75% of valid votes cast

   The provisional votes shall conclude by Day 360. The Founding Referendum Authority shall publish the final ballot, verified translations, neutral official materials, voting instructions, and challenge procedures by Day 365; voting shall remain open from Day 391 through Day 420;

preliminary results shall publish by Day 430; count challenges shall be filed by Day 440; and all recounts, appeals, final count certification, and reasons shall conclude by Day 480. The referendum is valid only if administered and certified under Section 11.4(0.7). Failure to meet a deadline does not transfer referendum control to the Founder, provisional EB, or provisional Court and does not extend any provisional term.

5. **Encoding:** If all three ratification thresholds are met, Rule Zero shall be encoded by Day 490 into a physically immutable, publicly visible ledger: distributed across multiple geographic locations, accessible to all, and unalterable by any single entity.

   If a threshold is not met, a referendum is invalid, failure to convene or submit a draft by Day 345 occurs, or certification cannot lawfully conclude, the Founding Referendum Authority shall publish the precise failure and preserve every valid preparatory record; a failure to submit a draft counts as a failed cycle, and if two consecutive cycles fail to produce a draft, the Secretariat shall draw a replacement drafting panel under Section 11.4(2.1) to prepare the proposed text. A corrected cycle shall begin automatically within 180 days and conclude within 1 year, using a freshly drawn authority or replacement panels where the prior body is conflicted or expired. If two consecutive corrected cycles fail to reach the thresholds in paragraph 4, a third cycle shall be decided by a majority of valid votes cast in the same referendum process, and that condition applies to later cycles; no other threshold is lowered except as provided in the next sentence. If eight consecutive cycles have failed to reach the institutional thresholds in paragraph 4, a later cycle shall be decided by the referendum alone, provided that the Constitutional Court, by at least 5 of its 7 members, or a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 where the Court or any justice is conflicted (and any justice who participated in drafting the proposed text under paragraph 1 is conflicted for this certification), has certified on the published records of the prior cycles that (i) the recurring failure arises from demonstrated institutional opposition rather than from a material defect in the proposed text identified in a prior Epistemic Council Blind Spot Memorandum; (ii) the proposed text has been revised to address each material concern stated in those Memoranda, or a public and reasoned response to each concern has been published; and (iii) the proposed text is consistent with the fixed principles in Section 11.1. A denial of certification by the Court requires the concurrence of at least 5 of its 7 members (or 5 members of the substitute bench) with published reasons; a vote to deny by fewer than 5 members is not a final denial. If the Court has not certified or validly denied within 90 days of the close of voting in the eighth failed cycle, the Epistemic Council shall either certify by 6 of its 9 members or publish a reasoned refusal within 60 days on the same record and standard; if the Council also fails to certify or issue a reasoned refusal within 60 days, the Secretariat shall draw a 7-member substitute bench under Section 10.2.1 to decide certification within 30 days. A certification once granted applies to the cycle in which it is issued and to later cycles using that exact text until the thresholds in paragraph 4 are met; any material revision to the proposed text requires a fresh certification under this paragraph. The majority-of-cast rule continues to apply from the third cycle. When a cycle begins after the provisional EB or provisional Constitutional Court has dissolved, the provisional thresholds in paragraph 4 shall instead be met by the permanent EB and permanent Constitutional Court; where those permanent bodies are conflicted, replacement panels drawn under the citizen-and-qualified rules in Section 11.4(2.1) shall vote in their stead. The majority-of-cast referendum in every third and later cycle is administered by the permanent referendum machinery under Article IV, Section 4.6, not by a defunct provisional authority. Before the compulsory reset, the independently selected provisional bodies may correct and retransmit only the failed operational rendition, subject to the same manifest clerical or translation error standard in paragraph 3, identified publicly by the Founding Referendum Authority and applied identically across every version; a disputed identification is appealable to the Constitutional Court or, before it seats, to a temporary tribunal under Article VIII, Section 8.5.6. After reset, that role passes to the permanent bodies under the same standard, with identification by the Independent Sortition Secretariat and appeal to the Constitutional Court. The fixed principles in Section 11.1, existing lawful protections and services, and current Covenant administrative rules remain operative throughout. No pre-Covenant legal order is preserved or restored by a retry. A retry never extends provisional tenure, restores a failed officeholder, or gives the Founder control of drafting or voting.

6. **Compulsory Permanent Review:** Within 1 year after the compulsory reset under Section 11.4, the first permanent EB and permanent Constitutional Court shall review the operational rendition in public, with a Blind Spot Memorandum from the Epistemic Council. Reaffirmation or revision requires the same numerical thresholds and referendum requirement stated in paragraph 4, applied to the permanent bodies. The 10-year bar in Section 11.5(d) does not apply to this compulsory review. The existing rendition remains binding during review. Failure to complete review does not expand provisional authority, extend any term, or weaken Section 11.1.

### Section 11.4: The "bootstrap" supersession period

To replace the old world order with operational Covenant institutions, the following temporary provisions shall apply. They establish administrative continuity and confer no surviving authority, parallel legality, or right of restoration on the old order:

1. **Founder Limitation.** The Founder may promulgate this Covenant, invite participation, and provide resources through an irrevocably transparent trust. The Founder's wealth, resources, authorship, birth, reputation, or prior office confer no authority. The Founder shall not nominate, score, screen, shortlist, appoint, remove, contact for selection purposes, direct, or otherwise influence any individual candidate for the provisional EB, provisional Constitutional Court, Epistemic Council, Independent Sortition Secretariat, founding custodian, auditor, or temporary founding selection authority. The Founder may not select an institution that performs those functions and may not condition resources on any selection outcome or substantive policy decision; any inconsistent trust term is void; the Constitutional Court (or, before it seats, a temporary tribunal constituted under Article VIII, Section 8.5.6) shall on application by any affected Covenant body or the Independent Sortition Secretariat declare the term void within 60 days and publish reasons. Trust transfers shall follow a mandatory published schedule: no less than 30% of the aggregate published provisional cost models under Section 11.4(0.6) and (0.7) and Article IX, Section 9.6.3 shall be transferred within 30 days of promulgation, and the remainder in equal quarterly installments over the two years following, unless a shorter completion schedule is certified by the audit teams under paragraph 0.4. Transfer delay does not excuse a deadline under this Article or Article IX, and a shortfall shall be published with its cause and remedy. No body may condition another body's appropriation on a selection outcome, finding, or policy decision. All communications and transfers concerning the supersession period shall be public and auditable. The Founder may not serve on any Covenant body, selection authority, secretariat, audit, or challenge panel, ever.

0.1 **Founding Regions, Registry, Entropy, and Custodian Draw.** For founding administration only, six **Founding Macroregions** exist from the instant of promulgation: Africa; Asia; Europe;

Latin America and the Caribbean; Northern America; and Oceania. Countries and territories shall be assigned geographically under the publicly archived United Nations geographic scheme frozen at promulgation solely as a non-authoritative data convention. Neither the United Nations nor that archived scheme has interpretive, political, sovereign, jurisdictional, boundary-setting, or continuing authority. These regions carry no political, sovereign, jurisdictional, or boundary-setting significance; they exist only to constrain founding and initial sortition and expire when permanent Covenant statistical regions take effect.

The custodian registry is self-enrolling. From Day 1 through Day 14 after promulgation, any non-Covenant public university, national statistical institute, professional audit body, or civil-society sortition organization may enter by transmitting a digitally signed declaration and documentary proof to at least 3 independent public registry mirrors. Eligibility requires 15 years of continuous existence, published audited finances, disclosure of controlling interests, and no founding-office applicant among directors. Eligibility authorizes only the express custodian or audit function assigned by this Section; no institution, registry, charter, license, office, or personnel obtains authority from inherited status. The merge code shall automatically combine duplicate submissions by legal identity and publish a preliminary registry on Day 15. The merge code shall be audited and reproduced by the three founding audit teams under paragraph 0.4 before any draw depends on it, and the audit shall be published. The transparent founding trust shall fund the published cost models of this Article in full; an unfunded model excuses no deadline and transfers no selection or audit authority. No Founder, donor, or Covenant body may add, omit, rank, or edit an entry.

Duplicate identity, false eligibility, undisclosed control, or forged evidence may be challenged from Day 15 through Day 19. Citizen and qualified-auditor applicants for three Registry Challenge Panels shall self-enroll through the public mirrors from Day 1 through Day 2; qualification is limited to adulthood and conflict disclosure for citizens and documented audit competence for auditors. Each Panel shall contain 2 citizens and 3 qualified auditors, selected on Day 3 by the fixed entropy procedure below, and shall decide randomly assigned challenges by Day 21 using only the published criteria. Panel decisions are provisional until reproduced by the three founding audit teams under paragraph 0.4 within 30 days of the audit teams' seating; a decision the audit teams cannot reproduce shall be re-decided by a freshly drawn Panel under this paragraph before the corresponding registry entry becomes final. Registry finality for the Consortium draw is contingent on completion of the audit-team reproduction; the Consortium draw on Day 22 proceeds on the frozen provisional registry, and any Consortium seat traceable to an unreproduced challenge decision is redrawn from the corrected registry within 30 days of the corrective Panel decision. Decisions and evidence shall be public subject to personal privacy. The registry freezes at 23:59 UTC on Day 21; no later change may affect the Consortium draw.

At promulgation, an immutable Founding Randomness Schedule shall publish the hash algorithm, source order, observation times, and at least 7 independent public entropy sources spanning at least 4 Founding Macroregions and at least 3 source types: public randomness beacons, closing hashes of high-volume public ledgers, and signed meteorological or seismographic observations. Each draw seed shall be the hash of every scheduled output in the fixed order. Ledger entropy sources shall be taken only from outputs published before the Day-21 registry freeze; no output recorded after the freeze may contribute to a draw seed. The seed for the audit-team draws under paragraph 0.4 shall be distinct from the seed for the custodian draw. An unavailable source contributes a pre-specified null marker; no substitute source or observation time may be chosen. The schedule shall generate separate seeds on Day 3 for challenge panels, Day 22 for the Consortium, and the fixed later dates required by this Section. No actor may choose, reject, rerun, or alter a seed after seeing candidates;

redraws use the original seed plus a public sequential counter.

Seven custodian institutions shall be drawn automatically on Day 22 from the frozen registry, with at least 4 Founding Macroregions and 3 institution types represented, no more than 2 institutions from one macroregion, and no more than 3 of one type. Acceptances are due by Day 25; refusals trigger automatic counter-based redraws, and the Founding Custodian Consortium seats on Day 30. The full registry, source code, entropy inputs, seeds, acceptances, refusals, substitutions, and draw records shall be public and independently reproducible. The Consortium's sole powers are to receive applications, execute published draws, maintain records, fund access and translation, and constitute temporary authorities under this Section. It may not govern or set substantive policy. The Consortium shall decide by majority of its institutions, one vote each. Institutions sharing a disclosed controlling interest count as one institution for the draw constraints and for voting and shall be reported as one.

0.2 **Temporary Founding Selection Authority.** The Consortium shall publish the pool rules when it seats on Day 30, open the following pools immediately, close them on Day 40, complete blind qualification review by Day 43, conduct the fixed-seed draws on Day 44, and seat by Day 45 a two-chamber Founding Selection Authority:

a) a Citizen Chamber of 24 adults selected by stratified sortition from a voluntary global pool, with the maximum mathematically achievable inclusion of affected and historically excluded populations from the eligible voluntary pool under the fixed seed; any shortfall and the constraints causing it shall be published, and no discretionary substitution may alter the pool or draw; and

b) a Method Chamber of 12 conflict-free persons selected by lot from applicants who meet publicly defined minimum thresholds in psychometrics, forensic audit, constitutional selection design, statistics, or public-sector appointment integrity. Qualification materials shall be evaluated blind where possible by rotating assessors from the Consortium institutions; assessors may not rank candidates who meet the threshold.

Neither chamber may act alone. Changes to procedure, resolution of a material challenge, or certification of a selection require a majority of the Citizen Chamber and two-thirds of the Method Chamber. Members and custodians shall disclose financial, familial, institutional, and political conflicts; recusal is mandatory. The Consortium dissolves no later than 30 days after the compulsory reset and in all events within 3 years of promulgation. The Founding Selection Authority dissolves when the first permanent cycle and every then-pending timely challenge, redraw, and replacement are complete, but in all events no later than the third anniversary of promulgation. At that deadline, any unresolved matter transfers ministerially to new conflict-free temporary dual panels drawn by the Independent Sortition Secretariat under the citizen-and-qualified rules in paragraph 2.1; no Authority member continues. Members, directors, assessors, and senior staff of either founding body are ineligible for the provisional EB or Court and for the immediately following permanent term or selection cycle.

0.3 **Selection of Provisional Institutions.** The Founding Selection Authority shall publish by Day 50 preliminary function-specific minimum qualification thresholds, application forms, scoring rules, required evidence, accessibility procedures, and conflict disclosures for every provisional EB domain and Constitutional Court seat. Public comment shall remain open through Day 62. Final thresholds and forms shall publish and freeze on Day 65; only then may applications open. Thresholds shall test demonstrated competence, ethical fitness, independence, and the composition requirements of Articles I and II without ideological loyalty tests or discretionary ranking.

Applications shall remain open from Day 66 through Day 105, with equal multilingual, accessible, digital, and offline submission routes and funded access support. No applicant may be judged under a criterion, form field, evidentiary demand, or scoring rule unavailable in the frozen Day-65 publication. After Day 65, no substantive criterion or form change is permitted for the founding selection. A manifest clerical, translation, or technical correction must be published to every applicant simultaneously, may not change substantive eligibility or scoring, and shall create the same 7-day amendment window for every submitted or prospective applicant; evaluation of the affected material pauses during that window. Evaluations shall run from Day 106 through Day 125 and shall be blind where possible. All candidates meeting the threshold enter a constrained or stratified sortition appropriate to the function; no qualified candidate may be excluded by a secret shortlist. Draws, challenges capable of affecting the draw, and reproduction audits shall conclude by Day 140. A provisional EB of 55 to 87 members, an uneven number, and a 7-member provisional Court shall install by Day 150, but may exercise no authority before the initial EC is seated. The domain minimums and maximums in Section 1.5 bind provisional selection.

By Day 180, the Authority shall also constitute provisional Expert Reserve pools under Article III by constrained lot from independently qualified applicants not selected for provisional EB or Court office. These Reserve members may verify Phase 1 work, conduct Shadow Rotation, and make Shadow Nominations but may not enter the first permanent candidate pool, select permanent members, or continue beyond the compulsory reset. Temporary qualified panels shall perform any Reserve verification function before those pools are operational. Public code, candidate-count data, constraints, random seeds, draw records, conflict disclosures, and audit reports shall be released promptly, subject only to necessary personal privacy.

0.4 **Challenge and Audit.** From Day 1 through Day 14, qualified audit entities may self-enroll through the same public mirrors used for the custodian registry. Eligibility requires at least 10 years of independent audit, election-integrity, statistical-reproduction, or open-source security work; published methods and finances; disclosed control; and no applicant, director, contractor, or affiliate in the Consortium, FSA, or officeholder pools. Enrollment in the audit pool is an irrevocable recusal from the custodian registry and every founding officeholder pool. Objective challenges follow paragraph 0.1. On Day 22, the fixed seed shall draw 3 audit teams of at least 3 entities each, spanning at least 3 Founding Macroregions, with no entity serving on more than one team. The teams shall reproduce every founding draw and audit threshold administration, conflicts, communications, pools, and resource flows.

**External Sortition and Records Continuity Network.** The Day-22 draw of the three founding audit teams automatically constitutes the initial External Sortition and Records Continuity Network under Article XII, Section 12.7(b.1), without a later appointment or certification by Founder, Consortium, Founding Selection Authority, Independent Sortition Secretariat, provisional bodies, or donor. Each team separately holds authenticated digital and offline copies of published selection code, frozen registries and pools, entropy schedules and inputs, sequential counters, conflict disclosures, public record hashes, and other records necessary for continuity. A team performing a continuity act under Section 12.7(b.1) may not reproduce, audit, adjudicate, or certify that act. Other conflict-free Network teams reproduce it only for continuity, not final audit. Every available conflict-free audit-pool or external-registry institution not serving on a Network team independently audits from published code, canonical inputs, protected verification access, and signed custody record. No Network team selects its auditor or finally certifies its own act. An unavailable or conflicted team shall be replaced from the frozen audit pool by the original seed plus the next unused public counter. Founder, donors, Consortium, Founding Selection Authority, provisional officers, Covenant bodies, and prospective beneficiaries may not nominate, remove, direct, selectively fund, or alter inputs or outputs of the Network. Dissolution of founding bodies does not dissolve the Network. It remains ministerial until permanent successors accept distributed custody. The immutable Founding Randomness Schedule shall include, without a terminal date, the recurring source order, observation rules, null markers, and two-year observation dates required for Network renewal; no ISS, Network team, CGA, Court, Founder, donor, or provisional body may choose a replacement source or observation time after identities or outputs are known.

Any applicant or citizen may file a specific selection challenge within 30 days of the disputed act. A challenge supported by prima facie evidence shall stay the disputed appointment only when both a 7-member citizen panel selected by lot and a 5-member qualified-methodologist panel selected by lot find that likely integrity harm exceeds continuity harm. Challenge-panel pools, draw dates, and seeds shall be published before applications close and audited by the 3 teams. Panels shall decide within 21 days and may order a redraw or reevaluation under preexisting rules but may not choose a candidate.

0.5 **Initial Epistemic Council.** The Founding Selection Authority shall constitute the Independent Sortition Secretariat under Article XIII through open competition and the same citizen-plus-qualified dual certification used in paragraph 0.2, with preliminary staffing rules published by Day 50, final rules by Day 60, and initial staff seated by Day 70. Notwithstanding Article XIII, Section 13.3(a), CGA approval and CC audit of permanent Secretariat staffing shall occur after those bodies are seated; until then, the dual certification and independent audit in paragraphs 0.2 and 0.4 substitute without creating removal or direction power. The Founding Macroregions in paragraph 0.1 govern the initial draw, and the audit teams under paragraph 0.4 perform the audit otherwise assigned to a CGA-certified pool by Article XIII, Section 13.3(h). The Secretariat shall select and seat the initial Epistemic Council by Day 135 strictly under all other Article XIII requirements. The EC is not appointed by the Founder, provisional EB, provisional Court, Consortium, or Founding Selection Authority and receives its full Article XIII terms and independence. No provisional EB or Court may exercise authority, and no irreversible alteration to the permanent EB selection pipeline may occur, before the initial EC is seated. A narrow exception to the authority bar applies only where all of the following are satisfied: (i) delay would create a specific, identified, immediate threat to human life or planetary systems, supported by contemporaneous published evidence; (ii) the Founding Custodian Consortium under paragraph 0.2, together with all three audit teams under paragraph 0.4, certify the specific threat, the necessity of the action, and the least intrusive effective measure available, each by internal supermajority of two-thirds of seated members; (iii) the action is limited to that measure and terminates automatically when the threat ends; (iv) no automated system makes any final decision under this exception (Article XII, Section 12.6); and (v) the action is subject to mandatory Epistemic Council review within 72 hours of the Council's seating, and to mandatory Constitutional Court review upon that Court's seating, each of which may void the action, order restoration where feasible, and refer implicated officers under Article X, Section 10.2.4. The exception does not reach irreversible alteration to the permanent EB selection pipeline; no such alteration may occur before the initial EC is seated on any ground, and any purported alteration made in reliance on this exception is void ab initio.

0.6 **Initial CGA and Bootstrap Integrity Panels.** By Day 75, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall compile and publish the deduplicated founding civic registry and the algorithms for the initial CGA, bootstrap citizen pools, and replacement draws, using the Founding Macroregions and the broadest lawfully obtainable public adult civil registries. CGA secretariat staff and trainers shall be selected by open competition, blind qualification review where possible, and joint certification by the Bootstrap Panels below; neither the provisional CC nor any other provisional body may direct them.

The initial CGA draw shall occur by Day 80. Paid training shall run from Day 81 through Day 140, and the CGA shall seat on Day 141 under Article V.

Separately from the CGA draw, the Secretariat shall by Day 80 draw a 30-member **Bootstrap Civic Certification Panel** from the founding civic registry and a 12-member **Bootstrap Qualified Integrity Panel** from applicants meeting blind-evaluated thresholds in sortition audit, public finance, constitutional procedure, forensic methodology, or high-impact systems assurance. No member may serve in another founding or provisional body. Acting together by majority of the Civic Panel and two-thirds of the Qualified Panel, they may until the CGA seats only: certify initial citizen and qualified pools for the ICPI and temporary tribunals; certify that the published ministerial prerequisites for automatic release of the ICPI's initial protected appropriation have been met; certify the published cost model and ministerial prerequisites for automatic release of the Founding Referendum Authority's appropriation; certify the initial Metric Integrity intake, jury, correction, and substitute-tribunal pools; and audit operational compliance with Article XII, Section 12.6 and manual/offline continuity for high-impact systems. Certification may identify a specific unmet published prerequisite but may not reduce, delay, redirect, or condition an appropriation on a selection or policy outcome. They may not select an officeholder from a certified pool, alter a substantive threshold, govern, or continue after Day 141. The Founder, provisional EB, and provisional CC may not nominate, remove, direct, fund selectively, or review their members or findings. All draws and certifications are subject to the independent audits in paragraph 0.4.

By Day 120, the Secretariat shall establish independently administered standing Metric Integrity pools of at least 300 citizens, 120 statisticians or forensic methodologists, 120 relevant domain experts, and 80 constitutional jurists. It shall also establish: (1) a separate substitute-justice pool of at least 70 persons collectively capable of satisfying every Article II composition and competence category, for conflict substitutions under Articles IV, VIII, and X; and (2) a high-impact systems-assurance pool of at least 80 conflict-free specialists in model audit, cybersecurity, safety engineering, due process, and manual continuity. Before dissolving, the Bootstrap Panels shall certify the pools and draw rules, not future findings. After the CGA seats, system-specific readiness panels shall be drawn by the Secretariat from the assurance pool and audited independently; the CGA may certify process integrity but may not alter a technical result. By Day 135, an intake-clerk roster shall be active, draw procedures tested, and sufficient conflict-free members pre-cleared to convene a Metric Integrity Review Jury, successor correction panel, substitute tribunal, substitute constitutional bench, or automation-readiness audit without discretionary appointment.

The CGA shall replace or revalidate every Bootstrap-certified pool and draw rule by Day 240 through public process-integrity review and independently reproduced audits. If the CGA does not complete review by Day 240, the Secretariat shall immediately draw a new 30-member civic certification panel and 12-member qualified integrity panel under the same eligibility, conflict, dual-key, and audit rules used for the Bootstrap Panels; those substitute panels shall complete review by Day 270 and dissolve. A rejected pool remains available only for already-filed matters until a compliant replacement becomes operational, and rejection of a pool may not revive a conflicted appointment power or terminate a pending protection. Every standing pool shall thereafter be independently revalidated at least every 2 years.

0.7 **Founding Referendum Authority.** The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall publish member-pool rules on Day 71, keep pools open through Day 90, complete blind qualification review by Day 96, conduct fixed-seed constrained draws on Day 100, and seat by Day 105 a temporary Founding Referendum Authority consisting of an 18-member Citizen Chamber and a 12-member Qualified Chamber. Qualified members shall meet public minimum thresholds in election administration, cybersecurity or cryptography, statistical audit, privacy and data protection, accessibility, translation integrity, or large-scale logistics. Procedure, expenditure, ballot, and certification rules require a majority of the Citizen Chamber and two-thirds of the Qualified Chamber. Neither chamber may act alone.

The Founding Custodian Consortium shall publish by Day 60 a provisional formula-based cost model covering only the Authority's fixed constitutional functions, independent testing, universal access, translation, offline operation, security, recounts, challenges, and archival transfer. The three founding audit teams shall reproduce and publish their assessment by Day 70. No donor, referendum participant, provisional body, or prospective Authority member may alter the model.

Upon seating, the Authority shall receive an automatic startup tranche equal to 25% of the protected founding appropriation stated in its pre-published provisional cost model. The final appropriation shall be based on the public cost model independently audited under paragraph 0.4 and certified before Day 141 by both Bootstrap Integrity Panels under paragraph 0.6. It shall be released automatically from the transparent founding trust and may not be reduced, delayed, redirected, or conditioned by the Founder, provisional EB, provisional Court, or any referendum participant. A certification delay does not claw back the startup tranche or interrupt minimum referendum preparation.

The Authority's sole mandate is the initial Rule Zero referendum. It shall provide universal and privacy-preserving voter access; deduplicated and challengeable voter registration; multilingual and accessible ballot materials; secure digital and offline voting routes; public source code and protocols; auditable chain of custody and counting; independent recount; and timely challenge and appeal. Official materials shall be viewpoint-neutral: they may contain the proposed text, verified translations, procedural facts, and equally limited authenticated statements for and against ratification, but may not label lawful viewpoints as misinformation or privilege a preferred interpretation.

Logistics, technical certification, and final count audit shall be institutionally and personally separated. A Logistics Service selected through open competition and constrained lot shall manage access, registry operations, and ballot delivery but may not certify technology or audit the count. A 7-member Technical Certification Panel drawn from conflict-free qualified pools shall test and certify code, security, privacy, accessibility, and offline equivalence but may not operate logistics or count ballots. A Count Audit and Challenge Tribunal of 5 citizens and 6 conflict-free election auditors, statisticians, or jurists selected by constrained lot shall conduct recounts, decide registry and count challenges, audit the final tally, and certify or reject the result; certification requires 3 citizen and 4 qualified votes. No person, contractor, chamber, or institution may serve in more than one of these three functions.

The provisional EB and provisional Constitutional Court may transmit the proposed text and separately identified factual statements, but may not control ballot framing, official translations, voter registry, logistics, code, counting, certification, recount, or challenges. The Founder and every provisional body are barred from appointing, removing, directing, selectively funding, or reviewing Authority members, staff, panels, contractors, or decisions. The founding audit teams under paragraph 0.4 shall continuously audit selection, procurement, code, registry methods, access parity, counting, and archival integrity.

The Authority shall publish preliminary protocols by Day 150, receive public comment through Day 180, freeze final protocols by Day 195, separately constitute the Logistics Service, Technical Certification Panel, and Count Audit and Challenge Tribunal by Day 240, and demonstrate operational readiness through independent public testing by Day 300. A preliminary voter registry and exclusion log shall publish under privacy-preserving identifiers by Day 330; registry challenges shall close on

Day 360 and the tribunal shall certify the final registry by Day 380. The Authority shall then follow the ballot and count-certification schedule in Section 11.3. Within 30 days after a valid final certification, it shall publish and archive a complete audit, transfer protected records to distributed custody, and dissolve. If the vote or certification is invalid, its members transfer records and ministerial functions to a freshly drawn successor authority under Section 11.3 and then dissolve; referendum capacity and lawful custody never lapse. Members, senior staff, panelists, and principal contractors are ineligible for the immediately following permanent global office cycle and may not convert the Authority into the permanent referendum administrator.

1. **Provisional Authority and Term.** The provisional EB and provisional Constitutional Court hold governance authority from their seating only as necessary to establish lawful continuity, complete Rule Zero, and operate this Covenant. No non-imminent coercive operation or emergency rights limitation may begin until the ICPI's core functions under Article VIII are operational. An imminent defensive action before that time must comply with Articles VIII, X, and XII, preserve complete records, and receive ICPI review immediately upon its selection. No high-impact automated system may be used before a system-specific readiness panel independently certifies Article XII, Section 12.6 compliance and tested manual continuity; uncertified functions shall operate manually. Provisional terms expire at the earlier of installation of permanent successors or 3 years after promulgation. Every provisional officeholder shall leave at that reset and is ineligible for the immediately following permanent EB term, Court term, Reserve cycle, command appointment, or other global Covenant office cycle. No provisional officeholder may draft, score, amend, or administer a criterion in a manner that advantages that officeholder or an associate. The initial Epistemic Council holds its full diagnostic authority from seating and is not a provisional appointee.

2.1 **Compulsory Permanent Selection and Reset.** The permanent Article I and II processes shall open immediately after the Founding Selection Authority seats and no later than Day 46. For the first Article I cycle only, the schedule is mandatory: Phase 1 runs from Day 46 through Day 225; Phase 2 concludes by Day 232; the full 2-year Phase 3 probation runs from Day 233 through Day 962; the independent Phase 4 channel may operate in parallel and closes by Day 962; and the full 60-day Phase 5 runs from Day 963 through Day 1022, with panel findings issued by Day 997, procedural appeals filed by Day 1002, and conflict-free appeal decisions issued by Day 1022. Phase 6 concludes by Day 1035; Phase 7 confirmation and any required reasons conclude by Day 1050; and permanent members assume authority after a recorded handover no later than Day 1060. Phase 7 mentorship continues after seating and does not postpone transfer of authority. The first permanent Article II selection, including all challenges and conflict substitutions, shall proceed in parallel under its separate competence requirements, conclude by Day 1050, and seat by Day 1060. Only logically independent application intake, auditing, pool preparation, and Phase 4 work may run in parallel; no probation, behavioral review, appeal, competence validation, or dual-key certification may be shortened, deemed complete, or overlapped with a logically dependent phase.

For this first permanent cycle only, Phase 3 candidates constitute a non-governing probationary cohort. They receive the access, stipend, observation, verifier, collaboration, dossier, and behavioral review required by Article I but have no EB vote and may not issue an order, authorize force, exercise monetary authority, make an appointment, administer selection, or bind the provisional EB. No reference in Article I to Phase 3 access, collaboration, committee attachment, or performance duties grants voting or governing authority during this cycle. Committee contributions are advisory and must be separately adopted by authorized provisional members, who retain individual responsibility.

For this cycle, Phase 6 closes finally on Day 1035. A potential petitioner may submit a sealed contingent Individualized Condition of Service petition before that closure, but the petition activates only if the named candidate is selected. Every active petition, including one first made after selection, shall be served on the candidate no later than Day 1036. A later allegation shall proceed, if applicable, through ordinary conflict, ethics, security, accommodation, rights, or removal law and may not reopen Phase 6 or become a late individualized-condition veto. A candidate's declination or an unresolved timely condition does not reopen or restart Phase 6, extend provisional authority, or compress due process. If the candidate cannot assume authority on Day 1060, the seat is treated as a permanent-cycle vacancy; limited caretaker authority passes under Article XII, Section 12.7 while the condition record transfers intact and a lawful resolution or unshortened permanent replacement process continues. If the condition is invalidated or accepted before the Independent Sortition Secretariat publishes final certification of a permanent replacement's Phase 6 selection following independent reproduction and the required citizen-plus-qualified process certification, the original selectee assumes the seat after a recorded handover and the replacement process terminates. That published replacement certification extinguishes the original selection and renders its condition proceeding moot without punishment or general disqualification; the replacement then proceeds through Phase 7. Mootness does not bar a narrow due-process claim to correct, expunge, or remedy a materially false or unlawfully disclosed record, but such relief cannot revive the extinguished selection. If the original selectee finally declines before that boundary, the Secretariat begins the fresh Article I replacement process without provisional participation.

Days 1061 through the third anniversary are a fixed internal contingency reserved only for an ordered redraw, replacement of an incapacitated selectee, resolution of a timely filed challenge, or completion of physical handover. The contingency may not reopen criteria, shorten a safeguard, extend a provisional officeholder, or justify ordinary delay. Permanent authority transfers earlier whenever the lawful process is complete, and every provisional term expires at the third anniversary regardless of contingency use.

The Founding Selection Authority administers only the first permanent cycle, subject to the same independent reproduction and challenge safeguards, and neither provisional EB nor provisional Court may select, confirm, veto, or rank successors. Any technical, forensic, behavioral-certification, or confirmation function otherwise assigned to the sitting EB, Court, or Expert Reserve in that cycle shall be performed by a temporary dual panel until a constitutionally eligible independent body can perform it: citizens selected by lot may observe, initiate challenge, and certify process legitimacy, while conflict-free domain experts, psychometricians, jurists, or forensic methodologists selected by lot perform only the function for which they meet a public competence threshold. Any adverse action and final confirmation require both citizen process certification and qualified substantive certification. Each panel applies pre-published criteria and dissolves when its function is complete.

For avoidance of doubt, every first-cycle Individualized Condition of Service shall be adjudicated by a freshly drawn 7-member substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1, matching the Article II composition and deciding by simple majority. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall perform notice and record transfer ministerially. A separately drawn, conflict-free ministerial panel shall implement any final condition but may not interpret, modify, adjudicate, or review it. No provisional EB member, provisional justice, provisional Reserve member, or person acting under the direction or control of a provisional body may constitute, appoint, direct, serve on, communicate with concerning the merits, implement, enforce, modify, or review any first-cycle Individualized Condition of Service process or body. Before the permanent Court seats, every claimed breach, requested modification, or enforcement dispute shall receive ordinary due process only before a freshly drawn Article X substitute bench that did not implement or previously adjudicate the matter. After the permanent Court seats, such a dispute belongs to the conflict-free permanent Court or, when it is implicated, a freshly drawn Article X substitute bench. Delay, litigation, emergency, failure to complete a phase, or failure to seat successors does not extend a provisional term beyond 3 years after promulgation.

2.2 **Continuity Without Extension.** Delay does not extend a provisional term. If lawful permanent successors are absent at the deadline for any reason, the most recently certified, conflict-free Expert Reserve members shall be selected by constrained lot as limited caretakers for successive terms not exceeding 180 days, and temporary Court vacancies shall be filled by lot from independently audited pools meeting Article II thresholds. No provisional founding officeholder may serve, and no person may serve more than one caretaker term unless every eligible alternate has been exhausted and a new conflict review and public draw selects that person. Caretakers may protect life, preserve systems, execute current Covenant administrative rules, and complete selection, but may not amend the Covenant, alter selection criteria, make irreversible appointments, initiate non-defensive force, or adopt irreversible monetary or planetary measures. Before each 180-day continuation, the EC shall publish a non-binding capture and delay diagnosis. Continuation requires a public necessity finding by a temporary tribunal constituted under Article VIII, Section 8.5.6, approved separately by at least 2 of its 3 citizen members and 3 of its 4 qualified members. After 6 consecutive caretaker periods, any further period also requires 60% approval of the CGA and majority approval in a global referendum administered under Article IV, Section 4.6. If a review, draw, CGA vote, or referendum misses its deadline, the minimal caretaker function transfers to a freshly drawn holder under Article XII, Section 12.7 until the decision concludes; the function never lapses and the prior holder gains no extension. The EC report informs but does not authorize, veto, or delay the decision. No continuation revives or extends a provisional officeholder's term.

2.3 **Physical Enforcement of Compulsory Reset.** Any provisional officeholder, including any provisional EB member, provisional Constitutional Court justice, provisional Reserve member seated for provisional purposes, provisional command appointee, Provisional Command Council member under Article VIII, Section 8.1.1, Founding Selection Authority member, Founding Custodian Consortium member, or founding functionary purporting to exercise provisional authority, who has not vacated by the third anniversary of promulgation is:

a) automatically disqualified from every future Covenant governance, oversight, command, adjudicative, inspection, contracting, or delegated-authority role on the same terms as a disqualification under Article X, Section 10.2.4; the disqualification takes provisional effect immediately at the third anniversary and becomes final either 30 days after the third anniversary if the person has not requested a hearing within that period, or after an expedited hearing before a freshly drawn 7-member substitute bench under Section 10.2.1 if the person requests one; the hearing shall be held within 7 days of the request, at which the person may show that non-vacation was caused by disaster, medical incapacity, transport failure, or another circumstance beyond the person's reasonable control and that the person complied with every ministerial vacation step within their control; a substitute-bench finding of such cause narrows the disqualification to what is necessary to prevent unlawful continued exercise of authority, without permanent bar to future Covenant service unrelated to the non-vacated office; the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall serve written notice of hearing rights on every non-vacator on the third anniversary and shall publish the notice;

b) treated as having no lawful authority from the moment of the third anniversary forward; every act, order, appointment, removal, expenditure, use of force, or communication purported to be taken by that person after the third anniversary is void ab initio and confers no authority, immunity, custody, benefit, or defense on any recipient, agent, contractor, or Covenant body; and

c) subject to physical enforcement of the vacancy under this paragraph.

Within 30 days after the third anniversary, the Constitutional Court, or if the permanent Court is not yet seated a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1, shall issue a binding declaratory order identifying every non-vacator and directing their immediate departure from office, premises, systems, and records. The order is a binding Constitutional Court decision for the purposes of Article VIII, Section 8.2. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall serve the order and publish it. If a non-vacator does not comply within 7 days of service, the permanent EB, or if not yet seated the caretaker holders under paragraph 2.2, may direct the Global Peacekeeping Corps to enforce the vacancy under Article VIII, Section 8.2. Enforcement shall be limited to the minimum force reasonably necessary to end the unlawful holding of office; permissible measures include physical removal from official premises, revocation of access credentials, and detention pending referral to competent criminal jurisdiction. No act barred by Article X, Section 10.3(b) may be authorized under this paragraph, and every enforcement action remains subject to full ICPI access and audit under Section 8.5. A person removed under this paragraph shall receive ordinary criminal due process for any offense charged and full Article X protections during and after removal.

No delay in the substitute bench's order, in service, or in Corps enforcement extends the non-vacator's authority; that authority ended by operation of law at the third anniversary regardless of enforcement timing. Neither the Founder nor a donor nor a provisional body may fund, direct, shelter, or condition enforcement. Compliance with this paragraph is a duty of every Covenant officer, employee, contractor, and delegated actor; failure to comply is itself a material constitutional breach subject to Section 10.2.4.

1. **Supersession and Administrative Continuity:** At Covenant ratification under the Ratification and Supersession Framework, every pre-Covenant law, treaty, agreement, constitution, charter, license, office, privilege, and claim of authority is superseded. An old rule may continue only as a revocable Covenant administrative rule where an express Covenant body adopts or continues it for a specified function, it does not conflict with this Covenant or Article X, it passes conflict-free legality review, and every metric materially supporting it remains subject to Article IV, Section 4.7. Such continuity is delegation under this Covenant, not inherited validity, parallel legality, national sovereignty, or a presumption against repeal. Old institutions, registries, records, systems, and personnel may serve only an expressly assigned Covenant administrative function and acquire no authority from prior status. The provisional EB may issue temporary administrative directives to maintain stability within its lawful jurisdiction, but each directive expires within 2 years unless explicitly codified after Article X, conflict-free legality review, and applicable Metric Integrity review. No continuity, emergency, retry, or expired directive may restore the old legal order.

2. **The Oath of Office:** Every EB member, Expert Reserve member, Constitutional Court justice, and Epistemic Council member shall take the following oath before assuming office:

   *"I swear to protect every person from coercion and bodily abuse, to preserve the planetary systems that sustain us, and to acknowledge my own fallibility. I shall test reason, evidence, ideology, tradition, inherited wisdom, and present interest with equal humility; remain answerable for the consequences of my judgment; preserve lawful continuity; receive lawful scrutiny, dissent, and correction as service to the same constitutional whole; cooperate without*

*surrendering independent judgment or concealing error; and serve persons, communities, humanity, future generations, and Earth. This I swear, without reservation or exception.”*

### Section 11.5: Revision of Rule Zero

The initial rendition of Rule Zero, drafted by the independently selected provisional Expert Body and provisional Constitutional Court and reviewed under Section 11.3(6), shall be the foundation of the Covenant. Future generations may revise this rendition through the following mechanism:

a) **Presentation of Qualms:** The Expert Body, by 2/3 supermajority acting as a collective, may present a formal statement of qualms with the current rendition of Rule Zero to the Constitutional Court, specifying the proposed revision and the reasoning for it.

b) **Initiation by the Court:** The Constitutional Court may, by simple majority of its members, initiate the double lock revision process. If the Court declines, it shall publish reasons, and the Expert Reserve Assembly may by majority vote request a single reconsideration, which the Court shall decide by simple majority; if the Court declines again, the qualms are archived and no revision proceeds.

c) **The Double Lock:** Two simultaneous votes are held:

   1. The Constitutional Court votes to approve or reject the proposed revision.
   2. A global referendum of valid votes cast approves or rejects the proposed revision.

d) **Ratification:** The revision is adopted only if BOTH the Constitutional Court (by a 2/3 supermajority of its members) AND the global referendum (by 75% of valid votes cast) approve. If either fails, the revision is rejected, and no further revision may be proposed on the same grounds for 10 years. Grounds are the same when the proposed revision relies on substantially the same asserted defect, evidence, and operative provisions; the Constitutional Court shall adjudicate sameness in a published decision. This bar does not apply to the compulsory permanent review under Section 11.3(6).

This Section provides the exclusive amendment route for the operational rendition of Rule Zero. A Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4 may not amend, repeal, replace, or alter the operational rendition; its authority concerning Rule Zero is limited to the certification under Section 12.4 that the Convention’s proposed text does not violate the three fixed principles of Section 11.1. For avoidance of doubt, the 10-year bar on substantially the same grounds binds any Convention-sourced attempt concerning the same subject matter as a failed 11.5 revision; the Constitutional Court shall adjudicate sameness under the same standard stated in this subsection. No provision of Article XII, including Section 12.9(b), shall be read to authorize a Convention to supply a lower-threshold route around this Section for revision of the operational rendition.

e) **Archival:** Every rendition of Rule Zero, the original and all revisions, shall be permanently archived in the public ledger. The archive holds the full record of how that foundation changed over time.

## ARTICLE XII: GENERAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

### Section 12.1: Supremacy

This Covenant is the supreme law of the planet. Any policy, practice, or law inconsistent with its provisions is void.

Rule Zero (Article XI) takes precedence over all other articles.

At ratification, claims of national or state sovereignty; inherited borders, which have no jurisdictional dignity, asserted as jurisdiction, resource title, or a power to exclude; every non-Covenant military, private army, militia, or armed formation; every monetary authority outside recorded EB authority and every act of private or fractional-reserve money creation; every inherited office or claim of authority by birth, wealth, or prior national office; and every property claim inconsistent with stewardship or Article X are void. No amendment, revision, replacement, dissolution, Constitutional Convention, emergency, retry, delegation, administrative-continuity rule, or other continuity clause may restore the nation-state order, territorial secession, independent armed force, outside monetary authority, private money creation, inherited authority, absolute property title, or parallel pre-Covenant legality. A purported act of restoration is void and creates no authority.

### Section 12.2: Good faith

All officers, experts, and citizens shall interpret and implement this Covenant in good faith, with the understanding that its purpose is the flourishing of humanity and the preservation of Earth.

### Section 12.3: Humility before the unknown

No system is infallible. Future generations shall have the right to amend, revise, or replace this Covenant through the mechanisms provided herein, provided they never violate the principles of Rule Zero or restore any order barred by Section 12.1.

### Section 12.4: Constitutional convention

If the Constitutional Court and the EB concur by joint declaration (each voting 2/3), and the Expert Reserve Assembly concurs by separate majority vote, a full Constitutional Convention may be convened to rewrite any portion of this Covenant. No Constitutional Convention may amend, suspend, or repeal the principles of Rule Zero as defined in Article XI, Section 11.1, revise the operational rendition that Section 11.5 protects, alter the Section 11.5 double-lock revision process itself, or restore any order barred by Section 12.1. Revision of Rule Zero, whether its principles declared in Section 11.1 or its operational rendition, proceeds exclusively through the double-lock process in Article XI, Section 11.5 and is not subject to Convention ratification at the Section 12.4 60% referendum bar.

**Ultra-vires convening sanction.** If a Constitutional Convention's proposed text is found by the Constitutional Court under the finding required for ratification below, by a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1, or on referendum failure grounded in a published Court or bench determination, to violate Rule Zero, the operational rendition that Section 11.5 protects, or Section 12.1, each member of the Expert Body, the Constitutional Court, and the Expert Reserve

Assembly who voted for the joint declaration convening that Convention is subject to individual sanction as follows: (i) removal from the office through which they voted, under Article X, Section 10.2.4, adjudicated by a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 within 90 days of the ultra-vires finding, and where the Constitutional Court is itself the source of the ultra-vires finding, an additional substitute bench drawn under the same Section shall adjudicate the removal of any voting justice to prevent self-adjudication of the sanction; (ii) 15-year ineligibility for any Covenant office, pool, panel, bench draw, or Convention delegate seat; and (iii) forfeiture of any pension, tenure benefit, honorarium, or preferential eligibility attaching to the office. This sanction is separate from and additional to the voiding of the Convention's output under this Section, and neither route excuses the other. Good-faith disagreement over the meaning of Rule Zero, its operational rendition, or Section 12.1, evidenced by contemporaneous published reasons that engage substantively with the affected principle or bar, is a full defense; the burden of establishing good faith rests on the person invoking it by clear and convincing evidence. Members who voted against the joint declaration, or who abstained on published reasoned grounds, are not subject to this sanction. Repeated convening on the same or a substantially similar ultra-vires text, after a prior ultra-vires finding, defeats the good-faith defense as to every member who voted for the joint declaration on the repeat convening. The Expert Reserve Assembly's separate majority vote is treated identically to a joint-declaration vote for the purposes of this paragraph.

**Citizen-Initiated Convention.** A Convention under this Section may also be convened upon a petition signed by at least 5% of registered adult citizens globally, provided that at least 1% of registered adult citizens in each of at least 4 of the six Covenant statistical regions, or, until those regions become operational, the Founding Macroregions under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.1), have signed. The global 5% and the per-region 1% minima are cumulative; neither substitutes for the other. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall verify the signatures ministerially, and the Constitutional Court shall certify only that the petition is within Section 12.1 and Rule Zero limits; certification is limited to legality and is not discretionary as to policy. A citizen-initiated Convention is subject to every other requirement, limit, and safeguard of this Section, including the Convention Blind Spot Report.

Before delegates are selected, the Epistemic Council shall publish a Convention Blind Spot Report identifying the epistemic assumptions, representation gaps, and lock-in risks most likely to affect the Convention. The report is advisory and shall neither authorize nor block the Convention.

**Delegate Selection.** The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall constitute the Convention through constrained global sortition as a body of no fewer than 100 and no more than 200 delegates:

a) At least 60% of delegates shall be citizens selected by stratified lot from the global adult population under the stratification rules in Article V, Section 5.2(b). No person may volunteer or campaign for selection.

b) No more than 40% of delegates shall be persons selected by constrained lot from applicants meeting publicly defined minimum thresholds in constitutional law, comparative governance, institutional design, public administration, or other competence relevant to the Convention's agenda. Qualification thresholds shall be proposed by an independent panel of jurists and system methodologists drawn by lot by the Secretariat, approved by 60% of the CGA and Epistemic Council legality review, and the qualified applicant pool shall undergo 3-auditor independent reproduction under Section 12.7(b.1) prior to the draw. Qualification is a binary threshold; no assessor may rank candidates who meet it. The affiliation-cluster cap in Article II, Section 2.2 applies verbatim to the qualified-delegate applicant pool and to the qualification-threshold proposal panel constituted under this subsection: no disclosed affiliation, institution, employer, funder lineage, or coordinated applicant cluster (defined as candidates sharing controlling organizational, financial, or familial ties) shall constitute more than one-fifth of the pool's candidates; related affiliations aggregate on the basis of the disclosures required by this subsection; the caps are administered ministerially by the Independent Sortition Secretariat; no candidate is excluded solely for affiliation, but a candidate whose cluster already fills its cap shall not be drawn while the cap is reached. Three independent auditors selected by lot from a CGA-certified pool shall reproduce each pool formation and draw under the same procedure the Article II successor pools follow.

No person who served within the preceding 15 years on the EB, Constitutional Court, Epistemic Council, or Expert Reserve may serve as a delegate. No Founder may serve. All delegates shall disclose conflicts and recuse from provisions affecting their direct personal interests. The Convention shall decide by two-thirds of its delegates present, with a quorum of 60%.

**Duration, Output, and Review.** The Convention shall publish its proposed text within 18 months of its first session. The proposed text shall be published for a 180-day public review period. The Epistemic Council shall publish a post-Convention review of the proposed text within 90 days of its publication. The Convention may revise the text once in response to public comment and the Council's review, and shall transmit a final text to the referendum authority within 24 months of its first session. If the Convention does not transmit a final text by that deadline, it dissolves and its records transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7; reconvening requires a new decision under this Section.

**Ratification.** The Convention's final text is adopted only upon:

1. A finding by the Constitutional Court, by at least 5 of its 7 members or by a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1, that the proposed text does not violate Rule Zero or Section 12.1; and
2. Approval by 60% of valid votes cast in a global referendum administered under the independent mechanism in Article IV, Section 4.6.

No body whose structure, composition, authority, or mandate the Convention's output would alter may exercise a ratification veto on that output. The EB, CGA, and Expert Reserve Assembly may publish reasoned positions but may not condition ratification on their approval. If the referendum fails, no Convention on substantially the same agenda may be convened for 5 years; the Constitutional Court shall adjudicate sameness in a published decision.

### Section 12.5: Anti-Dynasty safeguard

a) No person may serve on the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, or Epistemic Council if their parent, sibling, child, or spouse served on that same body within the preceding 15 years.

a.1) No person may serve on either chamber of the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, on the Independent Metrics Council, in senior staff of the Independent Sortition Secretariat, as Peacekeeping Corps commander above brigade level, or on the Provisional Command Council under Article VIII, Section 8.1.1 if their parent, sibling, child, or spouse served in the same position, on the same chamber, or on the same Council within the preceding 15 years. This bar applies to the Provisional Command Council notwithstanding the exemption in subsection (d) for the Citizen Grievance Assembly with respect to the Council seat drawn from the CGA. For purposes of this subsection, "senior staff of the Independent Sortition Secretariat" means the director, the deputies, and every employee at the two highest administrative tiers under the published Secretariat staffing plan. "Peacekeeping Corps commander above brigade level" is defined by the command-chain procedure enacted under Article VIII, Section 8.1.1; pending that procedure, this bar applies to any commander of a formation of 1,000 or more personnel, any commander exercising operational authority over capability equivalent to such a formation, and any commander of a formation structured or subdivided to evade this bar.

a.2) No person may serve on a Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly governance body if their parent, sibling, child, or spouse served on that same body within the preceding 10 years. For purposes of this subsection, "governance body" of a Local Cultural Council or Regional Coordinating Assembly means the formal decision-making organ of the Council or Assembly and any sub-body exercising delegated Covenant authority on its behalf. A Local Cultural Council whose Article VI Charter reflects a customary institution in which kinship structure is intrinsic to the lawful selection method may petition for a narrow exemption from this subsection, decided by a conflict-free Constitutional Court or substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 on a published finding that the customary structure is documented, is consistent with Article X, does not concentrate wealth, coercive capacity, or Covenant appointment power in the exempted lineage, and remains subject to individual exit under Article VI. An exemption applies only within the petitioning Local Cultural Council; it does not extend to Regional Coordinating Assembly governance, does not affect subsections (a), (a.1), or (f), and expires with the Charter that supports it.

b) All candidates for a body covered by subsection (a), (a.1), (a.2), or (f) must submit a sworn family-tree affidavit covering 4 generations, verified through a privacy-protective, conflict-free process subject to Constitutional Court legality review. False statements shall result in immediate disqualification and permanent ineligibility for any Covenant office after due process.

c) A privacy-protective independent verifier selected by lot from a CGA-certified forensic pool shall conduct randomized kinship verification of no less than 5% of candidates per cycle for each covered body. DNA analysis may be used only where necessary to test a relationship material to subsection (a), (a.1), (a.2), or (f), with informed notice, data minimization, destruction after final challenge, and no general genetic database. The Constitutional Court may review legality but may not select the sample or verifier. A candidate who refuses a lawful, necessary verification may be disqualified after independent review.

d) This section does not apply to the Citizen Grievance Assembly, whose members are selected by random lottery and serve a single term with no renewal.

e) The bar in subsection (a), (a.1), (a.2), or (f) does not apply where a relative's service was undertaken to exclude the person from a Covenant body, on a published finding under a conflict-free process; a demonstrated exclusionary purpose defeats the kinship bar.

f) **Cross-body cooling-off (asymmetric, with concentration cap).** No person may serve on the Expert Body if their parent, sibling, child, or spouse serves on, or served within the preceding 8 years on, the Constitutional Court, the Epistemic Council, the Expert Reserve, either chamber of the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, or the Independent Metrics Council. This bar is asymmetric: it addresses the concentration of familial reach in the most powerful body when its checking, force-audit, or metric bodies are staffed by relatives. It does not bar service on the Constitutional Court, Epistemic Council, Expert Reserve, Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, or Independent Metrics Council by a person whose family is or was on any other body listed in this subsection; the same-body bar in subsection (a) or (a.1) continues to govern those cases. The 8-year period runs from the last day of the relative's service. In addition, no person may serve on the Constitutional Court, Epistemic Council, Expert Reserve, either chamber of the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, or the Independent Metrics Council if two or more of that person's parents, siblings, children, or spouses simultaneously hold seats on any combination of those five bodies; a candidate seeking a seat that would produce such concentration is disqualified for that seat, and where an existing concentration arises through simultaneous confirmation, the seat drawn latest in time is deemed unfilled and returns to its selection process for redraw.

#### Section 12.6: Nondelegable human authority and accountable automation

a) **Risk Proportionality.** Automation shall be governed by risk. Low-risk clerical, translation, scheduling, accessibility, simulation, and advisory tools may be used with controls proportionate to likely harm. The following requirements apply whenever an automated output can materially affect rights, status, public resources, infrastructure, planetary systems, or physical safety.

b) **Nondelegable Decisions.** No artificial-intelligence or automated system may make the final decision to permanently exclude a candidate; authorize force; issue or contract currency; declare or renew an emergency; certify a rights violation; impose criminal or civil punishment; order infrastructure disconnection; or issue a final constitutional ruling. An automated output has made the final decision when a human lacks practical authority, relevant competence, sufficient time, or adequate information to reject it.

c) **Named Human Owner.** Every consequential automated recommendation shall identify, before action, a human decision owner with demonstrated competence relevant to the decision. That owner shall have legal authority to reject the recommendation, shall record independent reasons, and bears legal and professional liability for the decision. Where this Covenant requires a vote, tribunal, or dual key, automation cannot replace any member or key and each participating human remains individually responsible.

d) **Substantive Review.** Human review must test material assumptions, evidence, uncertainty, foreseeable distributional effects, rights risks, and available rights-consistent alternatives capable of meeting the stated purpose. Mere approval of a default, unexplained acceptance, review at an impossible volume or speed, or deference based only on machine confidence is rubber-stamping and constitutes a violation of duty.

e) **Provenance and Reproduction.** Consequential systems shall maintain tamper-evident records of data provenance, lawful basis, model and software identity, version, parameters, prompts or material inputs, outputs, human interventions, access, and deployment time. A high-impact output affecting a nondelegable decision shall be independently reproduced or validated by technically qualified persons using segregated infrastructure before final action, except during the narrow emergency acceleration in paragraph (h). Trade secrecy or contractor ownership shall not defeat access, audit, or reproduction.

f) **Notice, Contestability, and Appeal.** A person materially affected shall receive timely notice that automation was used, the identity and authority of the human owner, the material factors and uncertainty, and instructions for contesting the output. The person is entitled to a meaningful human appeal before an independent, competent reviewer who did not request, build, execute, or initially approve the system or decision. Protected information may be summarized or reviewed under secure procedure but may not erase the substance of appeal.

g) **Manual and Offline Continuity.** Every body using a consequential automated system shall maintain tested manual or offline procedures sufficient to preserve essential services, due process, command authentication, monetary control, and records during compromise, outage, model withdrawal, or lawful suspension. No body's constitutional authority may depend exclusively on a proprietary model, network connection, or single technical operator.

h) **Emergency Use.** An immediate threat to life may accelerate reproduction, notice, or ordinary sequencing only to the minimum extent necessary. It does not permit an automated final decision, erase the named human owner's responsibility, bypass any constitutional dual key for force or emergency authority, or prevent preservation of logs. Full independent reproduction, notice, and retrospective audit shall begin within 72 hours. Any continuing or renewed action must satisfy ordinary process.

i) **Separation and Enforcement.** No body may be requester, system operator or executor, and final reviewer of the same extraordinary automated power. The CC may remedy constitutional violations but may not operate systems it finally reviews. The ICPI reviews coercive automation; the Metric Integrity Review governs challenged metrics; neither may replace the competent human decision-maker. A decision made in material violation of this Section is voidable, and affected persons are entitled to correction and reparation where harm occurred.

### Section 12.7: Continuity of lawful function

a) **No Institutional Kill Switch.** No vacancy, term expiry, missed deadline, failed draw, exhausted pool, rejected proposal, suspended metric, network outage, pending appeal, dissolution, incapacity, or institutional conflict may interrupt essential services, rights protection, defensive command, monetary administration, record custody, grievance access, selection, audit, inspection, or referendum capacity. A deadline ends discretion or triggers transfer; it does not switch off the governed function.

a.1) **No Benefit from Caused Delay.** A body or officeholder whose avoidable delay, obstruction, or manufactured conflict caused or contributed to a missed deadline or a continuity transfer under this Section may not benefit from the fallback it triggered: it may not thereby extend its term, preserve its appointment or authority, avoid review, or receive preference, and the fallback operator's lawful decision stands.

b) **Continuity Hierarchy.** Unless a more specific clause supplies an equally continuous mechanism, authority passes automatically in this order: (1) the named lawful deputy or successor; (2) the first available conflict-free alternate from a pre-certified standing pool; (3) a temporary holder drawn under a pre-published succession rule; and (4) a freshly drawn temporary citizen-and-qualified panel administered by the Independent Sortition Secretariat. If digital administration is unavailable, the same draw, authentication, notice, record, and challenge functions shall operate through tested offline procedures and distributed public custody.

b.1) **External Continuity for Sortition and Records.** The External Sortition and Records Continuity Network constituted under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.4) is the preconstituted, institutionally external successor for the Independent Sortition Secretariat's ministerial sortition, notice, authentication, and record custody. It activates automatically if: the ISS gives authenticated incapacity or recusal notice; or the ISS misses the earlier of a constitutional deadline and the latest start time in the prepublished tested continuity procedure. Activation under either condition requires no ISS, Founder, CGA, Court, or provisional approval.

If every legally capable component of the ISS is unavailable or conflicted but neither of the automatic conditions is met, any Network team, the CGA, the Epistemic Council, or the EB may petition the Constitutional Court for an activation determination. The Court (or a substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 if the Court is conflicted) shall determine activation within 14 days on documented evidence that no ISS component remains both legally capable and conflict-free. The determination is subject to review by the canonical-record tribunal under this subsection and creates no stay of the continuity function pending review. An activation determination under this paragraph is not a finding against the ISS and creates no liability or adverse inference.

The Network may only: receive and preserve submissions and records; maintain authenticated hashes and protected distributed copies; issue notices already required by law; execute published code against frozen or lawfully certified pools using fixed constraints, entropy, and counters; transmit canonical outputs and records; and convene panels already independently authorized by this Covenant. The Network may not create or change eligibility, screen, qualify, or rank, choose or reject an outcome, rerun a valid draw, adjudicate, set policy, vote for another body, appoint through discretion, or enlarge its mandate or tenure. A person produced by a valid draw is selected by this Covenant, not appointed by the Network.

Every event shall have a unique public identifier derived from its function, the triggering record or deadline, and the last lawful record hash. Pool, constraints, source order, observation time, null marker, seed, and counter shall be fixed before identities or outputs. One canonical reproducible output is legally effective. A conflicting draw, input-substituted draw, observation-time-altered draw, or later same-event draw is void. A valid pre-activation ISS result survives; after activation, the ISS may not administer that event until lawful restoration.

**Canonical-record dispute tribunal.** A dispute concerning Network activation, event identity, record ordering, pool state, conflict status, or the last lawful record hash shall be decided by a temporary 7-member tribunal constituted under Article IV, Section 4.7(i): 3 citizens selected by lot and 4 conflict-free jurists or forensic methodologists selected by lot. Its draw shall be executed in parallel by conflict-free non-team external-registry institutions under the canonical mechanism, not by the ISS or the Network. The tribunal may decide only the disputed activation, event identity, record ordering, pool state, conflict status, and last lawful record hash; it may not screen, rank, or choose an outcome, or set policy. It shall decide by simple majority. Until a decision is reached, the last uncontested lawful state governs, and disputed draws are not final.

**Finality and later challenges.** A tribunal decision under the preceding paragraph is final for the same event on the record before it. Repeated grounds or evidence that was available through documented ordinary diligence earlier shall be summarily denied and may not reopen, stay, suspend, or invalidate the event, the canonical draw, or the record. A later challenge is admitted only on specific prima facie evidence that is materially new, was not available despite documented ordinary diligence earlier, and could change the canonical trigger, inputs, or output because of forgery, altered input or record, undisclosed material conflict, or a material authentication or jurisdictional defect. A tribunal constituted under the preceding paragraph shall decide admissibility; filing or admissibility alone creates no stay. A stay of an uncompleted draw may issue only on clear and substantial evidence that the challenge is likely to change the result and that integrity harm from proceeding exceeds continuity harm from delay. A stay is limited to the disputed material, expires at the latest safe start time for the draw, and may not be renewed on the same evidence. At expiry, the prior final determination controls unless invalidated. Continued review, correction, or reparation under other provisions of this Covenant remains possible. A final finding of materially relied-on forgery, altered canonical inputs, concealed disqualifying conflict, or material authentication or jurisdictional defect means that the prior draw was not valid. Correction using fixed code, the lawful canonical inputs, and the applicable counter is not a prohibited rerun of a valid draw.

For purposes of subsection (g), distributed custody, registry and mirror operation, offline readiness, testing, external audit, and successor draws are continuously active continuity functions from Day 22. Necessary assets and the apportioned last lawful appropriation transfer automatically; the ISS, any incumbent Network team, the Founder, a donor, or a prospective beneficiary may not reduce, delay, redirect, or condition them.

The external registry reopens after Day 22 and remains continuously self-enrolling through independent mirrors under Article XI, Section 11.4(0.4) eligibility, disclosure, conflict, and non-overlap rules, except that founding date requirements do not apply. Founding Macroregions apply only until permanent Covenant statistical regions become operational and are then automatically replaced. Before each two-year Section 12.7(h) test, a prepublished procedure shall fix the snapshot time and challenge window; authenticated pre-snapshot entries are eligible for that cycle, later entries enter the next cycle. Every available conflict-free registry institution not serving on a Network team independently executes and publishes the same successor draw from the canonical code, snapshot, constraints, entropy, and counter. Any identical canonical output is valid despite another institution's failure. The ISS and incumbent teams may not execute or control the successor draw. Refusal, incapacity, or conflict advances the counter against the frozen snapshot. A conflict-free incumbent holds only custody until the successor accepts and reproduces the record, with no replacement power or preference.

If digital systems fail, each acting Network team shall use the same authenticated offline code, records, notice, challenge, and draw procedure. When communications resume, each acting team shall synchronize its signed continuity record with the independent mirrors and publish any discrepancy. Each Network team and records custodian shall keep protected personal material encrypted and separately controlled. Public verification shall use hashes, privacy-preserving commitments, and only those inputs and transformations necessary to reproduce the outcome without disclosing protected personal data.

A successor ISS is constituted under Article XIII, Section 13.3(a), using lawful Section 12.7 substitutes for the CGA and Court if they are unavailable. Every conflict-free non-team registry institution executes and publishes the prepublished restoration test. A unique reproducible result is legally effective; neither the ISS nor the Network may choose inputs, certify the result, or audit itself. Disputes shall use the canonical-record tribunal under this subsection.

Once the result establishes full records, offline capability, lawful staff, and published criteria, authority returns automatically and the Network transfers remaining custody ministerially. Failure of the CGA, Court, ISS, or one registry institution may not block restoration through lawful substitutes or independent reproduction.

c) **Procedure and Evidence Failure.** The most recent lawful procedure, service level, appropriation, coefficient, or non-conflicted Covenant administrative rule continues until a replacement becomes operational, unless that item itself caused the constitutional defect. No pre-Covenant rule continues by inherited force or as parallel law. If the operative Covenant rule caused the defect, the function shall continue through direct observation, primary records, multiple independent indicators, competent recorded human judgment, and the least harmful reversible course. No invalid metric, automated output, expired emergency power, national sovereignty claim, or authority barred by Section 12.1 continues through this clause.

d) **Function Is Not Personal Tenure.** Continuity does not extend an individual term, revive a disqualified person, preserve a provisional founding officeholder, or convert temporary service into permanent eligibility. The function passes to a different lawful operator before or at expiry. Prior service may recur only where the governing Article permits it and only through a new public draw, full conflict review, and the narrowest caretaker authority after every eligible alternate is exhausted. A single-term or non-renewable-term prohibition, an absolute Article X disqualification, and the founding reset can never be bypassed; if such a prohibition applies, continuity passes to a non-office ministerial panel from a different certified pool.

e) **Dissolution and Transfer.** No body with pending protections, investigations, appeals, records, funds, or essential ministerial work dissolves until a lawful successor has received them. Members whose terms end lose decision authority on schedule, but records, appropriations, access credentials, and pending matters transfer automatically and may not be withheld, destroyed, or allowed to lapse. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall maintain a consolidated public reporter of substitute-bench and substitute-tribunal decisions under Articles IV, VIII, X, and XII, citing the decisions each follows or departs from.

f) **Status Quo Is Not Stagnation.** Continuity preserves service and lawful capacity, not a challenged policy outcome. A caretaker may maintain life, safety, access, payments, records, and existing Covenant-authorized reversible operations; it may also act where inaction would itself cause imminent harm. It may not exploit continuity to initiate offensive force, entrench personnel, enlarge jurisdiction, avoid correction, or make an irreversible departure not required to prevent greater irreversible harm.

g) **Funding Follows Function.** The last lawful appropriation and necessary operating assets transfer automatically with a continuity function, adjusted by the global median inflation rate where applicable. Founder-seeded resources already placed in the irrevocably transparent founding trust remain available only under ministerial terms compatible with Article XI, Section 11.4. Any term affecting law, policy, appointment, ratification, allocation, or review is void. Compatible Founder-seeded resources are not treated as a defect, office, appointment power, or policy veto.

h) **Mandatory Testing.** Every standing body shall test its succession, offline operation, pool exhaustion, record transfer, and reduced-capacity procedures at least once every 2 years. A failed test triggers correction and retesting within 90 days without suspending the function.

### Section 12.8: Constitutional cooperation without collusion

a) **One System, Differentiated Duties.** The EB, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, CGA, ICPI, Epistemic Council, Metrics Council, Independent Sortition Secretariat, temporary bodies, and every other Covenant institution are differentiated organs of one constitutional system. None is an internal enemy merely because it petitions, dissents, audits, inspects, questions, appeals, refuses an unlawful instruction, presents adverse evidence, or orders lawful correction. This Section governs official incentives and conduct; it does not compel private feeling, ideological conformity, or agreement.

b) **Persons Are Participants and Beneficiaries.** The constitutional-organism description concerns reciprocal function, not state ownership of human beings. A person or community may cooperate in common purposes while retaining conscience, rights, identity, personal movement, association, criticism, and lawful refusal. Personal or community exit means personal movement, disassociation, refusal, or change of lawful affiliation under Article X; it never means territorial withdrawal, secession, physical boundary closure, or removal of land, people, resources, or public functions from the Covenant. Institutional unity never justifies sacrificing a person as an expendable means, suppressing dissent, withholding remedy, or weakening Article X.

c) **Comity Without Merger.** Every body shall provide timely, specific, proportionate, and lawful records, expertise, access, or operational assistance requested by another body acting within its mandate. If compliance is unlawful, impossible, or would impair an independent pending judgment, the recipient shall preserve the relevant material and publish or securely transmit a reasoned, reviewable refusal identifying the precise constraint. Assistance transfers no jurisdiction, vote, command, authorship, or responsibility, and no body may direct another body's independent conclusion.

d) **Disclosure, Cure, and Review.** A body or officeholder that knows of a material defect in an official act shall promptly notify the competent reviewing body and materially affected persons where lawful and safe, preserve the complete relevant record, identify known consequences and deadlines, and propose or undertake any cure already within its authority. Timely, complete, good-faith disclosure made before compulsory discovery or independent exposure (or promptly upon discovery where earlier notice was impossible despite documented ordinary diligence) is not by itself evidence of bad faith and shall not aggravate a sanction. It does not erase the underlying act, limit an affected person's remedy or reparation, bar independent review, or excuse an otherwise mandatory consequence. The protection does not apply to knowing concealment or material falsehood, corruption, direct or indirect retaliation, obstruction, destruction of evidence, or substantially repeated unlawful conduct after authoritative notice.

d.1) **Independent Initiation.** Disclosure under subsection (d) does not depend on the implicated body's cooperation. An affected person or community, LCC, RCA, the CGA, EC, ICPI, a Covenant auditor, or a qualified researcher presenting disclosed evidence may petition for independent review of a suspected undisclosed material defect in an official act. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a conflict-free intake clerk from the forensic and plural-law pools used for Section 5.4(c). The clerk shall open review only upon standing and specific prima facie evidence of an undisclosed material defect; repetitive filings without materially new evidence may be denied with reasons, subject to one conflict-free procedural appeal under the substitute-tribunal model in Article IV, Section 4.7(i). Acceptance of intake automatically and immediately activates, without any finding on the merits: the evidence-preservation duty already imposed by subsection (d) on every body or officeholder with custody of the relevant record; protected, retaliation-free access for the petitioner and any identified witness to participate in the review and to receive lawful assistance under subsection (c); and the anti-retaliation and no-hostage-taking protections of subsection (f), extended to the petitioner, any identified witness, and the intake clerk. These protections attach on acceptance of intake alone, apply whether the review is ultimately confirmed, denied, or transferred, and neither constitute nor imply a finding that a defect occurred. An opened review proceeds to the competent reviewing body for that class of act under this Covenant's existing jurisdiction; this subsection creates no new adjudicative body and transfers no jurisdiction, vote, command, authorship, or responsibility.

e) **Problem-Solving Before Escalation.** Except where immediate action is necessary to protect a person or right, prevent irreversible harm or evidence destruction, address corruption, stop action plainly outside lawful authority, or meet a constitutional deadline, an inter-body enforcement dispute shall begin with a written notice that states the alleged defect, preserves existing rights and records, identifies the competent decision-maker, and permits the respondent to propose a lawful cure. Consultation may clarify evidence, consequences, uncertainty, operational dependencies, and feasible remedies; it may not bargain away a person's rights, negotiate the merits of a pending adjudication, or delay a subpoena, inspection, appeal, protective order, mandatory disclosure, or independent review.

f) **No Retaliation or Constitutional Hostage-Taking.** No person or body may be disadvantaged, directly or through another actor, for a protected disclosure, lawful assistance, testimony, dissent, petition, appeal, refusal of an unlawful instruction, or participation in review. One body's breach, refusal, criticism, or adverse finding never suspends another body's duty to protect rights, preserve evidence, maintain essential services, obey a lawful final order, or perform its own mandate. Public services, appropriations, appointments, records, access, and remedies may not be withheld to extract institutional concessions.

g) **No Conflict Dividend.** No person or body shall gain compensation, term extension, appointment preference, jurisdiction, command, voting weight, or automatic budget increase because of the number or outcome of accusations, adverse findings, sanctions, or disputes it produces. Neutral, independently audited workload funding remains permissible but may not depend on reaching a preferred merits outcome. Public records shall separately identify who disclosed a defect, who verified it, who helped repair it, and whether affected persons received remedy; repair shall not be represented as one institution defeating another, and no scalar cooperation score shall determine authority or tenure.

h) **Visible Interfaces and Independent Merits.** Material inter-body requests, refusals, defect notices, proposed cures, and implementation reports shall enter a common public docket. Lawfully protected material may be withheld only under existing privacy or security rules, with a public metadata entry identifying the withholding authority and review route where disclosure of that metadata is safe. Joint meetings and exercises may improve handovers, crisis coordination, and correction practice, but may not make a joint merits decision, pre-commit a later reviewer, trade enforcement outcomes, conceal an ex parte communication, or replace separately reasoned and attributable acts.

i) **Anti-Collusion Boundary.** Cooperation may not merge chains of command; combine detection, adjudication, and execution in one interested actor; create shared appointment control; suppress minority or public criticism; coordinate false accounts; exchange reciprocal non-enforcement; or evade recusal, audit, inspection, appeal, or publication. Every participant retains an independent duty to expose illegality and material error. Good-faith disagreement is compatible with cooperation; coordinated concealment is not.

j) **Incentive Audit and Correction.** The CGA's Annual Mission Fidelity Record and the Epistemic Council's Blind Spot work shall examine whether appropriations, promotions, jurisdictional rules, performance measures, communication practices, or repeated inter-body procedures reward escalation, concealment, passive resistance, retaliatory enforcement, or collusive peace. A finding does not create new jurisdiction. It shall identify the observed payoff structure and refer correction to the existing lawful budget, ethics, Metric Integrity, Mission Fidelity, adjudicative, or amendment process while essential functions continue.

### Section 12.9: Operational parameter calibration

a) **Purpose and Limit.** This Section supplies a lawful, evidence-gated route to recalibrate, within a previously adopted range, a single operational parameter individually listed on the Calibratable Parameter Schedule established by subsection (c). It is not a general amendment procedure, may not originate new text, powers, offices, or Schedule entries, and may not be used for any parameter excluded by subsection (b) or governed by a more specific provision.

b) **Categorical Exclusions from Streamlined Calibration.** No parameter of any of the following kinds may ever be listed on the Calibratable Parameter Schedule or recalibrated under this Section, regardless of how it is otherwise described: the size, composition, or membership criteria of any Covenant body; a term of office or tenure limit; a voting, removal, or amendment threshold; a jurisdictional boundary or allocation of authority between constitutional actors; an eligibility rule for any office, panel, or pool; a right recognized in Article X or a Section 10.3 emergency safeguard; a Rule Zero principle under Article XI, Section 11.1; an order barred by Section 12.1; a use-of-force or command safeguard under Article VIII; an allocation of monetary authority under Article IX; and any parameter already governed by a more specific, stricter bespoke revision route, including Article IX, Section 9.3.1's Welfare Standard basket competition, Section 9.2.5's monetary buffer coefficient route, Article I, Section 1.5's Domain Allocation Commission, Article XIII, Section 13.4(e)'s decadal epistemic amendments, and Article IX, Section 9.5.1(c) and Section 9.5.4(d)'s locked transition schedules. Rule Zero, its principles and its operational rendition, is governed exclusively by Article XI, Section 11.5 and is not a calibratable parameter, a bespoke revision route, or subject to amendment or revision through a Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4. This exclusion is permanent and may not itself be narrowed by any means, but it bars only the streamlined route this Section supplies. Subject to the exclusive Section 11.5 jurisdiction over Rule Zero and to Section 12.1's permanent restoration bar, every excluded parameter remains amendable through a Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4, through its applicable stricter bespoke route where one exists, or through any other amendment procedure expressly established by this Covenant; nothing in this subsection renders any structural parameter permanently unamendable. No listing, ratification, or implementation under this Section may violate this subsection; a purported listing or recalibration of an excluded parameter under this Section is void and creates no authority.

c) **The Calibratable Parameter Schedule.** The Schedule is the exclusive, published register of parameters eligible for this Section. Each entry shall state: the exact provision and parameter it identifies; the current value; the permissible calibration range; the amendment that adopted the entry; and the date of adoption. The Schedule contains no entries as of this Covenant's ratification. This empty state is a deliberate stub: the Schedule exists to record future lawful entries and is not an omission, error, or hidden transfer of authority. No parameter is therefore presently eligible for calibration under this Section; every petition filed while the Schedule remains empty is dismissed under subsection (d) for lack of an eligible listing. A parameter may be added to the Schedule, or a listed range expanded, only through a Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4 or another amendment procedure expressly established by this Covenant, subject in every case to the Categorical Exclusions in subsection (b); this Section supplies no route to create or expand a Schedule entry.

d) **Eligibility.** A petition under this Section is eligible only if the parameter is individually listed on the Schedule by citation and the proposed value lies within that entry's listed range. A petition concerning an unlisted parameter, an excluded parameter under subsection (b), or a value outside the listed range is dismissed with published reasons and is not curable by resubmission on the same ground; the petitioner's only remaining route, where the parameter is not excluded under subsection (b), is a Constitutional Convention under Section 12.4 or another amendment procedure expressly established by this Covenant.

e) **Intake.** The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a conflict-free intake clerk from the forensic-methodology pool used for subsection (c) of Article IV, Section 4.7. The clerk applies the eligibility test in subsection (d) and dismisses or dockets the petition with published reasons. A dismissal may be appealed once under the substitute-tribunal model in subsection (i) of Article IV, Section 4.7.

f) **Calibration Panel.** A docketed petition convenes a temporary Calibration Panel of 12 citizens selected by stratified lot, weighted toward persons with documented exposure to the parameter's operation, and 9 persons selected by lot from independently audited pools of statisticians, forensic methodologists, and relevant domain or comparative-institutional-design specialists. A member with service within the preceding 15 years in the body whose parameter is under review is barred, consistent with Article II, Section 2.1. The Panel shall compile the evidentiary record required by subsection (h) and recommend one replacement value within the listed range, or no change, by concurrence of at least 7 citizen members and 6 qualified members; a Panel that cannot reach that concurrence publishes a no-consensus finding with all sub-proposals and vote counts. A recommendation, once reached, is published for 90 days of public comment, and the full comment record is attached to the dossier before Court review.

g) **Legality Review.** The Constitutional Court, by simple majority of conflict-free justices, reviews only: procedural compliance; correct application of the eligibility test in subsection (d), including that the parameter is listed, the proposed value lies within the listed range, and no Categorical Exclusion under subsection (b) applies; and whether the interaction analysis required by subsection (h) was genuinely performed. It may not reweigh the Panel's evidence, select a different value, or expand a listed range. Every justice shall recuse if the petition concerns the Court's own Schedule entry; recusal of the full Court convenes a temporary 7-member substitute tribunal under the pattern of Article IV, Section 4.7(i) to perform this review instead. A curable procedural defect returns the petition to the same Panel for correction within 60 days; an incurable defect, meaning a failure of the eligibility test itself or a Categorical Exclusion, voids the petition permanently on that ground.

h) **Evidentiary Record.** A petition dossier and the Panel's recommendation shall include, as a filing requirement rather than a mere consideration: the public evidence file underlying the petition; any Panel member's dissent; a distributional-effects analysis of the current and proposed values; documented evidence of operational failure attributable to the current value, such as capture, deadlock, missed deadlines, or pool exhaustion, with dates and case identifiers; a capture-risk analysis of the proposed value; an interaction analysis identifying every other provision whose operation assumes the current value and confirming the proposed value does not defeat it; the public comment record; and a record of alternative values considered and the reasons for their rejection. A petition supported only by theoretical inadequacy is dismissed at intake.

i) **Ratification.** A petition that clears legality review is ratified by a simple majority of the seated EB members not lawfully recused and 60% of the seated CGA members not lawfully recused, matching the threshold in Article I, Section 1.5. If the petition concerns a parameter of the

EB's own Schedule entry, the Expert Reserve Assembly substitutes for the EB seat of this vote by simple majority. If the petition concerns a parameter of the CGA's own Schedule entry, a referendum administered under Article IV, Section 4.6, decided by simple majority of valid votes cast, substitutes for the CGA seat of this vote. Ratification failure bars a new petition on the same grounds for 3 years absent materially new evidence of operational failure.

j) **Implementation.** Upon ratification, the Independent Sortition Secretariat ministerially publishes the new value to the public ledger and updates the Schedule entry's current value. The new value takes effect only at the next ordinary rotation, vacancy, or fiscal-year boundary of the affected body or function and may never shorten a sitting officeholder's current term or alter a pending matter's governing rule.

k) **Continuity.** A missed deadline at any stage of this Section transfers the unfinished function and complete record under Section 12.7 to a freshly drawn replacement actor of the same type; it does not deem the petition approved, rejected, or withdrawn, and the parameter under review continues to operate at its existing value throughout. Every temporary body constituted under this Section dissolves upon completing its function and creates no continuing office, policy jurisdiction, or preferential eligibility for any Covenant position.

## ARTICLE XIII: THE EPISTEMIC COUNCIL

### Section 13.1: Purpose and principles

The Epistemic Council exists to protect the Covenant against **epistemic capture**. Epistemic capture is the condition in which a governing body becomes unable to perceive its own cognitive blind spots, cultural narrowness, metric distortions, or limitations of knowledge.

The Council is founded on four principles:

1. **Humility before the unknown.** Every system of knowledge is incomplete, and no selection pipeline is immune to drift.
2. **Diversity as an epistemic good.** A body composed of people who reason alike will make systematic errors that internal review may not detect.
3. **Separation of diagnosis from treatment.** The Council identifies epistemic problems; it does not prescribe substantive policy or govern.
4. **Authority through visibility.** The Council holds no executive, legislative, judicial, or military power. Its authority derives from access, transparent reasoning, and public scrutiny. When a Blind Spot Report or formal examination identifies a material defect implicating another body's constitutional duties, the Council shall refer the finding to the competent reviewing body (the Constitutional Court, the CGA, the Metric Integrity Review Jury, or the ICPI as applicable) within 60 days of publication. The receiving body shall acknowledge receipt within 30 days and act within its ordinary procedural deadlines. Withholding a finding that a reasonable Council would have identified as implicating another body's duties constitutes noncompliance under Section 13.11.

The Council is an independent constitutional oversight body. It is outside the Local–Regional–Global chain of command and neither outranks nor reports to the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, or Citizen Grievance Assembly.

### Section 13.2: Composition, terms, and independence

a) The Council shall consist of **9 members** selected by constrained global sortition under Section 13.3. No degree, credential, occupation, property threshold, examination score, or prior public service shall be required.

b) Members shall serve single, non-renewable **6-year terms**. Three seats shall be replaced every 2 years.

c) For the initial Council, 3 members shall serve 2 years, 3 shall serve 4 years, and 3 shall serve 6 years, assigned by public random lot after selection. Thereafter every full term shall be 6 years.

d) No member may simultaneously serve in another Covenant body or hold political office in any pre-Covenant institution.

e) No person who served in the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, or Expert Reserve during the preceding 15 years may enter the Council's selection pool.

f) For 15 years after leaving the Council, a former member may not serve in the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, or the permanent secretariat of any of those bodies. Service in a Local Cultural Council, Regional Coordinating Assembly, or Citizen Grievance Assembly remains permitted after the cooling-off periods otherwise required by this Covenant.

g) The Council shall elect a Chair from among its members for a 2-year term. No person may serve consecutive terms as Chair.

h) Membership is voluntary. Refusal to serve shall carry no penalty.

### Section 13.3: Constrained Global sortition

a) An **Independent Sortition Secretariat**, institutionally separate from the EB, CC, EC, and Expert Reserve, shall administer Council selection. Its permanent staff shall be selected through open competition under rules approved by the CGA and audited by the CC. Staff may not have served in the EB, CC, or Expert Reserve during the preceding 15 years. Staff serve renewable terms not exceeding 5 years under open competition and may not be removed by the EB, CC, EC, or Expert Reserve; staff may not select or de-select Council members or alter a pool, stratum, or draw.

The ISS shall never administer the formation, activation, membership, renewal, audit, or replacement of its own external Network under Section 12.7(b.1). Every material submission, pool state, conflict disclosure, entropy input, counter change, pending matter, access change, and sortition act shall write to independently controlled Network custody; no act is complete until a public hash and protected continuation record are replicated outside ISS control. The ISS may not withhold, delay, revoke, or be the sole gateway for any such replication. The Section 12.7(h) tests shall include complete ISS incapacity, complete institutional conflict, network loss, conflicting draws, and transfer in both directions. Failure of the ISS, CGA, or Court to participate may not stop an external test, activation, or ministerial continuity function.

b) Every 2 years, the Secretariat shall create a voluntary primary pool of **500 adult candidates** through a stratified global lottery. No candidate may campaign, purchase placement, or be nominated by another person.

c) The primary pool shall be stratified across:

1. The six Covenant statistical regions, approximately proportional to population, with no region contributing fewer than 40 or more than 140 candidates.
2. Educational background: formal STEM; formal humanities or social sciences; vocational or informal education; and traditional or indigenous knowledge systems. Each category shall constitute between 15% and 40% of the pool where sufficient volunteers exist.
3. Age: 18–35, 36–55, and 56 or older. Each cohort shall constitute between 20% and 50% of the pool.
4. Occupational experience: extractive, agricultural, or manufacturing work; service or knowledge work; care, education, or health work; governance or legal work; and unpaid, student, unemployed, or retired experience. Each category shall constitute between 10% and 40% of the pool where sufficient volunteers exist.

Until the permanent Covenant statistical regions are defined, the Founding Macroregions established before the custodian draw by Article XI, Section 11.4(0.1) shall be used for EC and CGA sortition. They carry no political or jurisdictional significance and expire upon adoption of the permanent statistical regions.

d) Each consenting candidate shall complete a non-evaluative Cognitive and Knowledge Profile recording reasoning preferences, languages, knowledge traditions, educational pathways, occupational experience, and other dimensions adopted after public review. No profile response shall be classified as correct, superior, loyal, or disloyal. Profile responses are material to the diversity ranking under subsection (g); knowing fabrication of a material profile claim is grounds for disqualification after independent review under the conflict-free procedures used for Article XII, Section 12.5(c). An independent verifier selected by lot from a CGA-certified forensic pool shall conduct randomized verification of profile truthfulness for no less than 10% of candidates per cycle, using the same privacy-protective, data-minimization, and destruction safeguards as Section 12.5(c). The verifier may review documentary evidence, conduct interviews, or request third-party confirmation; DNA analysis shall not be used for profile verification. The Constitutional Court may review legality but may not select the sample or verifier. A candidate who refuses a lawful, necessary verification may be disqualified after independent review.

e) The Secretariat shall use a published diversity model to generate feasible cohorts. The model shall be designed by a temporary committee of 9 members drawn by lot from independently audited pools: 3 statisticians, 3 affected-community methodologists, and 3 constitutional methodologists; its source code, design rationale, and validation shall be published with a Metric Passport and remain challengeable under Article IV, Section 4.7. For the initial selection, it shall evaluate 9-person cohorts. For later selections, it shall evaluate replacement cohorts of 3 against the 6 continuing members.

f) A feasible sitting Council shall, where the eligible pool permits:

1. Include at least 1 member from each Covenant statistical region.
2. Include at least 2 members whose principal knowledge pathway is vocational, informal, traditional, or indigenous.
3. Include no more than 3 members from the same educational category.
4. Include no more than 3 members from the same occupational category.
5. Include no more than 1 member from the same household.

g) Feasible cohorts shall be ranked only by measured cognitive and knowledge diversity. The final cohort shall be chosen by uniform random draw from the highest-ranked 10% of feasible cohorts. The model shall therefore constrain sortition but shall not deterministically select the members.

h) The model, source code, profile instrument, pool composition, feasible-cohort criteria, random seed, and final draw shall be published. Three independent statisticians selected by lot from a CGA-certified open pool shall audit each cycle and independently reproduce the pool formation and the final draw. The Constitutional Court shall certify legal compliance but shall neither operate the draw nor select the auditors.

i) If stratification targets cannot be met because insufficient candidates volunteer, the Secretariat shall publish the shortfall and use the nearest feasible distribution chosen by the published minimization algorithm, which minimizes the largest absolute deviation from the stratification targets; the chosen distribution, its objective value, and the algorithm's source code shall be published with the shortfall. It may not conceal, fabricate, or reclassify candidate data to satisfy a quota.

j) A vacancy with more than 18 months remaining shall be filled from the most recent primary pool by the same constrained random process, evaluated against the continuing members. A replacement serves only the remainder of the term. A vacancy with 18 months or less remaining may remain open until the next regular cycle only while at least 6 members remain able to act; any vacancy that would reduce the Council below 6 shall be filled immediately, and in no event later than 30 days from the vacancy, drawing from the standby pool under subsection (l) if the primary pool cannot supply a lawful cohort within that period.

k) **Protected Secretariat and Reserve appropriation.** The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall receive a protected annual appropriation of not less than 0.10% and not more than 0.40% of the Covenant's administrative budget, covering its own operations and the ministerial administration of the Expert Reserve under Article III. The amount within that range shall be proposed by the Secretariat, reviewed for legality by conflict-free justices of the Constitutional Court, and approved by the CGA. The EB shall not reduce, delay, or condition the appropriation. If the CGA does not decide before the fiscal year begins, the prior year's appropriation shall continue, adjusted by the global median inflation rate. From promulgation until the CGA's first approval, an initial protected appropriation of 0.20% shall vest automatically and shall be released through the transparent founding trust without Founder, provisional EB, or provisional Constitutional Court discretion. This appropriation covers ordinary sortition administration; the separate Boundary Architecture appropriation under Section 1.0.1 remains independently protected. No delay in the CGA's decision may suspend the Secretariat's administration of any draw, pool, or ministerial function under this Covenant.

l) **Standby pool.** The Secretariat shall maintain a continuous standby pool of at least 25 candidates who have completed the Cognitive and Knowledge Profile under subsection (d) and satisfy the stratification criteria under subsection (c). Applications shall remain open continuously through the Grievance Portal under Article V, Section 5.1 and equivalent offline channels; qualification is a binary threshold applied by rotating conflict-free assessors drawn by the Secretariat from independently audited pools. The standby pool refreshes on the same 2-year cycle as the primary pool, but a candidate may enter or leave the standby pool at any time. Where a vacancy under subsection (j) requires filling within 30 days, or where the primary pool is exhausted or cannot supply a lawful cohort, the Secretariat shall draw from the standby pool by the same constrained random process applied to the primary pool, evaluated against the continuing members. Draws from the standby pool are subject to the audit and reproduction requirements of subsection (h).

### Section 13.4: Diagnostic powers

The Council may exercise the following powers and no others:

a) **Independent red-teaming.** Commission independent analysis of the EB selection pipeline, CC evidentiary processes, Expert Reserve practices, metric design, knowledge exclusions, cultural assumptions, and recurring cognitive failure modes.

b) **Access to evidence.** Request and receive information relevant to its mandate, including:

1. Anonymized candidate data from all phases of the EB selection pipeline.
2. EB deliberation records, except operational security information withheld under Section 13.7.
3. Anonymized and aggregated Shadow Assessment data.
4. CC rulings, Compelling Interest findings, audit methodologies, and Frontier Sciences Audits.
5. Self-Correction Clause audits, pipeline metrics, and documentation of changes to selection criteria.

c) **Plain-language justification.** Require the EB or CC to explain within 60 days any epistemic choice concerning selection criteria, domain allocations, metric design, evidentiary standards, or the composition of a Covenant body. The responding body must identify material assumptions, uncertainties, alternatives considered, and evidence that would change its conclusion.

d) **Blind Spot Reports.** Publish at least one annual report, by approval of at least 6 of the 9 Council members, identifying:

1. Epistemic or cultural narrowness in global Covenant institutions.
2. Knowledge traditions or affected perspectives systematically excluded from deliberation.
3. Evidence of cognitive homogeneity, metric substitution, surrogation, or institutionalized bias.
4. Trends in pipeline diversity and reasoning patterns.
5. Prior Council findings that were accepted, rejected, ignored, or later shown to be materially mistaken.

Reports may criticize institutional processes and assumptions but may not diagnose the mental state of a named person or disclose the identity of a pipeline candidate.

e) **Decadal epistemic amendments.** Once per decade, propose amendments limited to epistemic architecture: selection pipeline design, composition rules, evidentiary standards, diversity safeguards, audit mechanisms, and institutional self-correction. Such amendments require 60% approval of the CGA followed by 60% approval of the EB. Rejection must be accompanied by published reasons. No proposal may alter Rule Zero or expand the Council's authority into substantive policy.

f) **Epistemic exercises.** Require anonymized participation by EB members no more than once every 3 years in structured exercises designed to measure perspective diversity, calibration drift, preference aggregation, and response to disconfirming evidence. Individual results shall remain confidential; only aggregate patterns may be published.

g) **Public testimony.** Testify before the CGA and receive epistemic concerns submitted by the public, LCCs, RCAs, or other Covenant bodies.

#### Section 13.5: Express limitations

The Council shall not:

1. Propose substantive policy in climate, health, economics, education, security, culture, or any other operational domain.
2. Veto, delay, reverse, or override any decision or ruling.
3. Command personnel, allocate resources outside its own budget, or direct the Peacekeeping Corps.
4. Remove any member of another Covenant body.
5. Suspend the EB selection pipeline acting alone. The Council's suspension recommendation under Section 13.6(c) is a diagnostic finding requiring independent Court concurrence under Section 13.6(d); it is not a unilateral suspension and does not violate this paragraph.
6. Publish classified information, private candidate data, or individual Shadow Assessments.
7. Serve as an appellate body for policy disputes disguised as epistemic complaints.
8. Require ideological conformity, compel declarations of political belief, or rank worldviews as constitutionally preferred.

The distinction between permitted diagnosis and prohibited policy advocacy shall turn on whether the Council addresses **how knowledge and judgment were constituted**, rather than which substantive outcome should be adopted.

#### Section 13.6: Formal pipeline examination and Dual-Key suspension

a) The Council may initiate a formal examination of the EB selection pipeline at any time. The examination shall cover all phases from Open Discovery through Confirmation and Mentorship and shall conclude within 6 months. If that deadline is missed, the narrow examination function and its records transfer under Article XII, Section 12.7 to a conflict-free operator; the missed deadline does not automatically suspend the pipeline or extend any term.

b) The report shall be published, except for candidate-identifying or properly classified material, which shall be summarized without disclosure.

c) A risk is **credible** when it rests on documented evidence of a pattern or structural defect rather than on an isolated error or theoretical concern. It is **specific** when it identifies the affected pipeline phase, the failure mechanism, and the evidence supporting the inference. It is **systemic** when the failure, if uncorrected, would propagate through the selection pipeline and produce a pattern of epistemic narrowing in the EB that internal review is unlikely to detect. If the report identifies a credible and specific risk of systemic epistemic failure meeting each element of this definition, the Council may recommend temporary suspension of one or more pipeline phases.

d) The Constitutional Court must respond within 90 days. Suspension requires both:

1. A formal recommendation approved by 6 of the 9 Council members; and

2. An independent finding approved by 5 of the 7 Constitutional Court members that continued operation presents a greater systemic risk than temporary suspension. "Greater systemic risk" means that the pipeline's continued operation, weighted by the probability and severity of the identified epistemic failure under subsection (c), presents a larger expected harm to the Covenant's epistemic integrity than the disruption caused by temporary suspension, considering the availability of interim succession mechanisms, the duration of the proposed suspension, and the risk of cascading effects on other phases or institutions. The finding shall state the comparative assessment and the factors on which it rests.

Every justice who designed, operated, audited, certified, defended, or materially relied upon the affected phase shall recuse. When the formal examination identifies the Court itself as a primary diagnosis target under Section 13.4(a) or 13.4(b)(4), every justice shall recuse from the suspension finding regardless of the specific recusal triggers above, and the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary 7-member substitute bench from the Article II successor pools, matching Section 2.1; approval then requires 5 substitute members. If the Court acted institutionally in any role listed in the first sentence of this paragraph or fewer than 5 conflict-free justices remain for any other reason, the substitute bench shall be drawn under the same procedure. The bench may adjudicate suspension and corrective conditions but may not operate or redesign the pipeline.

e) A suspension order must identify the affected phase, evidence, corrective conditions, interim succession mechanism, and expiration date. No suspension may exceed 12 months without renewed approval by both bodies under the same thresholds. Aggregate suspension of the same phase for substantially the same systemic failure may not exceed 24 months in any 5-year period. Before that outer limit, an independent temporary design panel drawn from citizen and qualified pools shall propose a replacement process preserving every competence, duration, rights, audit, and appeal safeguard of the affected phase.

**Emergency replacement procedure.** Because the sitting EB has a direct interest in its successor pipeline, adoption of a replacement for a suspended phase under this subsection is a narrow exception to the EB approval requirement in Section 13.4(e). This exception applies only while a suspension under this Section is in effect, only to the suspended phase or phases, and only when the design panel's proposal preserves every substantive safeguard of the affected phase. Adoption requires: 60% CGA approval, approval by 60% of valid votes cast in a referendum under Article IV, Section 4.6, and legality certification by the conflict-free bench under subsection (d). No replacement adopted under this paragraph may alter Rule Zero, Section 12.1, Section 13.5, or any provision outside the suspended phase's design.

If no replacement is adopted by the outer limit, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall activate the constitutional continuity baseline for one selection cycle. Pre-certified citizen process panels and conflict-free qualified panels shall perform the affected phase manually under its last valid substantive criteria, minimum duration, published evidence requirements, dual-key adverse-action threshold, and independent appeal, while excluding the invalidated metric, operator, or procedure. The manual baseline for Phase 2 shall be administered with a validated equivalent instrument certified by the Psychometric Commission before use, with the equivalence evidence published under Article IV, Section 4.7. No panel may rank a worldview or create a new substantive criterion. The baseline remains challengeable and dissolves when a lawful replacement takes effect. Suspension therefore cannot become permanent, no sitting term is extended, and no candidate is subjected to the invalidated procedure.

f) During suspension, vacancies shall be filled from previously certified Expert Reserve pools. A suspension may not be used to extend the term of a sitting EB member.

#### Section 13.7: Qualified subpoena and classified information

a) The Council may issue a subpoena for documents, data, or testimony relevant to its mandate by approval of 6 members.

b) The recipient shall comply within 30 days or state specific grounds for refusal.

c) A refusal by the EB, Expert Reserve, CGA, LCC, or RCA may be appealed to the Constitutional Court, which shall order disclosure unless the recipient demonstrates that disclosure would cause demonstrable, specific, and severe harm to planetary security, an active operation, or individual privacy. Upon appeal, the refusing body shall submit the contested material to the Court for in camera review within 14 days; the Court may review the material under security procedures and its determination that the classification is unnecessary or overbroad is binding.

d) A refusal by the Constitutional Court shall be reviewed by a temporary Disclosure Panel consisting of 3 CGA members selected by lot and 2 constitutional jurists selected by lot from the eligible CC candidate pool maintained for succession under Article II, Section 2.2. No current CC member may serve on the Panel. The same disclosure standard applies. The refusing body shall submit the contested material to the Panel for in camera review within 14 days of the Panel's constitution; the Panel may review the material under security procedures and shall decide within 30 days of receiving the material. A Panel determination that the classification is unnecessary or overbroad is binding. The Independent Sortition Secretariat shall administer the Panel draw; a Panel that fails to decide within 30 days dissolves and a new Panel shall be drawn within 7 days, applying the same decision deadline.

e) Council members shall receive access to non-operational classified information necessary to perform their mandate. Access to military movements, active crisis negotiations, intelligence sources, or personally identifying data requires case-specific authorization under subsections (c) or (d).

f) A subpoena may not be used to obtain individual voting choices protected by secret ballot, privileged legal consultation unrelated to alleged misconduct, or personal data irrelevant to the Council's mandate.

#### Section 13.8: Ethics, removal, and report immunity

a) Council members shall disclose financial interests, refuse outside compensation during service, protect classified information, and recuse themselves from matters involving a direct personal or household interest.

b) A member may be removed for corruption, deliberate disclosure of protected information, sustained non-performance, abuse of subpoena authority, knowing fabrication of evidence, or a rights violation under Article X.

c) Except for an Article X violation certified by the Court, removal requires a dual process:

1. Initiation by 6 Council members or 5 Constitutional Court members; and

2. Final approval by two-thirds of the body that did not initiate the proceeding, after a public hearing and written findings.

d) No member may be investigated, suspended, or removed because a good-faith Blind Spot Report is embarrassing, unpopular, mistaken, or critical of another Covenant body.

e) A removed member is permanently ineligible for global Covenant office. The member retains ordinary rights of due process under Article X.

### Section 13.9: Compensation, secretariat, and budget

a) Members shall receive compensation equal to 3 times the global median income, together with necessary housing, health, accessibility, travel, translation, caregiving, and family support. Compensation shall not vary according to findings or institutional approval.

b) The Council shall maintain an independent professional secretariat. Secretariat employees may provide research and administrative support but may not vote, determine findings, or draft conclusions without direction from Council members.

c) The Council shall receive a protected annual appropriation of not less than 0.05% and not more than 0.25% of the Covenant's administrative budget. The exact appropriation within that range shall be proposed by the Council, reviewed for legality by the CC, and approved by the CGA. The EB shall not reduce or condition the appropriation. If the CGA does not decide before the fiscal year begins, the prior year's appropriation shall continue, adjusted by the global median inflation rate.

For the initial fiscal period, an appropriation of 0.15% shall vest automatically upon promulgation and be released through the transparent founding trust without Founder, provisional EB, or provisional Court discretion. It continues, adjusted by global median inflation, until the first lawful CGA decision. No delay in that decision may suspend the Council's access, reporting, subpoena, or diagnostic functions.

d) All expenditures, contractors, research commissions, and potential conflicts shall be published annually, except narrowly classified security expenses reviewed by the CC.

### Section 13.10: Joint annual session with the Constitutional Court

a) The Council and Court shall convene for 3 consecutive days once per calendar year. All 9 Council members and all 7 Court members shall attend unless incapacitated. The Chair shall alternate annually between the EC Chair and CC President.

b) The mandatory agenda is:

1. **Day 1:** The CC presents forensic audits, ethics findings, Warnings, Compelling Interest rulings, and material evidentiary disputes. The EC questions the Court.
2. **Day 2:** The EC presents its Blind Spot Report, pipeline findings, and epistemic diversity assessment. The CC questions the Council.
3. **Day 3:** Each body presents a written response to the other's findings and identifies points of agreement, unresolved disagreement, and potential joint recommendations.

c) A Joint CC–EC Annual Report shall be published within 30 days. Each body's findings and response shall appear unedited. Separate or dissenting opinions may be appended.

d) Neither body may compel the other to adopt a substantive conclusion. The purpose of the session is forced confrontation between factual-forensic and epistemic-frame analysis.

### Section 13.11: Relationship with the Citizen Grievance Assembly and noncompliance

a) The EC may present any public finding to the CGA. It must accept a CGA invitation to testify on a matter within its mandate.

b) The CGA may request an EC investigation. The EC must acknowledge the request within 30 days and either open an inquiry or publish its reasons for declining.

c) Every body named in a Blind Spot Report must acknowledge the material findings concerning it within 30 days and provide a substantive response within 90 days. A response may disagree but must address the evidence and reasoning presented.

d) Failure to provide required access, acknowledgment, or response authorizes the EC, by approval of at least 6 of its 9 members, to issue an **Epistemic Noncompliance Notice**. The notice shall identify the unanswered request, responsible body, legal deadline, and claimed justification.

e) If noncompliance persists for 90 days after issuance of an Epistemic Noncompliance Notice, the EC shall refer the matter to the CGA for immediate public hearing and to the CC for a determination of constitutional breach. Upon a Constitutional Court or substitute-bench finding of constitutional breach for persistent Epistemic Noncompliance under this Section, or for material non-implementation of a Mission Correction Plan under Article V, Section 5.4:

1. The respondent body's discretionary budget authority is frozen for 90 days; funding continues at the prior fiscal quarter's inflation-adjusted level under formula-based continuation sufficient to sustain rights protection, protected services, ministerial obligations, essential continuity under Article XII, Section 12.7, and prior contractual commitments. For purposes of this paragraph, "discretionary budget authority" means non-operational capital projects, new programmatic initiatives, non-essential procurement, and new hires outside a pre-approved workforce plan; it does not include, and the freeze shall not restrict, investigator travel, expert-witness fees, translation and language-access services, digital-portal and public-record hosting, secure evidence storage and communications, staff salaries under existing contracts, statutory audit and inspection expenses, or any line item whose reduction would defeat a rights-protective, adjudicative, inspection, audit, or security function of the body. No new discretionary allocation, no new hire outside a pre-approved workforce plan, and no non-essential procurement may occur until the freeze expires or the body cures the breach on independent certification by the EC or the Court. Any dispute over whether a specific line item falls within "discretionary budget authority" is decided by a conflict-free substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 within 14 days on the record.
2. The CGA shall convene a public hearing within 30 days of the finding, at which the respondent body shall appear and answer on the record before the Court and on the corrective steps taken. The hearing is not itself an adjudication and shall not set substantive policy.
3. If noncompliance persists 180 days after the finding, the Court, or a fresh substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 if the Court is conflicted or unavailable, may extend the discretionary-budget freeze in successive 90-day increments upon renewed finding of persistent

noncompliance, order specific ministerial correction, and refer implicated officers for ethics investigation, removal, or disqualification under the applicable procedures in this Covenant. No extension of the freeze may fund suspension or extension of any Covenant term, and no order under this paragraph may set substantive policy, choose an officeholder outside the applicable removal procedure, or restore an order barred by Article XII, Section 12.1.

4. The freeze, hearing, and any order under this paragraph shall not suspend the respondent body's substantive mandate, shall not stop rights-protective functions or continuous continuity functions, and shall automatically dissolve upon EC or Court certification that the breach is cured. Protected budget floors elsewhere in this Covenant continue to apply as formula-based continuation for the frozen body; the freeze constrains discretionary allocation, not the floor itself. Protected continuity functions under this paragraph include, for the avoidance of doubt, the continuity Pledge publication duty of the Independent Metrics Council under Article IV, Section 4.1 and the baseline validation and interim comparable-metric duties supporting Article IV. The EC may maintain a public Non-Response Register showing whether each finding was acted upon, rebutted, ignored, or unresolved.

f) A good-faith substantive disagreement is not noncompliance. The duty is to expose reasoning, not to agree.

### Section 13.12: Review, reform, and dissolution

a) Every 10 years, a Review Commission shall assess the Council's effectiveness and independence. It shall consist of 5 CGA members and 4 members drawn by lot from the citizen and qualified pools maintained under Article IV, Section 4.7(d) for the Metric Integrity Review Jury, distributed as 2 from the citizen pool and 2 from the qualified pool. No member of the Expert Body, Constitutional Court, Expert Reserve, Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, Independent Metrics Council, or Independent Sortition Secretariat, and no person who has served on any of those bodies within the prior 5 years, may serve on the Review Commission. No person under an active Epistemic Council examination under Section 13.4 or 13.6, an active Blind Spot Report under Section 13.4(d), or an active Epistemic Noncompliance Notice under Section 13.11(d) may serve. No member of any Covenant body, other than the Citizen Grievance Assembly, that is currently, or was within the prior 3 years, the subject of any of those findings may serve. A member of the Citizen Grievance Assembly is not disqualified from Review Commission service by reason of an Epistemic Council finding whose subject is the Citizen Grievance Assembly as a body; the CGA's sortition composition and single non-renewable terms preclude the self-selection risk this Section addresses. Where a listed body's members would otherwise be eligible under Article IV, Section 4.7(d) pool membership, this Section overrides the pool listing for Review Commission draws only. The bodies the Council regularly diagnoses shall not serve on the Council's own survival review; if application of this paragraph produces fewer than 4 qualified pool members available in a given draw, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall expand the Article IV, Section 4.7(d) qualified pool under the same standards used for that pool's ordinary formation until 4 conflict-free qualified members are available, and no Review Commission draw may proceed with fewer than the composition specified in this subsection.

b) The review shall assess:

1. Whether the EC identified material problems not previously detected by another body.
2. The factual accuracy and correction record of its reports.

3. Whether other bodies responded substantively or merely performed compliance.
4. Whether the Council, Secretariat, selection process, or contractors were captured or ideologically narrowed.
5. Whether the diversity model produced genuine epistemic variation rather than measurable proxies alone.
6. Whether the Council remained within its diagnostic mandate.

c) The Commission may recommend continuation, amendment, restructuring, or dissolution. The EC shall receive the report and may publish a response but may not veto the recommendation.

d) Dissolution requires: (i) an Epistemic Council finding, by 6 of its 9 members, that dissolution is warranted, made within 12 months of the Review Commission's publication of a recommendation of dissolution or restructuring; (ii) 60% approval by the CGA; and (iii) 60% approval by valid votes cast in a global referendum administered under Article IV, Section 4.6. The Expert Body may publish a reasoned position on the proposed dissolution but holds no vote. If the Epistemic Council fails to make a finding under paragraph (i) within 12 months of a Review Commission recommendation of dissolution, the requirement in paragraph (i) is deemed satisfied and dissolution may proceed on the CGA and referendum thresholds alone. If two consecutive Review Commission cycles have recommended dissolution and the Council has not made a supporting finding under paragraph (i) within 12 months of each recommendation, the requirement in paragraph (i) is deemed satisfied and dissolution may proceed on the CGA and referendum thresholds alone, provided that all of the following are satisfied for both cycles:

(A) the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate certifies, by at least 7 Citizen Chamber members and 8 Qualified Chamber members, that no Expert Body act, pool-shaping conduct, delay, coordinated referral, or evidentiary interference materially shaped either Review Commission's composition, timeline, evidentiary record, or recommendation; the ICPI certification shall be published with its supporting record and shall be issued within 180 days of the second recommendation; if the ICPI declines to certify or fails to issue a certification within 180 days, the Independent Metrics Council by 5 of its 6 members may issue an equivalent certification on the same standard within a further 90 days; if both the ICPI and the Independent Metrics Council decline or fail to certify within their respective windows, the failsafe does not apply and the ordinary paragraph (i) requirement remains;

(B) each of the two Review Commissions was drawn from Article IV, Section 4.7(d) pools that were frozen and placed in escrow with the External Sortition and Records Continuity Network at least 5 years before that Commission's constitution, and each draw was independently reproduced under the audit and reproduction procedure in Article XII, Section 12.7(b.1);

(C) no Epistemic Council finding under Section 13.4(d), Section 13.6, or Section 13.11(d) identifying Expert Body conduct as materially shaping either Review Commission's composition, timing, evidentiary record, or recommendation is currently published and unresolved; a resolution requires a subsequent Council finding that the identified conduct was cured or was not material, made by the same threshold that supported the original finding. If the Council fails to make a resolution finding within 12 months of a written petition to do so by the CGA at 60% or by the ICPI under its dual-key of at least 7 Citizen Chamber and 8 Qualified Chamber members, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a 7-member substitute bench under Article X, Section 10.2.1 to decide the resolution question de novo on the record within 60 days, applying the same substantive standard the Council applies under this subparagraph. A substitute-bench resolution has the same effect as a Council resolution for the purposes of this subsection; and

(D) neither Review Commission's recommendation was adopted while the Council was operating under a suspension, incapacity, or vacancy condition attributable to Expert Body conduct certified as material under (A) or (C).

Where (A) through (D) are not satisfied, the failsafe does not apply, the paragraph (i) requirement remains, and the two Review Commission recommendations remain of record for reconsideration in subsequent cycles without prejudice. No dissolution may take effect during the Council's first 20 years.

e) Amendment or dissolution of the EC shall not destroy or conceal its archives. All reports, responses, selection records, and review findings shall remain permanently available in the public ledger, subject only to continuing privacy and security protections.

#### Section 13.13: Metric Integrity referral

Consistent with Sections 13.4 and 13.5, the Council may identify metric substitution, gaming, non-invariance, construct detachment, or excluded affected knowledge and may initiate or support a challenge under Article IV, Section 4.7. The temporary Metric Integrity Review Jury, not the Council, decides suspension and technical validity. Referral therefore does not authorize the Council to veto policy, set a metric, or exercise operational power.

### RATIFICATION AND SUPERSESSION FRAMEWORK

Promulgation starts the founding clocks but does not itself ratify the Covenant. During the period from promulgation to ratification, acts and omissions by provisional bodies and other Covenant actors are governed by this Covenant's law and subject to the Constitutional Court's jurisdiction; acts and omissions by pre-Covenant states and their agents remain governed by the law of those states until ratification. No provision of this paragraph imposes ex post facto criminal liability. Rule Zero ratification under Article XI, Section 11.3 is a necessary but distinct constitutional event. Covenant ratification, supersession of the pre-Covenant order, and activation occur automatically when every condition below has been satisfied and publicly certified. Certification establishes operational readiness; it is not permission from any pre-Covenant state or institution, Founder, provisional body, or permanent body. No such actor may waive a condition or veto supersession or activation after the conditions are met. A pre-Covenant state's refusal to cooperate with the founding process does not delay ratification, excuse any condition, or prevent supersession. Such refusal shall be documented by the Constitutional Court upon petition, and a non-cooperating state shall receive no Covenant protection until it ratifies or accedes under Article XI procedures.

Within 3 days after documentation of the last outstanding condition is published, the Independent Sortition Secretariat shall draw a temporary Ratification Certification Panel of 5 citizens and 6 conflict-free constitutional jurists, public-administration auditors, or forensic methodologists from the standing pools established under Article XI. The Panel shall decide each condition separately within 14 days; a certification already issued survives correction or retry of another condition. Final certification requires 4 citizen and 5 qualified votes. The Panel may verify records, require correction of an incomplete certificate, and state whether a listed condition is met; it may not alter the Covenant, excuse a condition, select an officeholder, or review the substance of Rule Zero. No provisional founding body may certify any Ratification condition, and no member of a provisional founding body may serve on the Panel. For every condition, the certification shall rest on evidence produced by an entity independent of the body, force, system, or process the condition concerns; the subject's own representations alone are insufficient. Where a condition depends on an act by a provisional founding body, including provisional selection under Article XI, Section 11.4, Rule Zero drafting and voting under Article XI, Section 11.3, or Decadal Pledge drafting under Article IV, Section 4.1, the Panel shall verify that the act complied with its governing Section and shall rest that verification on evidence produced by an entity independent of the provisional body. A provisional body may not certify its own act, its own drafting, or the operational readiness of an institution it controls or from which it draws membership.

A denial shall identify the exact missing evidence or unmet condition. Silence, deadlock, or incapacity on Day 14 dissolves the Panel, and a new Panel shall be drawn within 3 days. If the successor Panel also fails to decide within 14 days, a substitute bench drawn under Article X, Section 10.2.1 shall issue a condition-by-condition determination within 14 days and may order completion of a ministerial act but may not waive a substantive condition. A failed component is corrected and rerun without reopening valid certifications or interrupting existing lawful protections, services, institutions, and Covenant administrative rules. No correction or retry preserves or restores a pre-Covenant legal order. All records and reasons are public, and the Panel dissolves upon final certification. A certification later shown to rest on a materially false statement of fact may be reopened on petition to the Constitutional Court within 5 years of final certification. The Court shall issue a finding within 90 days and may declare the certification void ab initio and the condition uncertified. A declaration under this paragraph does not affect certifications of other conditions, which remain valid. Upon dissolution of the final Panel, its records, challenge intake, and any pending or reopened certification proceedings transfer to the Constitutional Court.

This Covenant is ratified, supersedes the pre-Covenant political and legal order, and activates automatically upon certification of:

1. The successful independent selection and installation of the **provisional initial Expert Body** and **provisional initial Constitutional Court** under Article XI, Section 11.4, and the initial Epistemic Council under Article XIII.
2. The seating of the initial Citizen Grievance Assembly and full operational installation of the Independent Coercive-Power Inspectorate, including protected funding, complaint access, field and records access, and continuously drawable rapid mixed tribunals. Operational installation shall be verified by a body independent of the ICPI and the provisional EB; certification may not rest solely on the ICPI's own representations.
3. Activation of the Metric Integrity intake-clerk roster and independently certified citizen, technical, correction, jurist, and substitute-tribunal pools sufficient to receive a challenge and convene every review required by Article IV, Section 4.7.
4. Independent audit certification that every high-impact automated system then in use has implemented Article XII, Section 12.6, including named competent human owners, logs, contestability, independent reproduction, and tested manual/offline continuity. A system that fails certification shall remain offline. Decommissioning a system without certifying its Section 12.6 compliance does not satisfy this condition; the condition requires certification of compliance, not mere non-operation. A system taken offline to avoid certification and later reactivated shall be treated as uncertified at ratification. Certification shall rest on evidence from a body independent of the system's owner, operator, or developer.
5. Independent certification that the Founding Referendum Authority was operationally ready before voting, remained institutionally separate from the Founder and provisional bodies, and completed the final count, challenges, archival audit, and certification required by Article XI.

6. The completion of the first Decadal Pledge formulation. If Rule Zero has not been ratified when this condition is certified, the certification is provisional and the Pledges shall be re-certified within 30 days after Rule Zero ratification under Article IV, Section 4.1; the provisional certification satisfies this condition for activation but neither forecloses revision of the Pledges to conform to a ratified Rule Zero nor precludes the continuity-rendition review required by Section 4.1.
7. The ratification of Rule Zero (Article XI) by the process defined in Section 11.3.

Every reference in this Ratification and Supersession Framework to the initial Expert Body or initial Constitutional Court means only the independently selected provisional body. Ratification creates no Founder appointment power, converts no provisional office into a permanent office, and neither postpones nor alters the compulsory reset and absolute 3-year term limit in Article XI, Section 11.4.

**END OF COVENANT OF EARTH**

**Deferred Clauses (Known Unknowns):**

1. **Peacekeeping Command Chain** (Article VIII, Section 8.1.1) -> *Deadline: 3 years*
2. **Global Referendum Infrastructure** (Article IV, Section 4.6) -> *Deadline: 5 years*
3. **Covenant Criminal Court and Code** (Article VIII, Section 8.6.5) -> *Deadline: 5 years after compulsory reset*

*Each deferred clause carries the deadlines and fallbacks stated in its Section; a missed deadline never suspends the governed function, and where its Section supplies no more specific continuous mechanism, the unfinished work transfers under Article XII, Section 12.7.*