

**CIVIC COMMONWEALTH OF THE BRITISH ISLES**

*Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies*

# **CIVIC JUSTICE ARCHITECTURE OF THE CIVIC COMMONWEALTH**

*A Complete Constitutional Instrument for Justice Without Prisons,  
Courts, or Barristers — Grounded in Restoration, Truth, and Community*

CJA-001 | Master Edition | Civic Commonwealth Constitutional Corpus

Drafted under the authority of the DD&SA Constitutional Design Programme

# Preamble

---

This document constitutes the complete and authoritative Civic Justice Architecture (CJA) of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles, operating under the constitutional framework of Direct Democracy and Sortition Assemblies (DD&SA). It replaces in their entirety all prior adversarial legal systems, courts of law, Crown Prosecution frameworks, barrister-dependent trial procedures, and custodial sentencing regimes as applied within the jurisdiction of the Civic Commonwealth.

The Civic Commonwealth recognises that justice must be earned through truth, not imposed through power. It recognises that harms require healing, not merely punishment. It recognises that communities are the proper authors of resolution, not institutions insulated from accountability. And it recognises that a civic system that imprisons its residents has already failed them.

This architecture is not a penal code. It is not a criminal law statute. It is a living constitutional instrument — a civic design for the resolution of harm, the restoration of dignity, the protection of community integrity, and the transformation of conditions that cause harm to persist. It is written for every resident of the Civic Commonwealth, for every Magister who bears civic responsibility, for every Sortition Assembly that oversees the system, and for every community circle that must work through pain and arrive at resolution.

Nothing in this instrument permits the caging of a human being. Nothing in this instrument permits the denial of civic participation to a person who has not had the opportunity to engage with a restorative process. Nothing in this instrument permits power to substitute for evidence, or authority to override the Civic Floor.

This is the design. It belongs to the people who live under it.

---

# Master Table of Contents

---

## **PREAMBLE**

### **PART ONE — Foundational Architecture**

- Chapter 1: Purpose, Scope, and Constitutional Basis
- Chapter 2: Core Principles of Civic Justice
- Chapter 3: Definitions and Terminology
- Chapter 4: Classification of Civic Matters
- Chapter 5: Jurisdictional Architecture

### **PART TWO — Institutional Roles and Governance**

- Chapter 6: Magisters — Role, Authority, and Accountability
- Chapter 7: Magisterial Community Facilitators (MCFs)
- Chapter 8: Sortition Justice Panels
- Chapter 9: The Civic Justice Secretariat
- Chapter 10: Civic Advocates
- Chapter 11: Independent Epistemic Secretariat — Justice Division

### **PART THREE — Investigative Architecture**

- Chapter 12: Intake, Triage, and Case Classification
- Chapter 13: Investigation Standards and Methodology
- Chapter 14: Evidence Protocols
- Chapter 15: Interview and Testimony Standards
- Chapter 16: Rights and Protections for All Parties
- Chapter 17: Anti-Bias and Anti-Capture Safeguards
- Chapter 18: Digital Systems and Audit Trails

### **PART FOUR — The Deliberative Justice Process**

- Chapter 19: From Referral to Resolution — The Complete Process
- Chapter 20: Standards of Civic Proof
- Chapter 21: The Harm Matrix and Classification System
- Chapter 22: Proportionality Framework
- Chapter 23: Decision-Making Rules for Magisters
- Chapter 24: Sortition Panel Intervention Thresholds
- Chapter 25: Recording, Archiving, and Transparency

### **PART FIVE — Restorative and Transformative Pathways**

- Chapter 26: Mediation and Facilitated Dialogue
- Chapter 27: Community Circles

- Chapter 28: Restitution and Reparative Agreements
- Chapter 29: Behavioural Commitments and Civic Compacts
- Chapter 30: Community Contribution (Non-Punitive)
- Chapter 31: Education and Reflection Programmes
- Chapter 32: Reintegration Architecture
- Chapter 33: Monitoring and Follow-Up

## **PART SIX — Civic Consequences and Outcomes**

- Chapter 34: The Consequence Framework — Principles
- Chapter 35: Temporary Exclusion from Civic Roles
- Chapter 36: Civic Privilege Adjustments
- Chapter 37: Required Learning and Development
- Chapter 38: Community Accountability Processes
- Chapter 39: Public Explanation and Civic Apology
- Chapter 40: Structural Remedies
- Chapter 41: Escalation Pathways
- Chapter 42: Severe and Persistent Harm — Extended Protocols

## **PART SEVEN — Safeguards, Integrity, and Anti-Abuse Mechanisms**

- Chapter 43: Protection Against Factional Capture
- Chapter 44: Anti-Corruption Protocols
- Chapter 45: Whistleblower Protections and Safe Reporting
- Chapter 46: Oversight by Rotating Sortition Panels
- Chapter 47: Appeals and Review Architecture
- Chapter 48: Emergency Procedures
- Chapter 49: Magister Misconduct and Accountability
- Chapter 50: Systemic Risk Monitoring

## **PART EIGHT — Education, Culture, and Public Understanding**

- Chapter 51: Civic Justice Literacy — Public Education
- Chapter 52: Magister and MCF Training Programmes
- Chapter 53: Community-Facing Communication Standards
- Chapter 54: Cultural Foundations of Non-Carceral Justice
- Chapter 55: Institutional Memory and Long-Term Resilience

## **PART NINE — Technical Annexes**

- Annex A: Model Procedural Scripts
- Annex B: Standard Intake and Referral Forms
- Annex C: Investigation Templates and Checklists
- Annex D: The Harm Classification Matrix (Complete)
- Annex E: Decision-Recording Formats

- **Annex F: Sample Cases and Walkthroughs**
- **Annex G: Glossary of Civic Justice Terminology**
- **Annex H: Cross-Reference Index**



# PART ONE

## Foundational Architecture of Civic Justice

---

### Chapter 1: Purpose, Scope, and Constitutional Basis

---

#### 1.1 Purpose of the Civic Justice Architecture

The Civic Justice Architecture exists to fulfil five interlocking civic purposes, each of equal constitutional standing:

1. **Truth-finding:** To establish, with the highest practical accuracy, what occurred, who was involved, what harm resulted, and why.
2. **Restoration:** To repair, to the greatest extent possible, the harm experienced by those affected — physically, materially, emotionally, and relationally.
3. **Accountability:** To ensure that those who caused harm to understand the nature and impact of their actions and bear proportionate civic responsibility for resolution.
4. **Transformation:** To address the conditions, structural failures, and systemic factors that enabled harm to occur, so that similar harm is less likely to recur.
5. **Protection:** To establish, where genuinely necessary, proportionate, and time-limited measures that prevent further harm whilst restoration and accountability processes are undertaken.

These purposes are not in competition. They are mutually reinforcing. A justice process that achieves accountability without restoration has accomplished only half its task. A process that achieves restoration without truth-finding has bypassed the dignity of those harmed. A process that addresses individuals without transforming conditions will face the same harm again. The Civic Justice Architecture is designed to pursue all five purposes simultaneously, weighting them proportionately to the nature of the matter at hand.

#### 1.2 Scope of Application

This Architecture applies to all matters arising within the jurisdiction of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles that involve:

- Any breach of an operative Civic Rule, whether at National, Regional, or Local Assembly level.
- Any act or omission causing material, physical, psychological, relational, financial, or civic harm to one or more residents, communities, institutions, or the shared civic fabric.
- Any dispute between residents, between residents and civic institutions, between civic institutions, or between communities that cannot be resolved through voluntary agreement.
- Any allegation of integrity breach, corruption, abuse of civic position, or misuse of sortition authority.

- Any matter referred to the Civic Justice Architecture by a National, Regional, or Local Sortition Assembly.
- Any systemic failure in civic delivery that has caused or risks causing widespread harm.

This Architecture does not apply to:

- Matters governed exclusively by the Civic Migration and Protection Framework where specialist processes are specified.
- Matters falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Independent Epistemic Secretariat under the Civic Constitutional Architecture.
- Internal governance disputes within Sortition Assemblies, which are governed by the Sortition Assembly Constitutional Charter.

Note: Where a matter touches multiple frameworks, the Civic Justice Secretariat shall determine jurisdictional primacy in consultation with relevant institutional leads. No matter shall fall outside civic accountability by reason of jurisdictional ambiguity.

## 1.3 Constitutional Basis

The Civic Justice Architecture derives its authority from three sources within the DD&SA constitutional hierarchy:

### 1.3.1 The Civic Commonwealth Constitution

The foundational constitutional document of the Civic Commonwealth establishes justice as a civic right, not a state privilege. Article 7 of the Constitution provides that every resident is entitled to a fair, transparent, evidence-based, and restorative process when they are party to any matter of civic harm or dispute. Article 8 prohibits custodial detention as a form of civic consequence. Article 9 establishes the right of every resident to be heard, to access a Civic Advocate, and to appeal any Magisterial determination.

### 1.3.2 The Civic Rules Framework

The Civic Rules Framework, adopted by the National Sortition Assembly and subject to Regional and Local augmentation, establishes the operative civic standards whose breach may trigger justice processes. The Civic Justice Architecture is the sole legitimate mechanism for determining whether a Civic Rule has been breached and for determining appropriate civic consequences.

### 1.3.3 The Constitutional Grammar Document

The Constitutional Grammar Document governs the terminology and institutional language used throughout the civic constitutional corpus. All terminology in this Architecture conforms to the Constitutional Grammar Document. Where apparent conflicts arise between this Architecture and the Grammar Document on terminological matters, the Grammar Document governs.

## 1.4 Relationship to Prior Legal Systems

Upon commencement of the Civic Commonwealth Constitution, the following cease to have operative effect within Commonwealth jurisdiction:

- The adversarial court system of England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, including Crown Courts, Magistrates' Courts, Sheriff Courts, and their equivalents.

- The Crown Prosecution Service and its devolved equivalents.
- The system of imprisonment and custodial sentencing.
- The Bar and solicitor-client systems as mechanisms of justice access.
- The sentencing guidelines and criminal records system of the prior regime.

Matters that were in progress within prior legal systems at the point of constitutional commencement shall be subject to a Transition Protocol established by the Civic Transition Authority. No person shall be held in custodial detention beyond a maximum of ninety days following commencement without having access to the full Civic Justice Architecture.

The Civic Justice Architecture does not recognise the concept of a "criminal record" as currently constituted. Civic Justice outcomes are recorded for accountability and institutional learning purposes, not for the permanent labelling or disadvantaging of individuals who have completed their restorative obligations.

## 1.5 Guiding Prohibitions

The following are absolutely prohibited under this Architecture and may not be authorised by any Magister, Sortition Panel, Assembly, or civic institution:

6. Custodial detention as a civic consequence of any kind, for any duration, under any circumstances. (Note: Temporary protective separation under Chapter 48 Emergency Protocols is a distinct mechanism, not a consequence, and is governed by strict time limits and review requirements.)
7. Physical punishment, restriction of food or water, or any bodily harm inflicted as a civic consequence.
8. Permanent exclusion from civic participation, except in the specific circumstances of proven, repeated, and severe harm set out in Chapter 42.
9. Secret proceedings. All Civic Justice processes shall be visible, auditable, and subject to civic scrutiny, subject only to the confidentiality protections set out in Chapter 18.
10. Processes conducted without the informed participation of all primary parties, except in the specific circumstances set out in Chapter 16.
11. Consequences determined without adherence to the evidence standards set out in Chapter 20.
12. Any consequence disproportionate to the nature and severity of the harm established, as assessed against the Harm Matrix set out in Chapter 21 and the Proportionality Framework set out in Chapter 22.

## Chapter 2: Core Principles of Civic Justice

---

The following ten principles govern the design, interpretation, and application of every element of this Architecture. Where operational provisions appear ambiguous, they shall be interpreted in the manner most consistent with these principles. Where a genuine conflict arises between two principles, the Magister shall record the conflict, explain the weighting applied, and refer the reasoning to the Independent Epistemic Secretariat for guidance development.

### 2.1 The Primacy of Restoration

The first and governing purpose of any civic justice process is to restore what has been harmed: relationships, dignity, material wellbeing, community trust, and civic fabric. Every procedural decision, every institutional design choice, and every consequence determination must be tested against the question: does this contribute to or detract from genuine restoration? Processes that achieve accountability without restoration have incomplete outcomes. Processes that achieve restoration without accountability lack civic credibility. Both are required.

### 2.2 Truth as the Foundation of Justice

No legitimate civic outcome can rest on an incomplete, distorted, or suppressed account of what occurred. The Civic Justice Architecture places truth-finding at the centre of its methodology. This means rigorous investigation, high evidence standards, structured fact-finding, and the institutional culture of epistemic humility — the recognition that initial accounts may be incomplete, that memories are fallible, and that multiple perspectives require active integration rather than passive reception.

Truth-finding does not mean the adversarial extraction of damaging admissions. It means the collaborative and structured assembly of the most accurate possible account of events, causes, and consequences. Magisters are truth-seekers, not prosecutors.

### 2.3 Proportionality

The civic response to harm must be proportionate to the harm itself: to its severity, its duration, its breadth of impact, the degree of intent involved, and the context in which it occurred. Proportionality does not mean minimalism. A severe harm warrants a substantial civic response. But proportionality does prohibit responses that exceed what the harm and the evidence justify, or that are driven by institutional self-protection, community anger, or political pressure rather than by an honest assessment of what is required.

### 2.4 Non-Domination

Justice processes must not become instruments of domination. This principle, drawn from the republican civic tradition, holds that a just process is one in which no party is made arbitrarily subject to the power of another. Power within the Civic Justice Architecture is always accountable, always limited, always reviewable, and never held permanently by any single person or institution. The sortition design of oversight panels is the primary structural guarantee of non-domination.

## 2.5 Transparency

Every process, every decision, and every outcome under this Architecture is subject to civic transparency. This does not mean the reckless publication of personal information. It means that the existence, structure, and general reasoning of every civic justice process can be scrutinised by sortition oversight, reported to the Independent Epistemic Secretariat, and made available to the public in appropriately anonymised form. Secret justice is no justice.

## 2.6 Participation

Every person materially affected by a civic matter has the right to meaningful participation in the process that determines its resolution. This includes those who caused harm, those who experienced harm, and the communities affected. Participation must be genuine — not performative. A process in which affected parties are present but not genuinely heard, or in which their perspectives are collected but not integrated, fails this principle.

## 2.7 Dignity

Every person who interacts with the Civic Justice Architecture does so as a civic equal, regardless of their role in the matter at hand. Those who caused harm are not to be dehumanised, publicly shamed beyond the requirements of civic accountability, or treated as inherently beyond the possibility of civic restoration. Those who experienced harm are not to be treated as passive recipients of institutional process, secondary sources of evidence, or statistical abstractions. The Civic Floor — the minimum standard of dignified treatment that applies to all residents unconditionally — applies throughout every stage of every process.

## 2.8 Timeliness

Justice delayed is justice denied. The Civic Justice Architecture establishes mandatory time standards at every stage of the process. These standards recognise that unnecessary delay causes secondary harm to those affected, undermines institutional credibility, and allows harmful conditions to persist. Urgency, however, must not be achieved at the cost of thoroughness. Where genuine conflict arises between timeliness and rigour, the Magister must document the trade-off, apply proportionate judgement, and report to the Civic Justice Secretariat.

## 2.9 Learning and Prevention

Every civic justice process is also a learning opportunity. The Civic Justice Secretariat, in partnership with the Independent Epistemic Secretariat, shall maintain a systematic record of patterns, contributing factors, and structural causes identified across cases. This institutional learning function serves the transformative purpose of the Architecture: not merely to respond to harm after the fact, but to build the conditions in which harm is progressively less likely. Prevention is justice's highest achievement.

## 2.10 Civic Equality

The Civic Justice Architecture shall apply identically regardless of the civic status, wealth, cultural background, gender, age, disability, or any other characteristic of any party. Special accommodation must be made for parties who require different forms of support, accessibility, or communication — but accommodation is an expression of civic equality, not a departure from it. No person shall receive more or less rigorous investigation, more or less proportionate consequences, or more or less access to restorative processes on the basis of who they are.

Anti-disparity monitoring: The Civic Justice Secretariat is required to publish quarterly demographic analysis of justice outcomes, identifying any patterns of disproportionate consequence by background, geography, or civic status. The Independent Epistemic Secretariat shall review this data and publish recommendations where disparities are identified.

## Chapter 3: Definitions and Terminology

All terms used in this Architecture carry the meanings set out in this Chapter unless the specific context requires otherwise. Where a term is defined both here and in the Constitutional Grammar Document, the Constitutional Grammar Document definition shall prevail. Where a term appears to be undefined, the Magister shall apply the definition that is most consistent with the principles set out in Chapter 2 and shall refer the ambiguity to the Civic Justice Secretariat for formal resolution.

### 3.1 Primary Institutional Terms

Term	Definition
Magister	A civic officer selected through a qualifying process from a trained pool and assigned to lead civic justice processes. A Magister is not a judge, does not apply criminal law, and does not sentence. A Magister determines facts, facilitates processes, assesses harm, and issues civic consequence determinations within the bounds of this Architecture.
MCF (Magisterial Community Facilitator)	A trained civic practitioner who supports the Magister in conducting restorative processes, community circles, facilitated dialogues, and mediation. MCFs are the primary point of contact for affected parties during most stages of a civic justice process.
Civic Advocate	A trained, independent civic practitioner who supports any party in a civic justice process to understand the process, prepare their account, access support, and exercise their civic rights. Civic Advocates are not legal representatives. they do not argue cases. They are civic supporters and procedural guides.
Sortition Justice Panel	A panel of randomly selected civic members convened to provide independent oversight at specified stages of a civic justice process, including complex determinations, appeals, and systemic reviews. Panel members are not civic professionals. they are residents exercising sortition civic responsibility.
Civic Justice Secretariat	The administrative body responsible for case management, record-keeping, data analysis, institutional learning, and operational coordination of the Civic Justice Architecture.
Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES)	The body responsible for epistemic governance across the Civic Commonwealth, including the quality of evidence standards, the integrity of fact-finding processes, and the production of guidance for Magisters on matters of contested or ambiguous evidence.
Mandated Challenger	A formally appointed advocate, within the IES framework, whose responsibility is to contest dominant interpretations of evidence and ensure that alternative explanations receive adequate scrutiny before any determination is made.

## 3.2 Process Terms

Term	Definition
Civic Matter	Any situation involving breach of a Civic Rule, commission of harm, civic dispute, integrity breach, or systemic failure that has been referred to or identified by the Civic Justice Architecture.
Referral	The formal notification to the Civic Justice Secretariat that a civic matter may require civic justice process. A referral may be made by any resident, MCF, Assembly, civic institution, or Magister.
Triage	The initial assessment of a referral to determine its classification, urgency, and appropriate process pathway.
Consequence Hearing	The formal stage of a civic justice process at which a Magister, having completed investigation, presents findings and facilitates a structured determination of appropriate civic consequences, involving all primary parties.
Civic Compact	A formally recorded agreement, reached through restorative process, that sets out the commitments, actions, and monitoring arrangements that constitute the resolution of a civic matter.
Restitution Agreement	A specific form of Civic Compact that details material, financial, or service-based actions to be taken to repair quantifiable harm.
Community Circle	A structured restorative process convened by an MCF in which all affected parties — including the broader affected community — participate in a facilitated, values-based dialogue aimed at shared understanding and resolution.
Civic Consequence	Any outcome imposed or agreed through a civic justice process that entails an obligation, limitation, or requirement placed upon a party who has been found responsible for harm or breach. Civic Consequences are not punishments. they are restorative, reparative, or protective obligations.
Civic Floor	The minimum standard of dignified treatment and civic entitlement that applies to every resident of the Civic Commonwealth unconditionally, and which no civic justice process may breach.

## 3.3 Evidentiary Terms

Term	Definition
Civic Proof — Clear Account	The lowest standard of civic proof, sufficient for triage determination and for matters of low harm level. Requires a coherent, consistent, and corroborated account sufficient to establish that a matter warrants further process.
Civic Proof — Reasoned Conclusion	The intermediate standard, applicable to mid-level harm matters. Requires that a Magister, having considered all

Term	Definition
	available evidence, can state clear and documented reasons why a particular account of events is significantly more credible than any available alternative.
Civic Proof — Established Account	The highest standard of civic proof, required for severe harm determinations, extended consequence recommendations, and permanent civic adjustments. Requires that the evidence for the account is so substantially stronger than any alternative that no reasonable civic mind, applying itself in good faith to the evidence, could reach a contrary conclusion.
Primary Evidence	Direct observational, documentary, physical, or testimonial evidence from a party with direct knowledge of the events in question.
Corroborating Evidence	Evidence that supports primary evidence without itself constituting proof of the central account.
Contextual Evidence	Evidence that illuminates the circumstances, patterns, or background conditions relevant to a matter without directly addressing the events themselves.
Mandated Challenge Report	A formal document produced by the Mandated Challenger setting out the strongest available alternative interpretation of the evidence, which the Magister must engage with before reaching any determination.

### 3.4 Harm Classification Terms

The following terms constitute the primary taxonomy of civic harm used throughout this Architecture. Full definitions and matrices appear in Chapter 21 and Annex D.

Level	Category	Summary Description
Level 1	Minor Civic Friction	Low-impact, isolated incidents causing limited harm, typically suitable for direct mediation.
Level 2	Moderate Individual Harm	Harm to a specific individual or small group with moderate and repairable impact.
Level 3	Significant Individual or Community Harm	Harm with substantial impact on individuals or communities, or repeated Level 2 harm.
Level 4	Severe Individual Harm	Serious physical, psychological, or material harm to one or more individuals.
Level 5	Community-Scale Harm	Harm affecting significant numbers of residents or causing systemic civic damage.
Level 6	Civic Infrastructure Harm	Harm to the constitutional integrity, democratic infrastructure, or systemic civic architecture of the Commonwealth.

## Chapter 4: Classification of Civic Matters

---

The Civic Justice Architecture recognises five distinct categories of civic matter, each with its own process pathway, evidence requirements, and consequence framework. Accurate classification at the triage stage is critical to ensuring that resources are proportionately allocated and that parties receive the most appropriate form of process.

### 4.1 Rule Breaches

A Rule Breach occurs when a resident, institution, or civic body has acted in a manner that contravenes an operative Civic Rule. Rule breaches range from minor non-compliance with procedural civic rules (Level 1) to deliberate and severe violation of fundamental civic standards (up to Level 5). Rule breaches require:

- Identification of the specific Civic Rule(s) engaged.
- Determination of whether the breach was knowing, reckless, or inadvertent.
- Assessment of actual or foreseeable harm arising from the breach.
- Appropriate restorative or reparative response.

### 4.2 Harm-Causing Acts or Omissions

A Harm-Causing Act or Omission occurs when an act or failure to act results in harm to a resident, community, or civic institution, regardless of whether a specific Civic Rule has been breached. The Harm Matrix (Chapter 21) classifies harm-causing matters. They require:

- Thorough investigation of the causal chain between the act or omission and the harm experienced.
- Assessment of foreseeability, intent, and context.
- A restorative process centred on the experience and needs of those harmed.
- Structural analysis of conditions that enabled the harm to occur.

### 4.3 Integrity Breaches

An Integrity Breach occurs when a person holding a civic office, sortition position, Magisterial role, MCF role, or any position of institutional trust has abused that position, acted in a manner inconsistent with the civic obligations of that role, or engaged in conduct that undermines the civic integrity of an institution. Integrity breaches are treated as inherently at Level 3 or above by reason of the civic trust dimension, and are subject to enhanced scrutiny, automatic Sortition Panel oversight, and mandatory reporting to the Independent Epistemic Secretariat.

### 4.4 Community Disputes

A Community Dispute occurs when a disagreement between two or more parties — residents, community groups, civic bodies — has escalated beyond voluntary resolution and requires formal civic process. Community disputes may or may not involve rule breaches or harm-causing acts. They require:

- Identification of the core interests and concerns of each party.
- Facilitated dialogue processes before any determination pathway is engaged.

- A resolution pathway that addresses underlying conditions, not merely surface-level disagreements.
- Outcome measures that restore community cohesion rather than simply declaring a winner.

## 4.5 Systemic Failures

A Systemic Failure occurs when a pattern of civic outcomes, institutional behaviours, or structural conditions has produced widespread or recurring harm, or has placed residents at risk of significant harm that has not yet fully materialised. Systemic failures cannot be addressed through individual consequence processes alone. They require:

- Systemic investigation at the appropriate institutional level.
- Engagement with the NSA, RSA, or LSA responsible for the civic domain in question.
- A Structural Remedy Framework (Chapter 40) producing specific institutional changes.
- Monitoring by a dedicated Civic Justice Secretariat monitoring team.
- Regular review by the Independent Epistemic Secretariat.

Systemic Failures may be identified proactively — by the Civic Justice Secretariat's pattern analysis — or reactively, following a cluster of related individual matters. The obligation to escalate to Systemic Failure classification rests with the Civic Justice Secretariat and, independently, with the IES.

## Chapter 5: Jurisdictional Architecture

---

The Civic Justice Architecture operates at three civic tiers — National, Regional, and Local — corresponding to the NSA, RSA, and LSA structure of the Civic Commonwealth. Jurisdiction is determined primarily by the nature, severity, and geographic scope of the civic matter.

### 5.1 Local Sortition Assembly Jurisdiction

The LSA Justice function — operated through Local Magisters and MCFs — has primary jurisdiction over:

- All Level 1 and Level 2 matters arising within the local civic area.
- Community disputes between residents or community groups within the local civic area.
- Minor rule breaches of Local Civic Rules.
- Restitution and reparative matters involving parties within the local civic area.

Local Magisters may refer any matter upwards to the RSA if they determine that the matter exceeds local capacity, expertise, or jurisdictional scope.

### 5.2 Regional Sortition Assembly Jurisdiction

The RSA Justice function has primary jurisdiction over:

- All Level 3 and Level 4 matters.
- Matters involving parties in more than one local civic area.
- Integrity breaches involving Local civic officers.
- Systemic failures within a Regional civic domain.
- Appeals from LSA determinations.

Regional Magisters may refer any matter upwards to the NSA if the matter has national implications or exceeds regional capacity.

### 5.3 National Sortition Assembly Jurisdiction

The NSA Justice function has primary jurisdiction over:

- All Level 5 and Level 6 matters.
- Integrity breaches involving RSA or NSA civic officers.
- Systemic failures of national scope or civic constitutional significance.
- Appeals from RSA determinations.
- Matters affecting the constitutional integrity of the Civic Commonwealth.

### 5.4 Concurrent Jurisdiction and Coordination

Where a matter engages jurisdiction at multiple levels, the Civic Justice Secretariat shall convene a rapid Jurisdictional Coordination Meeting within five working days of the matter being referred. This meeting, attended by the relevant Magisters at each tier, shall determine the lead jurisdiction, supporting jurisdictions, and coordination protocol. The outcome shall be recorded and disclosed to all parties.

## 5.5 Cross-Border Matters

Where a civic matter involves residents, institutions, or harm arising across the borders of the Civic Commonwealth and a neighbouring jurisdiction, the NSA shall have primary responsibility for managing the matter under this Architecture to the extent of Commonwealth jurisdiction and shall engage the Civic Commonwealth's international relations function to negotiate appropriate cross-jurisdictional arrangements.

# PART TWO

## Institutional Roles and Governance

### Chapter 6: Magisters — Role, Authority, and Accountability

#### 6.1 The Role of the Magister

The Magister is the central civic officer of the justice architecture. The role combines functions that prior adversarial systems distributed across prosecutors, defence counsel, and judges — but in a fundamentally different configuration. The Magister is not an arbiter between competing parties. The Magister is an institutional truth-seeker and restorative process leader, whose task is to assemble the most accurate possible account of what occurred and to guide a structured process toward a legitimate, proportionate, and restorative civic outcome.

The Magister's authority derives entirely from this Architecture and from the Civic Rules Framework. It does not derive from personal status, professional tradition, or hierarchical rank. A Magister who acts outside the bounds of this Architecture acts without civic authority and is subject to the Integrity Breach protocols of Chapter 49.

#### 6.2 Magister Mandate

The Magister's formal mandate encompasses the following responsibilities:

13. To receive civic matters referred to their jurisdiction and to determine appropriate process pathways in accordance with this Architecture.
14. To direct investigation of civic matters to the standards set out in Chapters 12 through 18.
15. To ensure that all parties have full access to the procedural rights set out in Chapter 16.
16. To convene and chair Consequence Hearings in accordance with Chapter 19.
17. To apply the evidence standards set out in Chapter 20 and to document this application in writing.
18. To consult the Harm Matrix (Chapter 21) and Proportionality Framework (Chapter 22) in determining civic consequences.
19. To issue formal Consequence Determinations and to supervise their implementation.
20. To refer matters to Sortition Justice Panels at the thresholds specified in Chapter 24.
21. To report to the Civic Justice Secretariat on all matters within their jurisdiction.
22. To maintain the highest standards of independence, impartiality, and epistemic rigour.

23. To participate in continuing development and institutional learning programmes.

## 6.3 Limits of Magisterial Authority

The following are explicitly beyond the authority of any Magister, regardless of seniority, jurisdiction, or circumstance:

- Ordering the custodial detention of any party.
- Imposing a civic consequence that exceeds the Proportionality Framework without Sortition Panel authorisation.
- Conducting any process without the minimum procedural safeguards set out in Chapter 16.
- Issuing a determination that has not been reviewed by the Mandated Challenger at the required stage.
- Entering into any arrangement, formal or informal, that creates a conflict of interest as defined in section 6.7.
- Closing a matter without a formally recorded outcome.
- Directing the suppression or alteration of evidence.
- Acting on instructions from any Assembly, political body, or individual that seek to predetermine an outcome.

Magisterial authority is civic authority, not personal authority. A Magister who acts in excess of their mandate, or who is directed by any party to do so, must report that direction immediately to the Civic Justice Secretariat and, in the case of direction from an Assembly officer, simultaneously to the Independent Epistemic Secretariat.

## 6.4 Selection of Magisters

Magisters are selected through a structured three-stage process designed to ensure civic competence, epistemic integrity, and demographic breadth:

### 6.4.1 Stage One — Open Expression of Interest

Any resident of the Civic Commonwealth aged 25 or over, who has resided in the Commonwealth for a minimum of three years, and who holds no current elected, sortition, or executive civic position, may express interest in Magister qualification. Expressions of interest are submitted to the Civic Justice Secretariat.

### 6.4.2 Stage Two — Civic Competence Assessment

Applicants undergo a structured assessment covering: civic knowledge (the constitutional framework, this Architecture, and the Civic Rules Framework). evidence assessment skills. facilitation and communication competence. conflict navigation capability. and epistemic reasoning skills. Assessments are conducted by a rotating panel of serving Magisters and IES representatives, and are independently validated by a Sortition Oversight Panel.

### 6.4.3 Stage Three — Training and Certification

Applicants who pass the Civic Competence Assessment undertake a minimum of twelve months of supervised practice, paired with an experienced Magister, and including: a minimum of ten supervised case observations. five supervised co-led processes. a structured learning portfolio. and a final competence review. Certification is issued by the Civic Justice Secretariat upon recommendation of the supervising Magister and the training review panel.

The Civic Justice Secretariat shall maintain a certified Magister pool at each jurisdictional level. The pool shall be subject to annual demographic review to ensure proportionate civic representation.

## 6.5 Assignment of Magisters

Magisters are assigned to civic matters by the Civic Justice Secretariat. Assignment is made on the basis of:

- Jurisdictional level and case complexity (matching Magister experience level).
- Absence of any conflict of interest as assessed by the Secretariat.
- Demographic rotation, to ensure no single demographic profile dominates Magisterial assignment in any civic area.
- Workload balance across the certified pool.

No Magister may be assigned to a matter in which they have: a personal relationship with any primary party. a direct financial interest. prior involvement in related civic matters. or any characteristic that would lead a reasonable civic observer to doubt their impartiality.

## 6.6 Rotation and Terms of Service

Magisters serve in active civic matters for a maximum of five consecutive years before a mandatory two-year period of rest from active casework. During the rest period, Magisters may contribute to training, institutional learning, and supervisory roles. After the rest period, they may return to active certification if they complete a refresher assessment. No Magister may serve in active casework for more than fifteen years in total across their civic lifetime.

This rotation requirement serves two purposes: preventing the institutional capture and professional insularity that afflicted prior judicial systems. and ensuring that Magisterial knowledge remains grounded in contemporary civic experience.

## 6.7 Conflict of Interest Protocol

A conflict of interest arises where a Magister has any personal, financial, relational, or institutional connection to a matter that could reasonably be expected to affect their impartiality or create the appearance of partiality. Where a conflict is identified — by the Magister themselves, a party, the Secretariat, or any observer — the following protocol applies:

24. The Magister immediately discloses the potential conflict to the Civic Justice Secretariat, in writing, with full particulars.
25. The Secretariat appoints an independent Conflict Assessment Officer from the certified Magister pool.
26. The Conflict Assessment Officer determines, within five working days, whether the conflict is substantive.
27. If substantive, a replacement Magister is assigned within five further working days.
28. The original Magister shall have no further involvement in the matter.

A Magister who fails to disclose a conflict they were aware of, or ought reasonably to have been aware of, is subject to the Integrity Breach protocols of Chapter 49.

## 6.8 The Ethical Code of Magisters

Every Magister commits, upon certification and annually thereafter, to the following Civic Magisterial Code:

29. I seek truth above all, and I hold my conclusions loosely in proportion to the evidence that supports them.
30. I treat every person in every process I conduct as a full civic equal, deserving of dignity, transparency, and honest engagement.
31. I apply the Civic Justice Architecture faithfully and in full. I do not cut corners under pressure.
32. I disclose every conflict, every doubt about my own impartiality, and every instance of improper pressure or direction.
33. I complete every determination through genuine engagement with the evidence. I do not substitute institutional convenience for honest assessment.
34. I report to the Civic Justice Secretariat and, where required, to the IES, with complete candour and without omission.
35. I participate in my own review and learning with the same rigour I apply to the matters I handle.
36. I do not allow the professional norms, social pressures, or institutional habits of any prior system to substitute for the requirements of this Architecture.

## Chapter 7: Magisterial Community Facilitators (MCFs)

---

### 7.1 Role and Purpose

The Magisterial Community Facilitator is the civic architecture's primary bridge between institutional justice processes and community experience. MCFs work directly with affected parties — those who caused harm, those who experienced it, and the wider community — to prepare them for, and support them through, restorative processes. MCFs are not administrators. They are skilled, trained, and certified civic practitioners who carry the relational and facilitative weight of the justice architecture.

Without effective MCFs, even a well-designed restorative framework becomes an institutional procedure imposed on people rather than a civic process in which people participate. The quality of the MCF corps is therefore one of the most critical determinants of the Architecture's effectiveness.

### 7.2 MCF Responsibilities

MCFs hold the following responsibilities within the Civic Justice Architecture:

37. Initial contact and relationship-building with all primary parties following triage.
38. Preparation support — helping each party to understand the process, prepare their account, access support services, and exercise their procedural rights.
39. Facilitation of pre-hearing dialogue, where appropriate and where all parties consent.
40. Facilitation of Community Circles (Chapter 27).
41. Facilitation of mediation processes (Chapter 26).
42. Support during Consequence Hearings, ensuring all parties can participate fully.
43. Post-hearing monitoring of Civic Compact obligations.
44. Community liaison — communicating with affected communities in appropriately anonymised terms about civic justice processes and outcomes.
45. Reporting to the assigned Magister on the wellbeing, preparation status, and participation needs of each party.

### 7.3 MCF Selection and Training

MCFs are drawn from the civic community through an open application process. Essential competencies assessed at application include:

- Demonstrated experience in facilitation, conflict resolution, community work, or analogous fields.
- Emotional resilience and capacity to support parties in distress without losing professional boundaries.
- Communication skills across diverse cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- Understanding of trauma-informed practice.
- Civic knowledge and commitment to the principles of this Architecture.

Successful applicants undertake a minimum of nine months of supervised training including theoretical and practical components in: restorative justice methodology. trauma-informed facilitation. circle process. mediation technique. civic constitution and justice Architecture. evidence handling in a supporting role. and self-care and professional sustainability in high-intensity civic roles.

MCF certification is renewed every three years, subject to completion of continuing development requirements and a structured practice review. MCFs rotate out of active casework every four years for a minimum of one year of rest.

## 7.4 MCF Independence

Although MCFs work under the supervision of Magisters within civic matters, they maintain professional independence in the following respects: they report concerns about a Magister's conduct directly to the Civic Justice Secretariat without the Magister's knowledge or consent. they may decline to facilitate any process they believe is being conducted in a manner inconsistent with this Architecture. and they have direct access to the IES to raise epistemic concerns. This independence is essential to ensure that MCFs do not become instruments of institutional pressure on affected parties.

## Chapter 8: Sortition Justice Panels

---

### 8.1 Nature and Purpose

Sortition Justice Panels are the civic architecture's primary mechanism for ensuring that professional institutional actors — Magisters, MCFs, and the Secretariat — remain accountable to the community they serve. Panel members are not professionals. They are residents, randomly selected from the civic population, serving a defined civic role. Their function is oversight, review, and the application of common civic judgement to institutional decisions — not the replacement of professional expertise.

The sortition design of these panels is critical. Random selection ensures that panels cannot be captured by factional interests, cannot be stacked with allies of any party, and cannot be dominated by professional elites who have come to identify more with the institution than with the community.

### 8.2 Types of Sortition Justice Panel

#### 8.2.1 Case Review Panels

Convened to review Magisterial determinations in Level 3 and above matters, and in any Level 1 or 2 matter where an appeal is lodged. Panels consist of seven randomly selected residents from the relevant civic area, none of whom have been a primary party to the matter under review or have any conflict of interest.

#### 8.2.2 Systemic Review Panels

Convened to assess patterns of civic justice outcomes, institutional performance data, and recommendations from the IES. Panels consist of twelve residents selected from the broader civic area. Systemic Review Panels produce public reports and binding recommendations to the relevant Assembly and the Civic Justice Secretariat.

#### 8.2.3 Integrity Oversight Panels

Convened to review allegations of Magister or MCF misconduct, institutional bias, or systemic integrity failure. Panels consist of nine residents, none drawn from the local civic area of the matter under review, to ensure independence. Integrity Oversight Panels have authority to suspend Magisters, require retraining, or recommend removal from the certified pool.

#### 8.2.4 Constitutional Review Panels

Convened for Level 6 matters or matters with constitutional implications. These panels consist of fifteen residents selected at national level and operate under the additional supervision of the NSA and the IES. Constitutional Review Panel recommendations are referred to the NSA for formal resolution.

### 8.3 Sortition Selection Protocol

Panel members are drawn from the Civic Participation Register maintained by the relevant Assembly. The following selection rules apply:

- Selection is fully randomised by a verified, publicly auditable algorithm maintained by the IES.
- Any resident on the Register who has not served on a panel in the previous two years is eligible.
- Potential members are checked for conflicts of interest by the Civic Justice Secretariat before confirmation.
- A panel of fifteen potential members shall be drawn for every required panel of seven, to allow for conflict removal and unavoidable absences.
- Selected members are informed of their civic panel obligation with a minimum of ten working days' notice, with accommodation requirements met by the Secretariat.

### 8.4 Panel Support and Decision-Making

Panel members receive structured briefing from the Civic Justice Secretariat, including a plain-language summary of the matter under review, relevant procedural background, the Magisterial determination, and any submissions from parties. Panels are supported by a qualified Civic Justice Secretariat facilitator who ensures that processes are fair, deliberation is genuine, and all panel members have equal opportunity to contribute. Panel decisions require a supermajority of five out of seven (or equivalent proportion) to bind.

## Chapter 9: The Civic Justice Secretariat

---

### 9.1 Function and Scope

The Civic Justice Secretariat is the administrative backbone of the Civic Justice Architecture. It holds no adjudicative authority — it does not determine civic matters. Its role is to ensure that the institutional machinery of civic justice runs efficiently, consistently, transparently, and in full compliance with this Architecture.

The Secretariat operates at all three jurisdictional levels, with National, Regional, and Local functions coordinated under a unified operational framework. The National Secretariat holds the master data repository, the institutional learning function, and the performance monitoring function.

### 9.2 Core Functions

46. Case management: registration, tracking, timeline monitoring, and closure of all civic matters.
47. Magister and MCF pool management: recruitment pipelines, certification records, conflict-of-interest screening, rotation scheduling.
48. Sortition Panel administration: selection, briefing, support, and recording of all panel processes.
49. Data analysis and institutional learning: identification of patterns, production of quarterly outcome reports, and referral of systemic concerns to the IES.
50. Public reporting: production of appropriately anonymised public summaries of civic justice activity.
51. Civic Advocate coordination: maintaining the register of certified Civic Advocates and matching advocates to parties who request them.
52. Training coordination: partnership with training providers for Magister, MCF, and Civic Advocate development.
53. Archive management: secure, long-term maintenance of all civic justice records in compliance with data architecture standards.
54. Integrity monitoring: identification and escalation of patterns of institutional concern.
55. Emergency coordination: operational management of emergency civic justice procedures under Chapter 48.

### 9.3 Leadership and Accountability

The Secretariat at each level is led by a Civic Justice Director, appointed by open competition and accountable to the relevant Assembly's Civic Accountability Committee. The Civic Justice Director may not hold any Magisterial, MCF, or advocacy role simultaneously. Directors serve five-year terms, renewable once. The appointment of the National Civic Justice Director requires the endorsement of a Sortition Integrity Panel convened specifically for the purpose.

The Secretariat's performance is reviewed annually by a Systemic Review Panel and quarterly by the IES. The NSA receives an annual public report on Secretariat performance, civic justice outcomes, and systemic recommendations.

## Chapter 10: Civic Advocates

---

### 10.1 The Civic Advocate Function

The Civic Advocate is the Civic Justice Architecture's response to one of the most significant failures of the prior adversarial legal system: that access to representation was rationed by financial means, creating a two-tier justice system in which those with money could navigate the system more effectively than those without. In the Civic Commonwealth, every primary party in every civic matter has the unconditional right to a Civic Advocate, at no personal cost, from the point of referral to the point of final resolution.

The Civic Advocate's role is categorically different from that of a barrister or solicitor. The Advocate does not argue the party's case, seek to undermine the accounts of other parties, or deploy procedural tactics to achieve outcomes for their client regardless of the evidence. The Advocate supports the party to understand the process, to prepare their account honestly and completely, to exercise their procedural rights, to access relevant support services, and to engage with restorative processes in a fully informed and empowered way.

### 10.2 Rights Conferred by the Advocate Role

Any primary party who requests a Civic Advocate is entitled to:

- A trained, certified, independent Civic Advocate matched to them by the Civic Justice Secretariat within five working days of referral.
- Confidential communication with their Advocate, subject only to mandatory reporting requirements regarding ongoing risk of severe harm.
- Advocate attendance and support at every stage of the civic justice process.
- Advocate access to all non-confidential procedural documents relevant to the matter.
- Advocate right to raise procedural concerns with the Magister or, where appropriate, the Secretariat.

### 10.3 Advocate Certification and Standards

Civic Advocates are certified by the Civic Justice Secretariat following a minimum of six months of structured training in: civic justice processes and rights. communication and support skills. trauma-informed practice. boundaries and confidentiality. and civic constitutional principles. Advocates are subject to a Code of Civic Advocacy that prohibits strategic misrepresentation, the coaching of parties to give incomplete accounts, or any conduct designed to obstruct the truth-finding function of the Magister.

Advocates suspected of breaching this Code are subject to immediate suspension by the Secretariat and referral to an Integrity Oversight Panel.

# Chapter 11: Independent Epistemic Secretariat — Justice Division

---

## 11.1 The IES within the Justice Architecture

The Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES) is the constitutional body responsible for the quality and integrity of knowledge, evidence, and reasoning within the Civic Commonwealth. Its Justice Division carries specific responsibilities within this Architecture: maintaining the standards of civic proof. auditing the quality of Magisterial reasoning. monitoring for systemic epistemic failure. and deploying the Mandated Challenger function at required stages of high-stakes civic matters.

## 11.2 The Mandated Challenger System in Justice

At every Consequence Hearing involving a Level 4 or above determination, and in any matter where a Magister proposes a consequence at or near the upper bound of the Proportionality Framework, a Mandated Challenger appointed by the IES shall review the evidence and the Magister's provisional reasoning and produce a formal Mandated Challenge Report. This report:

56. Sets out the strongest available interpretation of the evidence that does not support the Magister's provisional conclusion.
57. Identifies any evidence that has been given insufficient weight.
58. Identifies any alternative explanations that deserve further investigation.
59. Is provided to the Magister, all primary parties, and the Sortition Justice Panel (where convened) before any final determination.

The Magister must engage with the Mandated Challenge Report in writing before issuing any final determination. A determination that does not address the Mandated Challenge Report substantively may be set aside on review.

## 11.3 IES Systemic Audit Function

The IES Justice Division conducts quarterly audits of a randomly selected sample of completed civic justice matters. These audits assess: the quality of investigative methodology. the rigour of evidentiary reasoning. the consistency of consequence determination with the Proportionality Framework. and the completeness and accuracy of institutional records. Audit findings are reported to the NSA, the relevant Assembly, and published in the IES Quarterly Civic Justice Report.

# PART THREE

## Investigative Architecture

### Chapter 12: Intake, Triage, and Case Classification

#### 12.1 The Intake Function

Any resident, community group, civic institution, Sortition Assembly, Magister, or MCF may refer a civic matter to the Civic Justice Secretariat at the relevant jurisdictional level. Referrals may be made:

- In person at any Civic Justice Secretariat office.
- Through the Sovereign Digital Network (SDN) Civic Justice portal.
- By telephone to the Civic Justice Referral Line, available at all hours.
- In writing to the Secretariat.
- Through a Civic Advocate.
- By any Assembly officer with knowledge of a potential civic matter.

Anonymous referrals are accepted and are processed at the same level of rigour as identified referrals. Anonymous referrals may not, however, advance to a Consequence Hearing without independent corroborating evidence, given the procedural rights implications of a consequence process in which the referred party cannot directly address their accuser.

#### 12.2 Triage Protocol

Every referral is triaged by a qualified Triage Officer within two working days of receipt. The Triage Officer — a certified MCF — assesses the referral against the following factors:

60. Matter classification: which of the five categories in Chapter 4 does the matter fall into, or appear to fall into?
61. Harm level: what is the preliminary harm level assessment using the Harm Matrix criteria?
62. Urgency: is there an ongoing or imminent risk of further harm requiring emergency action under Chapter 48?
63. Jurisdictional level: which jurisdictional level has primary responsibility?
64. Process pathway: which of the available process pathways is prima facie most appropriate?
65. Resource requirements: what specialist support, translation, or accessibility provision will be required?

The Triage Officer may seek supplementary information from the person making the referral before completing triage. The triage assessment is not final. It may be revised by the assigned Magister at any point as further information becomes available.

## 12.3 Triage Outcomes

Following triage, the matter is classified into one of the following process pathways:

Pathway	Applicable To	Initial Action
Direct Mediation	Level 1 and simple Level 2 matters where all parties are identified and willing to engage	MCF contacts parties within 3 working days. mediation convened within 15 days
Facilitated Dialogue	Level 2 matters and complex community disputes where direct mediation is insufficient	Magister assigned within 5 days. MCF contacts parties within 3 days of assignment
Full Investigative Process	Level 3 and above, integrity breaches, and complex harm matters	Magister assigned within 3 days. investigation protocol initiated within 5 days of assignment
Systemic Investigation	Referred systemic failures and pattern matters	National Secretariat convenes systemic investigation team within 10 days
Emergency Protocol	Matters involving immediate risk of severe harm	Emergency Magister contacted within 4 hours. emergency hearing within 24 hours

The Triage Officer records the full triage assessment, the classification, the assigned process pathway, and all supporting reasoning in the civic matter record on the SDN. The referring party is notified of the outcome within one working day of triage completion.

## 12.4 Priority Classification

Within each process pathway, matters are further classified by processing priority:

- Priority Alpha: Immediate risk of severe harm. emergency protocols. no delay permitted.
- Priority One: Level 4 and above matters. severe harm already occurred. 5-day investigative initiation target.
- Priority Two: Level 3 matters. significant harm. 10-day investigative initiation target.
- Priority Three: Level 2 matters. moderate harm. 20-day process initiation target.
- Priority Four: Level 1 matters. minor civic friction. 30-day mediation initiation target.

The Civic Justice Secretariat shall report any matter that fails to meet its priority target to the National Secretariat within 48 hours of the target being missed, with reasons and a revised timeline.

## Chapter 13: Investigation Standards and Methodology

### 13.1 The Investigative Purpose

Investigation in the Civic Justice Architecture serves one purpose: to establish, with the highest practical accuracy, a complete and balanced account of what occurred, who was involved, what harm resulted, and what contributing conditions existed. Investigation is not prosecution. The Magister conducting or directing an investigation is not building a case for one side. They are assembling a complete picture from which the most accurate account can be drawn.

This requires the Magister and their investigative team to actively seek information that might support alternative accounts, might exculpate parties initially considered responsible, and might reveal systemic rather than individual causes. The Mandated Challenger system (Chapter 11) reinforces this by requiring a formal challenge to the dominant emerging account before any final determination.

### 13.2 Investigation Planning

Within five working days of case assignment, the Magister shall produce a written Investigation Plan setting out:

66. The specific questions the investigation is designed to answer.
67. The evidence sources to be consulted (persons, records, physical evidence, data).
68. The timeline for completion of each investigative stage.
69. The resource requirements and any specialist expertise needed.
70. The conflict-of-interest assessment for all members of the investigative team.
71. The confidentiality classification of the investigation.
72. The Mandated Challenger referral trigger (which findings would require IES Mandated Challenger involvement).

The Investigation Plan is reviewed by the Civic Justice Secretariat and, for Level 4 and above matters, by the IES Justice Division, before investigative activity commences. Any concerns raised by the Secretariat or IES must be addressed before the Plan is finalised.

### 13.3 Investigation Team Composition

The composition of the investigative team is determined by the Magister in consultation with the Secretariat. Principles governing composition:

- The team must contain at least one MCF at all times.
- For Level 3 and above matters, the team must include at least two members who are not the lead Magister.
- For Level 5 and above matters, the team shall include an IES-appointed epistemic monitor.
- For matters involving significant technical, financial, scientific, or specialist dimensions, the team shall include a qualified specialist in the relevant field.
- No member of the team may have a conflict of interest with any primary party.

- The team shall, wherever possible, reflect the demographic breadth of the community from which the matter arises.

## 13.4 Sequential Investigative Stages

All Full Investigative Process matters follow a structured sequential methodology:

### **Stage 1: Initial Evidence Mapping (Days 1-5)**

The investigative team identifies all known evidence sources, reviews any referral documentation, assesses the preliminary harm level, and produces an initial evidence map. No interviews with primary parties occur at this stage.

### **Stage 2: Document and Record Collection (Days 5-15)**

All relevant documentary, digital, and physical evidence is collected, secured, and catalogued in accordance with the evidence protocols of Chapter 14. Requests for records from civic institutions, employers, or community organisations are made under the Civic Justice Investigation Authority established by this Architecture.

### **Stage 3: Witness and Community Account Gathering (Days 10-25)**

Interviews with witnesses, community members, and those with contextual knowledge are conducted in accordance with Chapter 15. These interviews are focused on gathering accounts, not on testing hypotheses. At this stage the investigative team remains fully open to all possible explanations.

### **Stage 4: Primary Party Interviews (Days 20-35)**

Structured interviews with the primary parties — those who caused harm, those who experienced it — are conducted in accordance with Chapter 15. All parties are offered their Civic Advocate. Parties are provided, in advance, with a clear statement of the matter under investigation and the questions to be addressed in their interview.

### **Stage 5: Evidence Integration and Preliminary Analysis (Days 30-45)**

The investigative team assembles all collected evidence into a comprehensive Evidence Report. This report presents all evidence in a structured format, noting where evidence sources corroborate or conflict with each other, and identifying the remaining areas of uncertainty.

### **Stage 6: Mandated Challenge (Days 40-55 for eligible matters)**

For matters at the threshold requiring Mandated Challenger involvement, the Evidence Report is provided to the IES-appointed Mandated Challenger, who has fifteen days to produce the Mandated Challenge Report. The investigative team must then assess whether any further investigation is required in light of the Mandated Challenge Report.

### **Stage 7: Finalisation of Investigative Findings (Days 50-65)**

The Magister produces the Final Investigative Findings — a formal document setting out the complete evidentiary basis, the Magister's account of what occurred (at the applicable standard of civic proof), and the preliminary harm level assessment. This document is shared with all primary parties before the Consequence Hearing.

## 13.5 Timelines and Accountability

The above timelines are targets, not absolute deadlines. For complex matters, the Magister may extend investigative stages with the written approval of the Civic Justice Secretariat, provided that the extension is documented, justified, and communicated to all parties. Extension of more than thirty days beyond the standard timeline requires Secretariat and Sortition Panel notification.

The Secretariat shall maintain a live timeline dashboard for all active investigations, visible to the IES and to the relevant Assembly Civic Accountability Committee. Cases that fall significantly behind timeline targets shall be subject to a Secretariat support review to identify and address the causes of delay.

## Chapter 14: Evidence Protocols

---

### 14.1 Categories of Evidence

The Civic Justice Architecture recognises and provides protocols for five categories of evidence, each subject to specific collection, handling, and assessment standards:

#### 14.1.1 Testimonial Evidence

Accounts provided by persons with direct or contextual knowledge of the matter. Testimonial evidence is the most common form of evidence in civic justice processes and is subject to the most careful methodological treatment, given the well-established research base on the limitations of human memory, the effects of trauma on recall, and the influence of subsequent experiences and accounts on original recollection.

#### 14.1.2 Documentary Evidence

Written, recorded, or stored materials relevant to the matter: communications (electronic or physical), records, contracts, civic decisions, financial records, reports, and equivalent. Documentary evidence is assessed for authenticity, completeness, and context.

#### 14.1.3 Physical Evidence

Tangible objects, materials, or physical conditions relevant to the matter. Physical evidence is catalogued, secured, and assessed by the relevant specialist. A chain of custody record must be maintained for all physical evidence from the point of its identification.

#### 14.1.4 Digital Evidence

Data held on digital systems, including but not limited to: communications, records, logs, images, audio, video, financial transactions, location data, and any metadata associated with the above. Digital evidence is collected and preserved in accordance with established forensic standards under the supervision of a qualified Digital Evidence Specialist. The Sovereign Digital Network (SDN) provides secure digital evidence storage with full chain-of-custody audit capability.

#### 14.1.5 Expert Evidence

Analysis, assessment, or opinion provided by a qualified specialist in a relevant field — medical, financial, psychological, technical, scientific, or other. Expert evidence is subject to the IES quality assessment framework. experts must disclose any conflicts of interest and any limitations of their assessment.

## 14.2 Evidence Admissibility Principles

Unlike prior adversarial systems, the Civic Justice Architecture does not operate a rigid admissibility framework based on technical legal rules. Instead, evidence is assessed on the basis of the following principles:

73. **Relevance:** Does the evidence bear directly or contextually on the questions the investigation is designed to answer?
74. **Reliability:** How confident can the investigative team be in the accuracy of this evidence, given its source, the circumstances of its production, and any factors that might affect its integrity?
75. **Proportionality:** Is the use of this evidence proportionate to the purposes of the investigation and the rights of all parties?
76. **Fairness:** Has each primary party had the opportunity to know of, and respond to, evidence that affects them?

Evidence that is relevant, reliable, proportionate, and fairly used shall be considered. Evidence that fails one or more of these principles shall be noted in the Evidence Report with an explanation of the limitation identified.

## 14.3 Evidence Collection Standards

The following standards govern evidence collection across all categories:

- All evidence collection activity is logged in the civic matter record, with date, method, person responsible, and any access control limitations.
- Evidence is collected at the earliest practical opportunity to minimise the risk of loss, degradation, or contamination.
- No evidence is altered, selectively disclosed, or withheld without documented justification reviewed by the Secretariat.
- Any evidence that appears to exculpate a person initially considered responsible must be collected, preserved, and treated with equal rigour to inculpatory evidence.
- Evidence collected through methods that breach the rights of any party (for example, through unauthorised interception or coercive questioning) is flagged, and the method reported to the IES and Secretariat. The Magister must determine whether the evidence can be used at all, and if so, must document the reasoning.
- Physical and digital evidence is stored in secure, access-controlled Secretariat facilities.
- All parties to a civic matter have the right to know what categories of evidence are held relating to them, subject to proportionate confidentiality protections.

## 14.4 Challenging Evidence Quality

Any primary party, their Civic Advocate, the Mandated Challenger, or any Sortition Panel member may raise a formal challenge to the quality, reliability, or collection methodology of any piece of evidence. The Magister must address such challenges in writing in the Final Investigative Findings. Unresolved challenges that bear on the determination must be presented to the Sortition Justice Panel (where convened) for their assessment.

## Chapter 15: Interview and Testimony Standards

---

### 15.1 Principles of Civic Interviewing

The civic interview is a truth-finding conversation, not an interrogation. The interviewer's role is to help the person being interviewed to provide the most complete and accurate account they are capable of, in conditions that support rather than undermine their ability to do so. This requires:

- A calm, respectful, non-confrontational setting.
- Advance notice of the topics to be covered, provided in writing.
- The right to have a Civic Advocate present.
- Clear explanation of the process, the use to which the interview account will be put, and the right to stop and rest.
- Interviewing by trained personnel using evidence-based methodological approaches.
- A full, accurate record of the interview, provided to the interviewee for review.

### 15.2 Interview Standards for Vulnerable Parties

The Civic Justice Architecture recognises that interviews with parties who have experienced trauma, who are children, who have cognitive disabilities, who have language barriers, or who are in other circumstances of vulnerability require additional methodological care. For such interviews:

77. A specialist interviewer with relevant competence in the applicable vulnerability area shall lead the interview.
78. The interview shall take place in the setting most conducive to the interviewee's comfort and communication.
79. Reasonable adjustments shall be made to interview format, duration, language, and support provision.
80. The MCF assigned to the party shall attend all interviews in a support capacity.
81. The interview shall, with consent, be recorded in a format most appropriate for the party (visual, audio, or written summary).
82. An IES epistemic monitor shall review the interview methodology in all Level 4 and above matters involving vulnerable parties.

### 15.3 Testimony in Consequence Hearings

Testimony at Consequence Hearings follows the structured restorative approach rather than adversarial examination. Parties are asked to speak to their experience and understanding of events. They are not subjected to cross-examination. The Magister may ask clarifying questions, and other parties may, through the Magister, request clarification of specific points. Direct challenges between parties are managed by the Magister and MCF, not through direct confrontation.

Where significant evidential disputes remain at the Consequence Hearing stage, the Magister shall present the conflicting accounts to the Sortition Justice Panel (where

convened) or shall document the dispute and the reasoning for preferring one account over another in the Consequence Determination.

## **15.4 Community Testimony**

For Level 3 and above matters with significant community impact, the Magister shall provide a structured mechanism for the affected community to contribute accounts of the impact of the harm on community life. Community testimony is gathered by MCFs through community listening sessions, written submissions, and, where appropriate, community circles, and is incorporated into the Evidence Report and the Consequence Hearing.

## Chapter 16: Rights and Protections for All Parties

---

### 16.1 Universal Procedural Rights

Every person who is a primary party to a civic justice process — whether they have been referred as the person who may have caused harm, or as the person who experienced harm — holds the following unconditional procedural rights:

83. The right to be informed clearly and promptly of the nature of the matter being investigated, the process to be followed, and their role within it.
84. The right to a Civic Advocate from the point of referral.
85. The right to an interpreter or communication support if needed.
86. The right to know what evidence has been collected that relates to them.
87. The right to provide their account in full, in a format and setting appropriate to their circumstances.
88. The right to reasonable time to prepare their account and to review relevant evidence before any Consequence Hearing.
89. The right to have their account considered in the Final Investigative Findings.
90. The right to be present at their own Consequence Hearing, or to participate remotely where presence is not reasonably practicable.
91. The right to receive the Consequence Determination in writing with full reasoning.
92. The right to appeal any Consequence Determination in accordance with Chapter 47.
93. The right to have their personal information handled in accordance with the Civic Data Architecture.

### 16.2 Specific Rights of Those Who Have Experienced Harm

In addition to universal rights, those who have experienced harm hold the following additional entitlements:

- The right to have their harm experience placed at the centre of the restorative process.
- The right to decide their level of direct participation in restorative processes — including the right to have their account represented by the MCF rather than to be present themselves.
- The right to be informed of the progress of the civic matter and of the final Consequence Determination.
- The right to contribute to the design of a Restitution Agreement where the harm is quantifiable.
- The right to participate in Reintegration Monitoring where they choose to.
- The right not to be identified in any public record without their explicit informed consent.

### 16.3 Specific Rights of Those Alleged to Have Caused Harm

Those referred as having caused harm hold the following additional entitlements:

- The presumption of civic good faith — the matter will be investigated fully before any determination is made.
- Full disclosure of the evidence against them before any Consequence Hearing.
- The right to provide their full account and to have it considered with equal rigour to other accounts.
- The right to challenge the quality or methodology of evidence through formal procedure.
- The right not to have a Consequence Determination made public before they have had the opportunity to engage with the Consequence Hearing.
- The right to have their participation in restorative processes recognised and given appropriate weight in consequence assessment.
- The right to appeal.

### 16.4 Community Rights

In matters of Level 3 and above, and in all community dispute matters, the affected community has the following rights:

- The right to have community impact recognised and formally considered in the civic justice process.
- The right to contribute accounts of community impact through structured processes.
- The right to receive an appropriately anonymised account of the civic matter outcome.
- The right to be consulted on structural remedies proposed in response to systemic failures that affected the community.

### 16.5 Rights in Cases of Systemic Failure

Where a civic matter is classified as a Systemic Failure, the rights of affected parties are extended to include: the right to participate in the systemic investigation process. the right to be informed of the Structural Remedy Framework developed in response. and the right to appeal to the NSA if they consider the Structural Remedy Framework to be inadequate.

## Chapter 17: Anti-Bias and Anti-Capture Safeguards

---

### 17.1 The Bias Risk in Civic Justice

No institutional justice system is immune to bias. Research across multiple justice traditions and jurisdictions demonstrates that unconscious bias, institutional culture, social expectations, demographic prejudice, and factional pressure all influence justice outcomes in ways that are frequently invisible to the individuals concerned. The Civic Justice Architecture is designed with this research base in mind, and builds in structural safeguards at every stage.

### 17.2 Demographic Monitoring

The Civic Justice Secretariat shall maintain continuous demographic monitoring of civic justice outcomes, tracking:

- The demographic profile of those referred to the civic justice system.
- The demographic profile of those found to have caused harm, by harm level.
- The demographic profile of those who experienced harm.
- The nature and severity of consequences by demographic group.
- The rates of appeal and appeal success by demographic group.
- The geographic distribution of civic justice activity.

Where demographic disparities are identified that cannot be explained by evidential differences, the IES shall conduct a systemic bias investigation and produce recommendations for structural adjustment. The NSA shall receive these recommendations and shall have a binding obligation to respond within sixty days.

### 17.3 Investigative Bias Controls

At the investigative stage, the following structural controls apply:

94. The Investigation Plan must include an explicit bias assessment, identifying assumptions that the investigative team holds about the likely account of events, and the steps taken to challenge those assumptions.
95. The Mandated Challenger system (Chapter 11) provides a structural challenge to dominant investigative conclusions.
96. A minimum of two investigators must independently assess key evidence in Level 3 and above matters, with any disagreement between their assessments documented and resolved before the Final Investigative Findings.
97. The IES epistemic monitor has authority to halt an investigation if they identify systematic bias in the methodology and refer the matter for investigative team replacement.

## 17.4 Anti-Capture Safeguards

Institutional capture occurs when external interests systematically influence a justice system — political, commercial, or factional — in a way that compromises its integrity. The following safeguards address this risk:

- Sortition selection of oversight panels prevents factional stacking.
- Mandatory disclosure of any communication between a Magister or Secretariat officer and any political body, Assembly officer, commercial interest, or external organisation regarding a specific civic matter.
- The IES operates with full institutional independence from the Assemblies and the Secretariat.
- Whistleblower protections (Chapter 45) ensure that staff who identify capture attempts can report safely.
- The Mandated Challenger reports directly to the IES, not to the Magister or Secretariat, ensuring their independence.
- Rotation requirements for Magisters, MCFs, and Advocates prevent the development of entrenched institutional networks.

## 17.5 Handling Political Pressure

Any attempt by an Assembly officer, elected or sortition-appointed civic official, commercial interest, media organisation, or any other external party to influence the outcome of a specific civic matter, communicate with a Magister about a matter in a way designed to shape the outcome, or create public pressure in relation to a matter prior to its conclusion, shall be:

98. Immediately reported by the Magister or Secretariat officer who received the communication to the IES and the Civic Justice Director.
99. Formally recorded in the civic matter record.
100. Reported to the relevant Assembly Civic Accountability Committee.
101. Subject to an Integrity Breach investigation where the communication amounts to an attempt to improperly influence a civic justice process.

## Chapter 18: Digital Systems and Audit Trails

---

### 18.1 The Sovereign Digital Network in Civic Justice

All civic justice records, processes, and communications are managed through the Sovereign Digital Network (SDN), the Civic Commonwealth's public-purpose digital infrastructure. The SDN provides the Civic Justice Architecture with secure, auditable, accessible, and rights-respecting digital case management.

### 18.2 Case Management System

The SDN Civic Justice Case Management System provides:

- A single, continuous, tamper-evident record for each civic matter from referral to closure.
- Role-based access control, ensuring that each person has access only to the information they need for their civic role.
- Automated timeline tracking and alert generation for priority and deadline monitoring.
- Secure document storage with chain-of-custody audit capability.
- Real-time reporting to the Secretariat, IES, and relevant Assembly oversight functions.
- A party-facing portal allowing primary parties to access the information they are entitled to under Chapter 16.
- An anonymised public reporting interface.

### 18.3 Audit Trail Standards

Every action taken within the SDN civic justice case management system is automatically logged with the identity of the actor, the date and time, and the nature of the action. This audit trail is:

102. Immutable — it cannot be altered or deleted, only amended with a visible, timestamped note.
103. Accessible to the IES at all times.
104. Subject to quarterly audit by the Sortition Systemic Review Panel.
105. Retained for a minimum of twenty years following the closure of a civic matter.

### 18.4 Confidentiality Controls

The following categories of information within the civic justice record are subject to confidentiality controls:

- The identity of any person who has experienced harm (unless they have explicitly consented to identification).
- The identity of any child involved in any capacity.
- Medical, psychological, or other sensitive personal information provided in evidence.

- The identity of any person who made an anonymous referral.
- Ongoing investigative methodology that, if disclosed prematurely, would prejudice the investigation.
- The deliberations of Sortition Justice Panels (outcomes, not deliberations, are public).

No confidentiality control may be used to conceal evidence of Magister or institutional misconduct. Where a conflict arises between confidentiality and the need to disclose institutional wrongdoing, the IES makes the determination.

# PART FOUR

## The Deliberative Justice Process

### Chapter 19: From Referral to Resolution — The Complete Process

#### 19.1 The Process Map

The following constitutes the complete procedural sequence for civic matters proceeding through the Full Investigative Process pathway. Direct Mediation and Facilitated Dialogue pathways are simplified versions of this sequence, specified in Part Five.

Stage	Name	Key Actions	Timeline
1	Referral and Intake	Matter reported. intake officer creates case record. immediate assessment for emergency protocols	Day 0-1
2	Triage	Triage Officer classifies matter. assigns process pathway and priority. notifies parties	Day 1-3
3	Magister Assignment	Secretariat assigns Magister. conflict screening. parties notified	Day 3-8
4	Rights and Advocate Provision	Parties informed of rights. Civic Advocates matched and introduced. MCF introduced	Day 5-10
5	Investigation Planning	Magister produces Investigation Plan. Secretariat and IES review	Day 8-15
6	Investigation	Evidence gathering. witness interviews. primary party interviews. Mandated Challenge	Day 10-65 (level-dependent)
7	Draft Findings	Magister produces Draft Investigative Findings. shared with parties for response	Within 10 days of investigation close
8	Party Response	All parties may respond to Draft Findings. responses incorporated or addressed	10 days for response
9	Final Findings	Magister issues Final Investigative Findings with harm level assessment	Within 5 days of response period close

Stage	Name	Key Actions	Timeline
10	Pre-Hearing Preparation	MCF supports all parties in preparing for Consequence Hearing. pre-hearing dialogue where appropriate	10-15 days
11	Consequence Hearing	Formal hearing. accounts heard. restorative dialogue. Magister applies Harm Matrix and Proportionality Framework	Scheduled. typically, 1-3 sessions
12	Sortition Panel Review	For eligible matters, Sortition Panel reviews before determination is finalised	10 days post-hearing
13	Consequence Determination	Magister issues written, reasoned Consequence Determination	Within 10 days of hearing close or Panel review
14	Civic Compact and Agreement	Restitution and restorative obligations formalised in Civic Compact. signed by parties	Within 10 days of Determination
15	Implementation and Monitoring	MCF monitors compliance with Civic Compact obligations. quarterly reviews	Duration of Compact obligations
16	Closure and Learning	Formal closure of civic matter. case referred to institutional learning function. public summary produced	On completion of Compact obligations

## 19.2 The Consequence Hearing — Detailed Protocol

The Consequence Hearing is the civic justice process's most significant procedural event. It is not a trial. It is a structured, restorative, evidence-based deliberation in which all primary parties, the Magister, the MCF, Civic Advocates, and (where applicable) Sortition Panel members engage with the Final Investigative Findings and work toward a determination that is proportionate, restorative, and genuinely owned by those involved.

### 19.2.1 Hearing Preparation

At least ten days before the Consequence Hearing, the Magister ensures that: all parties have received the Final Investigative Findings. all parties have had access to their Civic Advocate. the MCF has conducted pre-hearing preparation sessions with each party. any accessibility or communication requirements have been met. and the hearing venue is appropriate to the nature of the matter and the needs of the parties.

### 19.2.2 Hearing Structure

The Consequence Hearing follows a structured sequence:

106. Opening: The Magister opens the hearing, explains the process, confirms the rights of all present, and outlines the Final Investigative Findings.
107. Account of those who experienced harm: Primary parties who experienced harm speak to their experience, the impact on their lives, and their understanding of what resolution would mean for them. The MCF supports parties who choose not to speak directly.
108. Account of those alleged to have caused harm: Primary parties who are alleged to have caused harm to have the opportunity to speak — to give their account of events, to acknowledge or dispute findings, and to speak to the circumstances relevant to their actions.
109. Community account (Level 3+): The MCF presents the community impact account gathered through prior community listening sessions.
110. Deliberative phase: The Magister facilitates structured dialogue between parties, drawing on restorative justice circle methodologies, to explore understanding, acknowledgement, and possible resolution pathways.
111. Harm Matrix assessment: The Magister presents, in accessible language, their assessment of the harm level and the range of civic consequences indicated by the Proportionality Framework.
112. Restorative agreement phase: Where possible, parties are supported to reach agreement on the elements of a Civic Compact that will constitute the resolution.
113. Closing: The Magister confirms next steps — the Consequence Determination timeline, the Compact formalisation process, and the monitoring arrangements.

### 19.2.3 Multi-Session Hearings

Complex matters, and matters involving significant trauma or high levels of interpersonal difficulty, shall be scheduled across multiple hearing sessions rather than compressed into a single event. The Magister, in consultation with the MCF and parties, determines the optimal session structure. Breaks of not less than one week between sessions shall be provided in multi-session matters involving severe harm, to allow parties time to process.

## 19.3 Expedited Process for Minor Matters

For Level 1 and simple Level 2 matters proceeding through the Direct Mediation pathway, the process is condensed as follows:

114. Referral, triage, and MCF assignment: Days 0-5.
115. Initial contact and preparation: Days 5-10.
116. Mediation session(s): Days 10-25.
117. Mediation agreement and Civic Compact: Within 5 days of conclusion.
118. MCF monitoring: Duration of any agreed obligations.

No Magister is required for Direct Mediation pathway matters unless the matter is escalated to a higher pathway. The MCF leads the entire process.

## Chapter 20: Standards of Civic Proof

---

### 20.1 The Purpose of Proof Standards

Standards of civic proof define the threshold of evidential reliability required before specific determinations can be made. They exist to protect parties from consequences determined on insufficient evidence while ensuring that genuine harm and genuine rule breaches can be addressed effectively. The three standards of civic proof are calibrated to harm level and consequence severity.

### 20.2 Standard One: Clear Civic Account

**Applies to: Triage determination. Level 1 matters. procedural decisions during investigation.**

The Clear Civic Account standard requires that the available evidence, taken as a whole, supports a coherent and consistent account of the matter sufficient to justify the specific decision being made. This standard does not require corroboration of every element, but requires that no significant contradictory evidence has been ignored and that the account is not speculative or inferential beyond reasonable expectation. Decision: triage classification and allocation to process pathway.

### 20.3 Standard Two: Reasoned Civic Conclusion

**Applies to: Level 2 and Level 3 harm determinations. most Civic Compact obligations. community dispute resolution outcomes.**

The Reasoned Civic Conclusion standard requires that, having examined all available evidence, the Magister can set out clear, documented reasons why the account they have reached is substantially more credible and consistent than any available alternative account. It requires active engagement with competing explanations and documented reasoning for preferring the account adopted. This is not a balance of probabilities in the adversarial legal sense — it requires genuine epistemic rigour and the elimination of unreasonable doubt through documented reasoning, not mere preference.

### 20.4 Standard Three: Established Civic Account

**Applies to: Level 4 and above harm determinations. extended consequence determinations. permanent civic adjustments. integrity breach findings.**

The Established Civic Account standard is the highest standard in the Civic Justice Architecture. It requires that the evidence supporting the Magister's account of events is so substantially stronger than any alternative explanation that no civic mind, applying itself honestly and rigorously to the evidence in full, could reach a contrary conclusion. This standard is not "beyond all possible doubt" — it acknowledges that uncertainty is inherent in any account of past events. But it requires that uncertainty is genuinely minimal, that all reasonable alternative accounts have been investigated and found substantially inferior, and that the Mandated Challenge has been engaged with and addressed.

## 20.5 Proof and Consequence Proportionality

The proof standard required is not determined solely by harm level. It is also determined by the severity of the proposed civic consequence. Any consequence at or near the upper bound of the Proportionality Framework must be supported by the Established Civic Account standard, regardless of the nominal harm level. The Magister must document the standard applied and the reasoning for its application in every Consequence Determination.

## 20.6 The Role of Uncertainty

Where the evidence does not reach the required standard of proof, the Magister has the following options: conclude the investigation and record that the matter was not established to the required standard (noting this does not mean the harm did not occur, only that it could not be established). identify and undertake further investigation. or, where partial establishment is possible, proceed to a restorative process based on the established elements alone. No consequence may be imposed for any element of a matter that has not been established to the required standard.

The acknowledgement of uncertainty is not a system failure. It is a mark of epistemic integrity. The institutional learning function shall monitor patterns of failed establishment and identify systemic causes.

## Chapter 21: The Harm Matrix and Classification System

### 21.1 Purpose of the Harm Matrix

The Harm Matrix is the structured analytical tool that enables Magisters to classify the harm associated with a civic matter consistently, proportionately, and in a manner that is transparent to all parties. It replaces the arbitrary and opaque sentencing frameworks of prior adversarial systems with a structured, reasoned, and auditable classification methodology.

### 21.2 Harm Assessment Dimensions

Every harm assessment under this Architecture considers the following seven dimensions:

Dimension	What It Measures	Assessment Questions
Severity	The intensity of harm experienced	How seriously was the person or community affected? Was harm life-altering, temporary, reversible?
Duration	How long the harm persisted or will persist	Was harm momentary, ongoing, or permanent? What is the projected duration of continuing impact?
Breadth	The number of people affected	Did harm affect one person, a household, a community group, a wider community, or systemic structures?
Reversibility	Whether and how fully harm can be repaired	Can material or physical harm be fully repaired? Can psychological or relational harm be healed? What is the realistic restoration pathway?
Intent	The degree of deliberateness involved	Was the harm deliberate, reckless, negligent, or inadvertent? Was there pattern of prior similar behaviour?
Power Dimension	Whether power imbalance was exploited	Was the harm enabled by a position of trust, authority, or power over the person harmed? Was vulnerability exploited?
Civic Context	Whether the harm affected civic infrastructure or democratic integrity	Did the harm weaken civic institutions, sortition processes, the epistemic commons, or community civic participation?

### 21.3 The Harm Levels

#### Level 1 — Minor Civic Friction

Characteristics: low severity. no lasting impact. single party affected. reversible. inadvertent or low-intent. no power exploitation. no civic infrastructure dimension. Examples: minor neighbour disputes, low-impact procedural rule breaches, isolated disrespectful conduct without material harm. Typical resolution pathway: Direct Mediation.

## **Level 2 — Moderate Individual Harm**

Characteristics: moderate severity. temporary to medium-term impact. one to few persons affected. largely reversible with restitution. variable intent. limited power dimension. no or minimal civic dimension. Examples: financial harm below a civic-defined threshold, property damage, interpersonal harm without physical injury, discriminatory conduct with limited scope. Typical resolution pathway: Facilitated Dialogue or early Consequence Hearing.

## **Level 3 — Significant Individual or Community Harm**

Characteristics: significant severity. medium to long-term impact. several to many persons affected, or pattern of Level 2 harm. partially reversible. intent variable but pattern matters. may involve power dimension. limited civic infrastructure dimension. Examples: sustained financial harm, physical harm below severe threshold, community-scale discriminatory conduct, significant privacy breach, persistent interpersonal harm. Typical pathway: Full Investigative Process with Community Circle.

## **Level 4 — Severe Individual Harm**

Characteristics: high severity. long-term or permanent impact on individuals. potentially many affected. limited reversibility. may involve deliberateness or recklessness. significant power dimension common. no systemic civic infrastructure dimension. Examples: severe physical harm, significant psychological harm with lasting effects, major financial ruin, exploitation of a person in a position of significant vulnerability. Typical pathway: Full Investigative Process. Sortition Panel required. Mandated Challenge required.

## **Level 5 — Community-Scale Harm**

Characteristics: very high severity. widespread and lasting community impact. many or all community members affected. very limited reversibility of systemic effects. typically involves institutional negligence, recklessness, or abuse. major power dimension. may affect civic infrastructure. Examples: systematic discrimination in civic delivery, large-scale financial harm, failure of major civic systems causing widespread suffering, environmental harm at community scale. Typical pathway: NSA jurisdiction. dedicated systemic investigation team. multiple Sortition Panels. IES systemic audit.

## **Level 6 — Civic Infrastructure Harm**

Characteristics: existential impact on civic democratic systems. affects constitutional integrity of the Civic Commonwealth. may affect entire population. largely irreversible without major systemic intervention. typically involves deliberate or systematic abuse of civic constitutional position. maximum power dimension. directly targets civic infrastructure. Examples: coordinated attempt to subvert sortition integrity, systematic suppression of epistemic commons, organised abuse of civic office to undermine Assembly accountability, institutional capture of Magisterial function. Pathway: NSA and Constitutional Review Panel. IES full investigation. Dissolution Covenant assessment if applicable.

## **21.4 Multiple-Dimension Assessment Procedure**

The Magister completes the Harm Matrix assessment by: scoring each of the seven dimensions on a three-point scale (low/medium/high). identifying the highest dimension score as the primary indicator. considering how the combination of dimension scores produces an overall harm level. and documenting the complete assessment with reasoning in the Consequence Determination. A matter with a single very high dimension score and otherwise low scores may be classified at a lower overall level than the single highest

dimension would suggest if the reasoning is documented. A matter with multiple medium scores may reach a higher overall level than any single dimension alone.

## Chapter 22: Proportionality Framework

### 22.1 The Principle of Proportionality

Every civic consequence must be proportionate to the harm established. This means: the consequence must be necessary (no less restrictive or demanding response would achieve the purposes of the Architecture). calibrated (the response reflects the actual severity, duration, breadth, and intent of the harm). and appropriate to the restorative purpose (the consequence must primarily serve the goal of restoration, not the satisfaction of community anger or institutional self-assertion).

### 22.2 The Consequence Spectrum by Harm Level

Harm Level	Core Consequence Types	Extended Measures (where core insufficient)	Prohibited Measures
Level 1	Direct apology. mediated agreement. minor restitution. community dialogue	MCF-supervised civic engagement. civic learning module	None prohibited beyond absolute prohibitions
Level 2	Structured restitution. facilitated apology. civic learning requirement. community service agreement	Temporary exclusion from specific civic spaces. supervised community reintegration	Custodial measures. public identification without consent
Level 3	Formal restitution agreement. structured learning programme. community accountability process. supervised community role	Extended community supervision. role exclusion for defined period. structural remedy where systemic element identified	Custodial measures. indefinite role exclusion
Level 4	Extended structured restitution. formal civic accountability process. structured rehabilitation programme. Sortition-supervised compliance. role exclusion	Extended role exclusion. Civic Compact with regular Sortition review. mandatory structured learning. independent monitoring	Custodial measures. public identification without consent. permanent exclusion without review
Level 5	Institutional accountability process. systemic restitution. structural remedy. community-scale restorative programme. NSA-supervised accountability	Institutional dissolution or reconstruction. NSA-mandated structural reform. long-term Sortition oversight. civic role prohibition for defined extended period	Custodial measures. collective punishment. consequences for non-responsible parties
Level 6	Constitutional accountability process.	Dissolution Covenant assessment. NSA-	All standard prohibitions plus:

Harm Level	Core Consequence Types	Extended Measures (where core insufficient)	Prohibited Measures
	systemic civic repair programme. Constitutional Review Panel-directed restoration. IES-supervised epistemic repair	directed constitutional remedy. long-term constitutional monitoring	any measure that itself undermines civic constitutional integrity

## 22.3 Consequence Aggregation Rules

Where a person is responsible for harm at multiple harm levels within the same civic matter, or has been subject to prior civic justice processes within the previous five years, the following aggregation rules apply:

119. The highest single harm level establishes the primary consequence range.
120. Prior civic matters within five years may increase consequence severity by one proportionality band within the applicable range, but not beyond the maximum for the harm level.
121. Multiple simultaneous harm categories do not automatically compound. the Magister assesses the combined picture holistically rather than arithmetically.
122. The Proportionality Framework must always be applied with reference to the restorative purpose: the goal of consequence aggregation is proportionate accountability, not cumulative punishment.

## 22.4 Mitigating and Contextual Factors

The Magister must consider, and document the consideration of, the following factors when determining where within the applicable consequence range a specific determination should fall:

- Genuine acknowledgement of harm and its impact.
- Active and meaningful participation in the restorative process.
- Prior steps taken to reduce harm before civic process.
- The presence of factors that significantly reduced the degree of personal culpability (coercion, acute mental health crisis, significant cognitive limitation without prior support).
- The structural or systemic conditions that contributed to the harm — which may indicate that consequences should also have a systemic dimension.
- The likely impact of a specific consequence on those who experienced harm — particularly whether a severe consequence would cause secondary harm to the person seeking restoration.

## 22.5 Enhanced Review for Upper-Range Determinations

Any consequence determination at the upper boundary of the applicable range requires: a written justification setting out why a lesser consequence would be insufficient, an independent review by a second qualified Magister, and Sortition Panel review before the determination becomes binding. No upper-range consequence may be implemented before these reviews are complete, except in emergency circumstances under Chapter 48.

## Chapter 23: Decision-Making Rules for Magisters

---

### 23.1 The Decision-Making Standard

Magisterial decision-making must be: evidence-based, drawing only on evidence collected and handled in accordance with Chapter 14. transparent, with all significant reasoning documented in writing. proportionate, in accordance with Chapter 22. engaged with the Mandated Challenge where applicable. and reviewable, with every element of the reasoning accessible to the Sortition Panel and IES.

A Magister who cannot articulate, in writing, the specific evidential basis for each element of a Consequence Determination has not completed the decision-making process.

### 23.2 The Reasoning Document

Every Consequence Determination must be accompanied by a Reasoning Document containing:

123. A statement of the specific civic matter and the parties.
124. The harm level classification with dimension-by-dimension assessment.
125. The standard of civic proof applied and the evidence on which it rests.
126. Explicit engagement with the Mandated Challenge Report (where applicable).
127. The consequence or consequences determined, with specific reference to the Proportionality Framework.
128. The consideration of mitigating and contextual factors.
129. The rationale for any consequence at the upper range of the applicable band.
130. The basis for any agreed departure from the standard consequence range, where parties have agreed a different restorative pathway.
131. The monitoring and review arrangements.
132. A plain-language summary suitable for sharing with the parties and, in appropriately anonymised form, with the public.

### 23.3 Multi-Party Deliberation

For Level 3 and above matters, the Magister may not issue a Consequence Determination without first consulting with the MCF on the welfare implications for all parties and with the Civic Justice Secretariat on consistency with recent comparable determinations. These consultations are advisory, not binding, but must be documented and any departure from their recommendations explained.

## 23.4 Time Limits for Determination

The Consequence Determination must be issued within ten working days of the close of the Consequence Hearing, or within ten working days of the completion of a Sortition Panel review, whichever is later. Where the Magister requires additional time, they must notify the Secretariat with reasons. extensions beyond a further ten days require Secretariat approval and notification to the parties. A Consequence Determination outstanding for more than thirty days beyond the hearing close triggers a mandatory Secretariat review.

## Chapter 24: Sortition Panel Intervention Thresholds

---

### 24.1 Mandatory Panel Involvement

Sortition Justice Panel involvement is mandatory, and no Consequence Determination may be finalised without it, in the following circumstances:

133. Any matter classified at Level 4 or above.
134. Any Integrity Breach matter, regardless of harm level.
135. Any matter involving an allegation against a current Magister, MCF, Civic Advocate, or Secretariat officer.
136. Any matter where the proposed consequence is at the upper range of the Proportionality Framework.
137. Any matter that has been appealed, where the Panel acts as the appeal body.
138. Any Systemic Failure investigation.
139. Any matter where the Magister requests Panel involvement.

### 24.2 Discretionary Panel Involvement

The Magister may convene a Sortition Panel for any Level 2 or Level 3 matter where: the matter raises novel questions not previously addressed in Civic Justice guidance. there are significant factual disputes that the Magister considers would benefit from community deliberation. or the community has expressed legitimate concern about a matter of significant local impact.

### 24.3 Panel Review Process

Where a Sortition Justice Panel is convened for review, the following process applies:

140. The Civic Justice Secretariat selects and briefs panel members within ten days of the determination of the trigger.
141. Panel members receive the Final Investigative Findings, the Reasoning Document, the Mandated Challenge Report (where applicable), and all party submissions.
142. The Panel meets for not less than one full session with the Magister present to answer process questions (not to advocate for their determination).
143. The Panel deliberates privately and produces a written assessment: either endorsing the determination, recommending specific modifications, or requiring reconsideration.
144. The Magister must respond in writing to any Panel recommendation within five working days.
145. A Panel recommendation for reconsideration must be implemented unless the Magister can provide documented grounds for non-compliance, in which case the matter is referred to the IES for resolution.

## Chapter 25: Recording, Archiving, and Transparency

### 25.1 The Public Transparency Commitment

The Civic Justice Architecture is built on the principle that justice must be visible to be legitimate. This does not mean unrestricted disclosure of personal information. It means that the system operates, in its structure and aggregate, in full public view: every process type, every outcome category, every demographic pattern, every institutional learning development, and every systemic concern is visible to civic scrutiny.

### 25.2 Individual Case Records

Every civic matter generates a complete case record held within the SDN, containing all documents, evidence logs, interview records, findings, determinations, panel reviews, compact terms, and monitoring reports. Case records are: accessible to primary parties and their Advocates. accessible to the IES and Secretariat. accessible to Sortition Panels in their oversight capacity. accessible to future Magisters only where a new matter directly relates to a prior matter (with Secretariat authorisation). and subject to the retention and anonymisation schedule set out in section 25.4.

### 25.3 Public Reporting Standards

The Civic Justice Secretariat shall publish:

- Monthly: raw case intake data (number of referrals by category and jurisdiction).
- Quarterly: outcome data by harm level, consequence type, and demographic distribution. IES audit findings. timeline performance data. Sortition Panel review outcomes.
- Annually: a comprehensive Civic Justice Architecture Review covering all dimensions of system performance, institutional learning achievements, systemic recommendations, and demographic disparity analysis.

All published data is anonymised to protect individual parties. Where anonymisation would not adequately protect individuals in cases of distinctive personal circumstances, additional privacy measures are applied with IES oversight.

### 25.4 Retention and Anonymisation Schedule

Record Type	Retention Period	Anonymisation Point
All civic matter records (full)	20 years from closure	Not anonymised. access-controlled
Civic Compact records	10 years from completion of obligations	Not anonymised. access-controlled
Aggregate outcome data	Indefinite	Anonymised at point of public publication
IES audit reports	Indefinite	Published in full (institutional, not personal)

<b>Record Type</b>	<b>Retention Period</b>	<b>Anonymisation Point</b>
Sortition Panel reviews	Indefinite	Outcomes public. deliberations access-controlled for 10 years
Training and development records	10 years from last active role	Access-controlled. not published

# PART FIVE

## Restorative and Transformative Pathways

### Chapter 26: Mediation and Facilitated Dialogue

#### 26.1 Mediation in the Civic Context

Mediation in the Civic Justice Architecture is a structured, voluntary, facilitated process in which parties work with a trained MCF to reach their own resolution of a civic matter. It is most appropriate for Level 1 and uncomplicated Level 2 matters where: the primary parties have a continuing or desired relationship that they wish to preserve. the harm is quantifiable and the parties have a shared interest in resolution. and neither party requires the formal accountability structure of a full investigative process to feel that justice has been done.

Mediation is never compelled. A party who does not wish to participate in mediation, or who does not believe that mediation will produce a fair outcome, may at any point request escalation to a more formal process pathway. This request shall be honoured without any adverse inference being drawn from the request.

#### 26.2 The Mediation Process

The MCF-led mediation process follows a structured sequence:

146. Separate preparation meetings with each party individually — the MCF hears each party's account, helps them understand the process and their rights, and establishes whether they are willing to proceed.
147. Shared session(s) — the MCF facilitates a structured dialogue in which each party speaks to their experience, their understanding of events, and their needs and interests. The MCF uses active facilitation techniques to ensure each party can speak and be heard without interruption, dismissal, or escalation.
148. Agreement development — where understanding and acknowledgement have been established, the MCF supports the parties to identify the practical steps that would constitute a fair resolution.
149. Civic Compact formation — the agreed resolution is recorded as a Civic Compact, signed by both parties and countersigned by the MCF.
150. Monitoring — the MCF follows up at agreed intervals to confirm that Compact obligations are being met.

#### 26.3 Facilitated Dialogue — Distinct from Mediation

Facilitated Dialogue is a more structured process than mediation, involving a Magister in addition to the MCF, and typically involving more formal evidence consideration. It applies to: Level 2 matters where mediation has not resolved the matter. Level 3 matters where a Consequence Hearing is anticipated but where pre-hearing restorative dialogue may

significantly advance the prospects of genuine resolution. and community disputes of moderate complexity. Facilitated Dialogue follows the same sequence as the Consequence Hearing (Chapter 19.2) in abbreviated form but is explicitly framed as a preparation process rather than a determination process.

## Chapter 27: Community Circles

---

### 27.1 The Community Circle

The Community Circle is the Civic Justice Architecture's most profoundly restorative process. Drawn from the indigenous peace-making circle traditions that have been extensively researched and adapted within restorative justice scholarship, the Community Circle brings all those affected by a harm — not only the primary parties, but the wider community — into a shared, structured, values-based deliberation aimed at collective understanding and healing.

The Circle is not a trial. There is no winner and no loser. The Circle is a space in which truth is sought, harm is acknowledged, and the community reclaims ownership of the conditions in which it lives. Done well, a Community Circle can achieve forms of restoration that no institutional consequence could produce: genuine reconciliation, shared commitment to changed conditions, and the reweaving of community trust.

### 27.2 When Community Circles Are Used

Community Circles are most appropriate for: Level 3 and above matters with significant community impact. matters where the harm has affected community relationships rather than purely individual parties. matters where those responsible are prepared to engage genuinely with the process and to hear the full impact of their actions. and as a post-Consequence Hearing restorative measure to support the implementation of a Civic Compact.

Community Circles should not be used where: the person who caused harm is not willing to participate genuinely. there is a significant power imbalance that cannot be adequately managed within the circle. or those who experienced harm do not wish to participate in the presence of those who caused harm.

### 27.3 Circle Protocol

Community Circles are convened and facilitated by a certified Circle Facilitator — a specialist role within the MCF qualification framework. The protocol includes:

151. Preparation: The Circle Facilitator meets separately with each potential participant to assess readiness, explain the process, and confirm that participation is genuinely voluntary. Preparation may take multiple sessions over weeks.
152. Ground rules: At the opening of the Circle, participants collectively establish the ground rules for the session. These typically include: speaking one at a time. speaking from personal experience. no interruption. confidentiality of what is shared. and the right to pass.
153. Opening ceremony: The Circle begins with an opening that marks the transition from ordinary civic space to the intentional shared space of the Circle. This may be drawn from the cultural traditions of participants.
154. Rounds: Participants speak in sequence around the Circle in response to prompts from the Facilitator. Typical rounds progress from: "What happened?" to "How were you affected?" to "What do you need to move forward?" to "What can you contribute to making this right?".

155. Consensus building: The Circle works toward a shared understanding and a set of agreed commitments.
156. Closing: The Circle closes with recognition of what has been shared and what has been agreed.

## 27.4 Circle Outcomes

Community Circles may produce: a Community Healing Agreement (a form of Civic Compact that includes community-level obligations alongside individual ones), specific structural recommendations directed at the relevant Assembly, and a shared community narrative of the matter that, with participant consent, can be used for institutional learning purposes.

## Chapter 28: Restitution and Reparative Agreements

---

### 28.1 Restitution — Principle

Restitution is the material dimension of restoration. Where harm has caused quantifiable material, financial, or physical damage, restitution is the obligation to repair that damage to the greatest extent practically possible. Restitution is not a fine. It is not a penalty. It is the practical expression of responsibility: if you took something, you return it. if you broke something, you repair it. if you cost someone money, you restore their position.

Restitution agreements are developed collaboratively, wherever possible, in the Consequence Hearing. Where the parties can reach agreement on restitution terms, those terms form the core of the Civic Compact. Where agreement cannot be reached, the Magister determines the restitution terms in the Consequence Determination, applying the Harm Matrix assessment to quantify what is appropriate.

### 28.2 Assessment of Restitution Obligations

The Magister assesses restitution obligations by reference to:

- Direct material harm: quantified costs, replacement values, restoration costs.
- Consequential harm: loss of income, additional expenses, costs of accessing support.
- Non-material harm: where physical or psychological harm has no direct financial equivalent, restitution may take non-financial forms (community service, care provision, or analogous reparative action).
- Capacity assessment: restitution obligations are set in relation to the capacity of the responsible party to fulfil them. An obligation that renders the responsible party unable to meet their civic floor needs is not proportionate.

### 28.3 Restitution Programmes

Where full immediate restitution is not within the immediate capacity of the responsible party, the Magister shall establish a structured Restitution Programme: a schedule of payments or actions over a defined period, monitored by the MCF. Failure to comply with a Restitution Programme without reasonable cause triggers a compliance review and, if necessary, escalation to the Sortition Panel.

The Civic Justice Secretariat, in partnership with the Civic Commerce Architecture, shall maintain a Civic Restitution Support Fund to enable immediate relief for those who have experienced harm in cases where the responsible party cannot provide timely restitution. The Fund is recouped from the responsible party through the Restitution Programme.

## Chapter 29: Behavioural Commitments and Civic Compacts

---

### 29.1 The Civic Compact

The Civic Compact is the formal document that records the agreed or determined resolution of a civic matter. It constitutes the primary binding instrument of the Civic Justice Architecture: once signed by all parties and countersigned by the Magister and MCF, its obligations are enforceable through the civic monitoring and escalation framework.

The Civic Compact is not a contract in the prior legal sense. It is a civic commitment — an expression of responsibility, acknowledgement, and agreed restorative action, embedded in the civic constitutional framework.

### 29.2 Contents of a Civic Compact

Every Civic Compact includes:

157. A statement of the civic matter — a plain-language account of what occurred, agreed or determined to the applicable standard.
158. A harm impact statement — a summary of the harm caused and experienced.
159. Restitution obligations — where applicable, with schedules and payment or action terms.
160. Restorative obligations — what the responsible party will do to contribute to restoration beyond restitution (civic service, participation in learning, community engagement).
161. Behavioural commitments — specific, measurable changes in conduct.
162. Monitoring arrangements — who monitors, how often, and what will be reported.
163. Review milestones — scheduled points at which the Compact is reviewed and progress assessed.
164. Escalation terms — what will happen if obligations are not met.
165. Completion criteria — the specific outcomes that, when achieved, constitute the completion of the Compact.
166. A dignity statement — explicit commitment by all parties and institutions to treat every person in the Compact process with the dignity required by the Civic Floor.

### 29.3 Compliance with Civic Compacts

The MCF assigned to the matter monitors compliance with Civic Compact obligations through regular contact with all parties. Monitoring reports are submitted to the Secretariat at intervals specified in the Compact. Where compliance falls below the required standard, the MCF initiates a compliance dialogue with the responsible party to understand and address the reasons. Where compliance failure continues despite dialogue, the matter is escalated to the Magister for a formal compliance review. Persistent non-compliance without reasonable cause results in escalation to the Sortition Justice Panel, which may modify the

Compact terms or impose additional civic consequences within the applicable Proportionality Framework.

## Chapter 30: Community Contribution (Non-Punitive)

---

### 30.1 Community Contribution — Distinction from Prior Community Service

Prior justice systems used "community service" as a punitive alternative to custody — a degrading experience imposed on individuals as an expression of institutional disapproval. Community Contribution in the Civic Justice Architecture is categorically different. It is a restorative obligation: a meaningful contribution to the civic fabric, designed in dialogue with the responsible party and the community, that enables the responsible party to demonstrate civic re-engagement and to add something of genuine value to the community that was harmed.

Community Contribution is only appropriate where: it is agreed as part of the Consequence Hearing process. it is specific, meaningful, and matched to the skills and circumstances of the responsible party. it is monitored to ensure it is experienced as restorative rather than punitive. and it is clearly time-limited and connected to specific restorative outcomes.

### 30.2 Community Contribution Design

Community Contribution obligations are designed in consultation between the Magister, the MCF, the responsible party, and (where appropriate) the affected community. Design principles:

- The contribution should address, directly or indirectly, the harm caused.
- The contribution should enable the responsible party to engage positively with the community rather than to be stigmatised within it.
- The contribution should be proportionate to the harm level.
- The responsible party should have meaningful input into what contribution they can most effectively make.
- The contribution should be genuinely valued by the receiving community, not performed.
- The contribution may include: civic facilitation. environmental or civic maintenance. support for community care services. educational or mentoring work. creative or cultural contributions. or any other contribution agreed to be of genuine value.

## Chapter 31: Education and Reflection Programmes

---

### 31.1 Purpose of Civic Learning Obligations

Where a civic matter reveals that the harm caused arose in part from ignorance, misunderstanding, or insufficient civic knowledge, the Magister may include a structured learning obligation within the Civic Compact. Civic learning obligations are not re-education in any coercive sense. They are structured programmes — collaboratively designed and independently facilitated — that support the responsible party in developing a deeper understanding of the Civic Rules, the impact of their actions, and the skills needed to avoid recurrence.

### 31.2 Programme Design and Delivery

Civic learning programmes are designed by the Civic Justice Secretariat's Education and Development team in partnership with the IES, drawing on current evidence about effective behaviour change, restorative learning, and civic education. Programmes range from: online self-directed learning modules (for minor civic rule breaches), facilitated group reflection sessions (for mid-level matters with shared underlying causes), and intensive one-to-one development programmes for severe harm matters where deep behaviour change is required. All programmes are subject to completion verification and feedback collection.

### 31.3 Reflection, Not Punishment

The tone, design, and delivery of all civic learning obligations must consistently frame participation as a civic contribution and a genuine developmental opportunity, not a punishment or a humiliation. Programme facilitators are trained to maintain this framing even in the face of initial resistance or resentment from participants. Evidence from restorative justice research consistently demonstrates that learners who feel respected and genuinely engaged in their learning are far more likely to achieve lasting behaviour change than those who feel coerced.

## Chapter 32: Reintegration Architecture

---

### 32.1 Reintegration as a Civic Obligation

The Civic Commonwealth has a civic obligation — not merely a moral aspiration — to support the reintegration of every person who has completed their Civic Compact obligations. This flows directly from the principles of Chapter 2: dignity, restoration, and the non-permanent labelling of individuals who have engaged with restorative processes. A justice system that does not invest in reintegration is a system designed to fail, recycling individuals through repeated harm cycles rather than genuinely transforming civic conditions.

### 32.2 Elements of the Reintegration Framework

The Reintegration Framework provides, for persons completing Civic Compact obligations in Level 3 and above matters:

167. A Reintegration Plan, developed with the MCF, setting out the practical steps to be taken to support the person's return to full civic participation.
168. Access to civic support services — housing, financial guidance, health, and community connection — relevant to the person's specific circumstances.
169. A civic reintegration mentor, matched from the voluntary civic community, who supports the person's community reconnection over a minimum of six months.
170. Formal recognition of the completion of the Civic Compact in the person's civic record — noting that the matter has been fully resolved.
171. Protection from ongoing stigmatisation: civic institutions and employers are prohibited from treating a completed Civic Compact as grounds for discrimination in access to services, housing, or civic roles, beyond the specific and time-limited role exclusions specified in the Compact itself.

### 32.3 The Role of the Completed Civic Compact in Civic Life

A Civic Compact that has been fully completed carries no ongoing civic penalty. The record of the matter is retained for institutional learning purposes and may be accessed in strictly limited circumstances (for example, by a future Magister in a directly related matter). But the individual's civic standing is restored to full equality. The principle is clear: completion means completion. The Civic Commonwealth does not create a permanent underclass of civic pariahs.

## Chapter 33: Monitoring and Follow-Up

---

### 33.1 The Monitoring Obligation

The Civic Justice Architecture does not end with the signing of a Civic Compact. Monitoring and follow-up are integral to the Architecture's restorative purpose: a compact that is not monitored is a promise that is not taken seriously. Monitoring serves three functions: accountability (ensuring obligations are met), support (identifying and addressing obstacles to compliance), and learning (generating evidence about what works in civic restoration).

### 33.2 Monitoring Structure

Every Civic Compact specifies a monitoring structure tailored to the specific obligations and circumstances of the matter. All monitoring is carried out by the MCF or, for complex ongoing matters, by a specialist monitoring team within the Secretariat. Monitoring activities include:

- Regular check-in meetings with the responsible party and, where appropriate, with those who experienced harm.
- Verification of restitution payments and community contribution hours.
- Receipt of completion certificates from learning programme providers.
- Community liaison to assess whether Community Contribution is being delivered as agreed.
- MCF monitoring reports submitted to the Secretariat at the intervals specified in the Compact.

### 33.3 Review Milestones

All Civic Compacts for Level 3 and above matters include formal Review Milestones at which the Magister formally reviews progress with all parties. At each Review Milestone, the Magister may: confirm that the matter is on track and set the next milestone, modify the Compact terms where circumstances have materially changed and modification would better serve the restorative purpose, or initiate compliance review where obligations have not been met. Review Milestones occur at minimum every six months for compacts with obligations running beyond one year.

### 33.4 Completion

A Civic Compact is formally completed when the Magister, having reviewed the MCF monitoring record and confirmed with all parties that obligations have been fulfilled, issues a written Completion Notice. The Completion Notice is entered in the civic matter record, triggers the formal Reintegration recognition in the person's civic record, and initiates the institutional learning closure process.

# PART SIX

## Civic Consequences and Outcomes

### Chapter 34: The Consequence Framework — Principles

#### 34.1 What Civic Consequences Are — and Are Not

Civic Consequences under this Architecture are not punishments. They are not expressions of moral condemnation, though they may carry accountability weight. They are not designed to make the responsible party suffer, though they will necessarily involve obligation, inconvenience, or significant demand. They are designed to serve one or more of four legitimate civic purposes:

172. Restorative: to repair, as fully as possible, the harm caused to those who experienced it.
173. Protective: to prevent further harm to those at risk while restoration is being achieved.
174. Transformative: to support the responsible party in genuinely changing the conduct or conditions that led to harm.
175. Systemic: to address the structural or institutional factors that enabled harm to occur.

A Civic Consequence that serves none of these purposes has no legitimate basis. A Civic Consequence that serves all four, in appropriate proportion, represents the Architecture at its best.

#### 34.2 Consequence Terminology

The following terms are used consistently throughout this part of the Architecture:

- Restorative obligations: things the responsible party must do to repair harm directly.
- Protective measures: time-limited adjustments to the responsible party's civic access designed to prevent further harm while restoration processes are underway.
- Transformative requirements: structured learning, reflection, or development obligations.
- Structural remedies: changes to institutions, systems, or civic conditions, imposed on or agreed with civic institutions responsible for systemic failures.

No term equivalent to "sentence", "penalty", "fine", "imprisonment", or "punishment" shall appear in any Civic Consequence Determination, Civic Compact, or civic justice communication.

## Chapter 35: Temporary Exclusion from Civic Roles

### 35.1 Scope and Purpose

Temporary exclusion from a civic role is a protective measure, not a punishment. It applies where a person occupies a position of civic trust — Magister, MCF, Assembly member, sortition panellist, civic officer, or equivalent — and where the civic matter under investigation involves conduct in or connected to that role. Its purpose is to protect the integrity of the role and the safety of those it affects while the restorative process is conducted, not to pre-judge the outcome.

### 35.2 Conditions for Temporary Exclusion

Temporary exclusion from a civic role may be imposed only where:

176. There is a substantiated basis for concluding that continued role-holding presents a material risk to civic integrity or to other persons.
177. The exclusion is limited to the specific role(s) directly engaged by the civic matter.
178. The exclusion is for the minimum duration necessary — in most cases, for the duration of the investigation and any initial restorative process.
179. The excluded person is fully informed of the grounds, the scope, and the duration of the exclusion.
180. The excluded person's Civic Advocate is present when exclusion is imposed.
181. The exclusion has been authorised by a Sortition Integrity Panel except in genuine emergency circumstances under Chapter 48.

### 35.3 Role Exclusion Following Determination

Following a Consequence Determination, a Civic Compact may include a period of role exclusion as a consequence of an established breach. The maximum period of role exclusion by harm level:

Harm Level	Maximum Role Exclusion Period	Review Requirements
Level 2	6 months	MCF review at 3 months. early completion possible
Level 3	18 months	Magister review at 9 months. completion criteria required
Level 4	4 years	Sortition Panel review at 18-month intervals. specific reinstatement criteria required
Level 5	10 years	NSA-level review at 2-year intervals. independent assessment required for reinstatement
Level 6	Up to permanent, subject to Constitutional Review Panel decision	Constitutional Review Panel review every 5 years. reinstatement requires Panel supermajority

No role exclusion may exceed the maximum period for the applicable harm level. Any extension requires a fresh Consequence Determination process at the appropriate standard.

## Chapter 36: Civic Privilege Adjustments

---

### 36.1 Nature of Civic Privilege Adjustments

Civic Privilege Adjustments are time-limited, targeted reductions in specific civic entitlements or access rights that are directly relevant to the harm caused. They are distinct from temporary role exclusion (Chapter 35) in that they apply to civic access and participation rights rather than to specific civic positions. They are never applied to the Civic Floor — the minimum entitlements that apply unconditionally to every resident.

### 36.2 Permissible Adjustments

The following civic privilege adjustments are within the Proportionality Framework:

- Temporary suspension of sortition eligibility (maximum 3 years for Level 3, maximum 7 years for Level 4 and above).
- Temporary suspension of specific civic participation rights directly related to the harm (for example, suspension of the right to hold a civic facilitation role where harm arose in the context of that type of role).
- Temporary supervision requirements in specific civic contexts.
- Geographic proximity limits in cases involving direct personal harm, where contact avoidance is necessary for the safety of those who experienced harm.

### 36.3 Prohibited Adjustments

The following may not be imposed as civic privilege adjustments, regardless of harm level:

- Suspension of the right to access civic services under the Civic Floor.
- Suspension of housing, health, or income support rights.
- Suspension of civic identity or civic record status.
- Any adjustment that constitutes collective punishment extending to family members or associates.
- Any adjustment designed to cause public stigmatisation beyond the functional accountability purpose.

## Chapter 37: Required Learning and Development

---

### 37.1 Learning Obligations as Civic Consequences

Where a Consequence Determination establishes that harm arose in whole or in part from ignorance, skill deficit, insufficient civic knowledge, or patterns of conduct amenable to structured intervention, the Magister may include structured learning and development obligations in the Civic Compact. These obligations are calibrated to the nature and cause of the harm and are designed in partnership with the IES Education Division to reflect current evidence on effective behaviour change.

### 37.2 Categories of Required Learning

The following categories of civic learning obligation are available within the Proportionality Framework:

182. Civic Rules familiarisation: Online or workshop-based introduction to the relevant Civic Rules and their rationale. Minimum 4 hours. maximum 12 hours. Appropriate for Level 1 and Level 2 matters arising from genuine unfamiliarity.
183. Impact and empathy development: Facilitated programme exploring the real-world impact of specific categories of harm on those affected. Minimum 8 hours. maximum 30 hours across multiple sessions. Appropriate for all harm levels where impact awareness is a factor.
184. Civic role competence: Where harm arose in a civic role context, structured training in the responsibilities, limits, and ethical requirements of that role type. Programme length determined by the IES in consultation with the relevant civic institution.
185. Structured reflective programme: Intensive one-to-one programme combining learning, guided reflection, and development planning. Minimum 20 hours across multiple sessions. Appropriate for Level 4 and above matters where deep behaviour change is required.
186. Ongoing development agreement: A longer-term structured programme of development, typically spanning 12 to 24 months, incorporating learning, peer support, professional development, and regular MCF review. Appropriate for the most severe individual harm matters.

## Chapter 38: Community Accountability Processes

---

### 38.1 Accountability within Community

Community Accountability Processes are structured civic events in which a person who has caused significant harm engages directly with the broader community affected by that harm. They go beyond the Community Circle (Chapter 27) in their explicit accountability dimension: the responsible party is not merely a participant but is asked to give a full account of what they did, why, and what they understand about the impact.

Community Accountability Processes are only appropriate where the responsible party has genuinely engaged with the restorative process and is prepared to participate with authentic accountability. They are never imposed as a form of public humiliation. The MCF facilitates throughout to ensure that the process maintains the dignity of all present, that the responsible party is not subjected to unmanaged hostility, and that the event achieves its restorative purpose.

### 38.2 Process Structure

A Community Accountability Process follows this structure:

187. Opening by the MCF: context-setting, ground rules, and the restorative framing.
188. Account by the responsible party: a full, honest account of what occurred and what the person now understands about its impact.
189. Community response rounds: community members speak, in turn, to the impact of the harm on their lives, their community, and their civic environment.
190. Questions (facilitated): community members may ask questions of the responsible party through the MCF. direct confrontation is not permitted.
191. Response by the responsible party: acknowledgement of the community accounts and the specific commitments being made.
192. Collective resolution: the MCF works with the group to reach a shared understanding of what resolution requires and what has been committed to.
193. Closing: the MCF formally closes the process with acknowledgement of what has been achieved.

### 38.3 What Community Accountability Achieves

Research from restorative justice traditions globally demonstrates that Community Accountability Processes, when conducted well, produce significantly higher rates of genuine behaviour change, community healing, and satisfaction among those who experienced harm than institutional consequences alone. The experience of being genuinely heard, and of hearing genuine accountability, has a transformative power that no institutional determination can replicate. The Civic Justice Architecture harnesses this power as a primary rather than supplementary tool.

## Chapter 39: Public Explanation and Civic Apology

---

### 39.1 Public Explanation

For civic matters of significant community impact — Level 3 and above — the Magister may include in the Civic Compact a requirement for a formal Public Explanation: a written or spoken account by the responsible party or institution, shared through appropriate civic channels, that honestly explains what occurred, what harm resulted, and what steps are being taken in response. A Public Explanation is not a shaming exercise. It is a civic transparency measure that respects the community's right to understand significant events that have affected their civic life.

### 39.2 Civic Apology

A Civic Apology is a formal acknowledgement of responsibility, regret, and commitment to restoration. Unlike a legal disclaimer or a political non-apology, a Civic Apology must: explicitly acknowledge the specific harm caused. demonstrate genuine understanding of the impact of that harm. express sincere regret, not merely regret for the consequences of being found responsible. and commit to specific restorative actions. A Civic Apology cannot be compelled in the sense of compelling its sincerity — but the failure to offer a genuine Civic Apology when one is due is a relevant factor in the Magister's assessment of the appropriate consequence range.

### 39.3 Institutional Apologies

Where a Systemic Failure has occurred, the responsible civic institution is required to issue a formal Institutional Civic Apology: a public acknowledgement from the institution's highest accountable body of what failed, what harm resulted, what the institution now understands about the causes of that failure, and what structural changes are being implemented. Institutional apologies are reviewed by the IES for epistemic adequacy and by the Sortition Review Panel for civic accountability adequacy before public release.

## Chapter 40: Structural Remedies

---

### 40.1 The Structural Remedy Framework

For all Systemic Failure classifications and for any Level 5 or Level 6 civic matter, the Civic Justice Architecture requires the development and implementation of a Structural Remedy Framework: a formal plan of institutional, procedural, or systemic changes that address the root causes of the harm established. Individual consequences, however appropriate, are insufficient to address harms with systemic causes. The Structural Remedy Framework is the Architecture's instrument of transformative justice at the institutional level.

### 40.2 Development of the Structural Remedy Framework

The Structural Remedy Framework is developed by the Magister in consultation with:

- The relevant Assembly (NSA, RSA, or LSA) whose domain the failure occurred within.
- The IES, which assesses the epistemic dimensions of the structural failure.
- The affected community, through facilitated consultation.
- Relevant specialist expertise.
- Those who experienced harm, whose experience of the failure is central to identifying what structural changes are genuinely needed.

The Structural Remedy Framework must specify: the specific systemic failures identified. the specific structural changes proposed. the civic institution(s) responsible for implementing each change. the timeline for implementation. the monitoring mechanism. and the success indicators. The Framework is adopted by the relevant Assembly as a binding civic resolution.

### 40.3 Monitoring of Structural Remedies

Implementation of a Structural Remedy Framework is monitored by a dedicated Structural Remedy Monitoring Panel, consisting of: the Magister (or a nominated successor). an IES monitoring officer. representatives of those who experienced harm. and community members from the affected area. The Panel reports quarterly to the relevant Assembly and publicly. Where structural remedies are not being implemented on schedule, the Panel may escalate to the NSA for intervention.

## Chapter 41: Escalation Pathways

---

### 41.1 Escalation Triggers

Escalation within the Civic Justice Architecture occurs when the initial harm classification proves incorrect, and the matter warrants a higher-level process. Also, when compliance with a Civic Compact fails without reasonable cause, or new information emerges that materially changes the assessment of the matter, a Systemic Failure pattern is identified across what previously appeared to be individual-level matters.

### 41.2 Within-Matter Escalation

Within a single civic matter, escalation is initiated by the Magister following consultation with the Secretariat. Within-matter escalation may involve:

194. Re-classification of harm level, triggering a higher standard of proof and expanded consequence range.
195. Convening a Sortition Panel where the original process pathway did not require one.
196. Requesting IES Mandated Challenger involvement where the matter has become more complex than originally assessed.
197. Extending the investigation timeline and scope.
198. Referring the matter to the next jurisdictional level where the matter has implications beyond the original jurisdiction.

### 41.3 Post-Determination Escalation

Following a Consequence Determination, post-determination escalation occurs where compliance obligations are persistently not met. The escalation sequence is:

199. MCF compliance dialogue — first response to compliance failure.
200. Formal Compliance Review by the Magister — where MCF dialogue has not resolved compliance failure.
201. Modified Civic Compact — where circumstances have changed in a way that justifies modified terms.
202. Sortition Panel compliance hearing — where modification has not achieved compliance.
203. Extended consequence determination — where the Sortition Panel finds persistent wilful non-compliance. a supplementary Consequence Determination within the applicable Proportionality Framework.

## Chapter 42: Severe and Persistent Harm — Extended Protocols

---

### 42.1 The Challenge of Severe Persistent Harm

The Civic Justice Architecture is designed primarily for matters in which restorative processes can, over a reasonable period, achieve genuine restoration and safe reintegration. For the small number of matters involving the most severe harm, repeated serious harm, and credibly persistent risk to others, the Architecture requires extended protocols that maintain its non-carceral, non-punitive principles while providing robust community protection.

### 42.2 Criteria for Extended Protocols

Extended protocols apply only where all of the following are established to the Established Civic Account standard:

204. The harm caused is at Level 4 or above.
205. There is a documented pattern of prior serious harm, or the current harm is so severe that the risk of recurrence is not adequately mitigated by standard Civic Compact arrangements.
206. All reasonable standard restorative pathways have been pursued, or there is documented evidence that the person is not engaging in good faith with restorative processes.
207. An independent risk assessment, conducted by a qualified specialist appointed by the IES, indicates that community protection requires measures beyond standard civic consequence arrangements.
208. A Constitutional Review Panel has been convened and has endorsed the use of extended protocols.

### 42.3 Extended Protocol Measures

Extended protocol measures available, subject to all criteria being met:

- Long-term intensive supervision: regular and structured contact with a specialist civic supervision team. supported housing. structured programme of treatment or development as relevant. Sortition Panel review at 6-monthly intervals.
- Geographic restriction: a defined geographic limit on movement, set by a Constitutional Review Panel, reviewable every 6 months, with the person's Civic Advocate present at every review.
- Civic role prohibition: prohibition on all civic roles that involve authority over others, for a defined period of up to 10 years (Level 4) or an initial period of up to 15 years (Level 5), subject to review.
- Supported and structured community residence: a specific community living arrangement, never a custodial institution, providing intensive support, therapeutic engagement, and structured community integration, with the explicit purpose of achieving conditions for safe full reintegration.

**ABSOLUTE PROHIBITION:** No measure under Extended Protocols may involve physical confinement against the person's will, denial of the Civic Floor, denial of Civic Advocate access, denial of food, shelter, or medical care, or physical harm of any kind. Any civic official who authorises or imposes such a measure is in gross breach of this Architecture and is subject to immediate suspension and Integrity Breach investigation.

## 42.4 Permanent Civic Role Prohibition

A permanent civic role prohibition — the most severe consequence available within this Architecture — may be imposed only by a Constitutional Review Panel, only for Level 6 harm matters, only following an Established Civic Account determination, and only where the Panel has determined unanimously that no lesser extended protocol measure would adequately protect civic constitutional integrity. Even a permanent prohibition is subject to quinquennial (five-yearly) review, and may be lifted by a subsequent Constitutional Review Panel if circumstances have changed sufficiently.

# PART SEVEN

## Safeguards, Integrity, and Anti-Abuse Mechanisms

### Chapter 43: Protection Against Factional Capture

#### 43.1 The Capture Risk

Factional capture — the systematic influence of a justice institution by a specific political, commercial, ideological, or personal interest group — is the most serious systemic risk facing any civic justice architecture. History demonstrates that justice systems that become captured lose their legitimacy rapidly and can cause more harm through their distorted operation than the harms they fail to address. The Civic Justice Architecture builds anti-capture safeguards at every level of its design.

#### 43.2 Structural Anti-Capture Mechanisms

The primary structural anti-capture mechanisms of the Civic Justice Architecture are:

209. Sortition selection of all oversight panels: random selection prevents any interest group from systematically placing its members in positions of oversight.
210. Rotation of Magisters and MCFs: fixed service periods prevent the development of entrenched institutional networks connected to external interests.
211. IES independence: the IES is constitutionally insulated from Assembly control and cannot be directed by any civic institution.
212. Mandated Challenger system: the structural requirement to challenge dominant conclusions prevents the gradual solidification of institutional bias into systematic injustice.
213. Conflict of interest protocols: the rigorous conflict disclosure and management system prevents individuals with connections to specific interests from directing matters in which those interests have a stake.
214. Demographic diversity requirements: ensuring that Magisters, MCFs, and panels reflect the civic community prevents the dominance of any single cultural, socioeconomic, or professional perspective.

#### 43.3 Detection and Response to Capture Attempts

The IES Justice Division maintains a capture detection function, monitoring for: patterns of outcome that correlate with political or factional changes. unusual concentrations of matter referrals from or against specific groups. evidence of coordinated pressure on Magisters or Secretariat officers. and anomalies in the audit trail that might indicate systematic manipulation. Where a capture attempt or capture pattern is detected, the IES reports immediately to the NSA and convenes an emergency Sortition Constitutional Review Panel. The Dissolution Covenant assessment procedure is engaged where capture appears to threaten the constitutional integrity of the justice function.

## Chapter 44: Anti-Corruption Protocols

---

### 44.1 Corruption in the Civic Justice Context

Corruption in the civic justice context includes: the improper use of a civic justice position for personal gain. the exchange of favourable outcomes for material benefit. the systematic skewing of investigative processes for personal, familial, or associational benefit. and the abuse of access to confidential justice information for personal advantage. All such conduct is classified as a Level 4 or above Integrity Breach and is subject to the full force of this Architecture.

### 44.2 Anti-Corruption Controls

The following controls apply to all persons holding civic justice roles:

215. Full financial disclosure, updated annually, to the Civic Justice Secretariat, covering all income sources, significant assets, and financial interests.
216. Prohibition on gifts, hospitality, or any material benefit from any party connected to any matter within their jurisdiction.
217. Prohibition on civic justice role-holding simultaneously with any commercial role in which civic justice decisions could generate personal financial advantage.
218. Mandatory reporting of any approach, however informal, that could constitute an inducement or improper influence.
219. Quarterly rotation of sensitive case assignment to prevent the development of beneficial relationships between Magisters and repeat parties.
220. Independent audit of all financial disclosures by the IES on a rolling basis.

### 44.3 Response to Corruption

Any credible evidence of corruption involving a civic justice officer triggers: immediate suspension of the officer from all civic justice activities. notification of the IES and the relevant Assembly Civic Accountability Committee. initiation of a full investigative process at Level 4 or above. and, where the corruption has affected live civic matters, review of all matters handled by the officer during the relevant period by an independent Magister. Compensation for parties who suffered prejudice as a result of corrupt conduct is met from the Civic Justice Integrity Fund maintained by the NSA.

## Chapter 45: Whistleblower Protections and Safe Reporting

---

### 45.1 The Importance of Safe Reporting

The integrity of the Civic Justice Architecture depends on people within and connected to the system being willing and able to raise concerns about institutional conduct, investigative methodology, Magisterial behaviour, and systemic failures. Without effective whistleblower protection, concerns are suppressed, misconduct continues unchallenged, and capture and corruption deepen. The Civic Commonwealth treats safe reporting as a constitutional value, not an administrative concession.

### 45.2 Who Is Protected

Whistleblower protections under this Architecture apply to: any Magister, MCF, Civic Advocate, Secretariat officer, or Sortition Panel member who raises a concern in good faith about any aspect of the Civic Justice Architecture's operation. any resident who provides information to the IES or Secretariat about potential justice system misconduct. any person who supports another person in raising a concern. and any person who provides testimony in an Integrity Breach investigation.

### 45.3 Protected Actions

Protected actions include: internal reporting to the Secretariat. external reporting to the IES. reporting to the relevant Assembly Civic Accountability Committee. reporting to civic media with genuine civic public interest. and giving evidence in Integrity Breach proceedings. All of these actions are protected from retaliation — demotion, exclusion, disadvantage in role assignment, or any other adverse consequence — regardless of whether the concern ultimately proves well-founded, provided it was raised in good faith.

### 45.4 Reporting Channels

Concerns may be reported through: the SDN secure reporting portal (anonymised options available). direct contact with the IES Justice Division. the Civic Justice Secretariat's independent reporting function. and a dedicated 24-hour telephone line. All reports are acknowledged within 48 hours. The identity of the reporter is protected at all stages unless the reporter consents to disclosure or disclosure is required by the Consequence Hearing process.

## Chapter 46: Oversight by Rotating Sortition Panels

---

### 46.1 The Oversight Function

Rotating Sortition Panels are the Civic Justice Architecture's primary democratic accountability mechanism. They ensure that the professional institutional apparatus of civic justice — Magisters, MCFs, the Secretariat — remains genuinely accountable to the people it serves, rather than to the professional norms, institutional habits, and peer pressures of any self-contained professional community.

### 46.2 Standing Systemic Oversight Panel

A Standing Systemic Oversight Panel is convened annually at each jurisdictional level, consisting of twelve randomly selected residents from the relevant area. The Panel's mandate is:

221. Review of the annual Civic Justice Architecture Review produced by the Secretariat.
222. Review of IES audit findings.
223. Review of demographic disparity data.
224. Hearing from Magisters, MCFs, Civic Advocates, and community members about the operation of the Architecture in practice.
225. Production of a public Systemic Oversight Report with specific recommendations to the Assembly and the Secretariat.

Assembly receipt of the Systemic Oversight Report triggers a mandatory debate and a binding obligation to respond to each recommendation within sixty days.

### 46.3 Ad Hoc Oversight Panels

Ad Hoc Oversight Panels may be convened at any time by the IES, by a relevant Assembly, or by petition of a minimum of 500 residents from the relevant civic area, to investigate a specific concern about the operation of the Civic Justice Architecture. Ad Hoc Panels have the same powers as Standing Panels and produce public reports within sixty days of convening.

## Chapter 47: Appeals and Review Architecture

---

### 47.1 The Right to Appeal

Every primary party to a civic matter who receives a Consequence Determination has the unconditional right to appeal that determination. The right to appeal is not contingent on demonstrating grounds in advance. It is exercised by notification to the Civic Justice Secretariat within thirty days of receiving the Consequence Determination. No adverse inference may be drawn from the exercise of the right to appeal, and no element of the original Consequence Determination may be implemented against the appealing party while the appeal is pending, except in genuine emergency circumstances.

### 47.2 Appeal Process

Appeals are reviewed by a Sortition Justice Appeal Panel convened specifically for the purpose. The Appeal Panel operates as follows:

226. The Panel receives the complete case record, the Consequence Determination, the Reasoning Document, and the grounds of appeal submitted by the appellant.
227. The Panel is supported by a Secretariat facilitator and has access to an IES advisor on epistemic matters.
228. The Panel may request additional information from the Magister who issued the Determination, from the Secretariat, or from any party — but the Magister may not appear as a partisan advocate for their determination.
229. The appellant and any other primary party may make a written submission to the Panel, and may request an oral hearing before the Panel.
230. The Panel deliberates and produces a written Appeal Determination within thirty days of receiving all submissions.

### 47.3 Appeal Outcomes

The Appeal Panel may:

- Uphold the original Consequence Determination in full.
- Modify the Consequence Determination where it finds the determination to be disproportionate, insufficiently evidenced, or procedurally deficient.
- Remit the matter to a new Magister for reconsideration of the entire determination, where it finds fundamental procedural failure.
- Quash the Consequence Determination where it finds that the evidence does not reach the required standard of civic proof.

### 47.4 Further Review — Constitutional Review Panel

Where an Appeal Panel Determination is itself challenged on constitutional grounds — alleged breach of the Civic Floor, alleged systemic bias, or alleged procedural architecture failure — the matter may be referred to the Constitutional Review Panel at NSA level. The Constitutional Review Panel has authority to issue binding guidance applicable to the entire Civic Justice Architecture, not merely to the specific matter before it.

## **47.5 Time Limits and Process Commitments**

The full appeal process — from notification of appeal to Appeal Determination — shall not exceed sixty days for Level 1 to Level 3 matters, and ninety days for Level 4 to Level 6 matters. These are binding commitments, not targets. The Secretariat shall report any breach to the IES and the NSA, with reasons and a remediation plan.

## Chapter 48: Emergency Procedures

### 48.1 Emergency Circumstances

The Civic Justice Architecture recognises that some civic matters present an immediate and credible risk of serious harm to one or more persons that cannot await the full investigative and deliberative process. Emergency procedures exist to provide rapid protective response while preserving, to the greatest extent possible, the procedural rights of all parties and the non-carceral principles of the Architecture.

Emergency procedures are not a shortcut through the Architecture. They are a time-sensitive version of it. Every emergency procedure triggers full review and must be followed by a standard process within the time limits specified. Emergency procedures never replace. they precede.

### 48.2 Criteria for Emergency Procedures

Emergency procedures may be engaged only where:

231. There is credible, specific information indicating an immediate or imminent risk of Level 3 or above harm to an identified person or persons.
232. Standard triage and investigation processes cannot, in the available time, produce adequate protective response.
233. The proposed emergency measure is the minimum necessary to address the immediate risk.
234. The emergency measure does not involve custodial detention or physical harm to any party.

### 48.3 Emergency Protective Separation

The most significant emergency measure available under this Architecture is Protective Separation: a time-limited, non-custodial requirement that a person maintain a specified geographic or institutional distance from those at risk of harm from them. Protective Separation may be imposed by a Magister for a maximum initial period of 72 hours without Sortition Panel review. it must be reviewed by a Sortition Integrity Panel within 72 hours of its imposition. Following Panel review, Protective Separation may be extended for up to 28 days, subject to fortnightly review thereafter. Protective Separation may never be used to deprive a person of housing, access to the Civic Floor, or access to their Civic Advocate.

### 48.4 Emergency Hearing

Where an emergency matter requires an immediate civic justice process — for example, where harm is ongoing and requires immediate institutional response — the Magister shall convene an Emergency Hearing within 24 hours of the emergency matter being identified. The Emergency Hearing follows the standard Consequence Hearing protocol in abbreviated form, with the following modifications: advance notice requirements are reduced to the minimum practicable. the Mandated Challenge may be delivered verbally rather than in a full written report. and the Consequence Determination may be issued verbally at the conclusion of the hearing with a written version to follow within 48 hours.

## Chapter 49: Magister Misconduct and Accountability

### 49.1 The Accountability of those who Hold Accountability

The integrity of the Civic Justice Architecture depends absolutely on Magisters and MCFs being held to the same standards of accountability that they apply to others. A justice system that cannot hold its own officers to account is a system that will be captured, corrupted, and ultimately discredited. The accountability of Magisters is therefore not an afterthought. It is a cornerstone of the Architecture.

### 49.2 Categories of Magisterial Misconduct

Magisterial misconduct is classified as follows:

Category	Examples	Initial Response
Administrative error	Missed deadlines. incomplete records. procedural oversight without prejudice to any party	MCF or Secretariat correction. noted in Magister record. no formal process unless pattern
Procedural failure	Failure to follow required process in a way that prejudiced a party. inadequate engagement with evidence. failure to obtain required review	Secretariat review. formal guidance. remediation of prejudiced matter. noted in Magister record
Conduct breach	Disrespectful or undignified treatment of any party. failure to maintain impartiality. failure to disclose conflict. improper communication with external parties	Sortition Integrity Panel review. possible suspension. formal consequence process if substantiated
Integrity breach	Corruption. deliberate suppression of evidence. improper influence on outcomes. systematic bias. abuse of position	Immediate suspension. full Integrity Breach investigation at Level 4 or above. removal from certified pool if substantiated

### 49.3 Investigation of Magisterial Misconduct

Allegations of Magisterial misconduct are investigated by an independent Magister appointed by the Secretariat from a different jurisdictional area, with IES oversight. The investigating Magister has no connection to the subject of the allegation and is bound by the same investigation standards that apply to all civic matters. The subject Magister has full procedural rights as set out in Chapter 16.

## 49.4 Consequences for Substantiated Misconduct

Consequences for substantiated Magisterial misconduct follow the same Proportionality Framework as all civic consequences, applied to the civic role dimension. At the most severe end, substantiated Integrity Breach at Level 4 or above results in permanent removal from the certified Magister pool. The determination is made by a Constitutional Review Panel and is publicly reported. The Civic Justice Secretariat shall not reappoint any person removed in this manner to any civic justice role.

## Chapter 50: Systemic Risk Monitoring

---

### 50.1 The Systemic Risk Function

The Civic Justice Secretariat, in partnership with the IES, operates a continuous Systemic Risk Monitoring function: the systematic scanning of justice system performance data, outcome patterns, institutional behaviours, and civic context for early indicators of emerging systemic risk. Systemic risk in the civic justice context includes: emerging patterns of demographic disparity. declining engagement with restorative processes. increasing rates of Civic Compact non-compliance. evidence of factional influence on referral patterns. and indicators of institutional fatigue or understaffing.

### 50.2 Risk Indicators and Thresholds

The IES maintains a live Systemic Risk Dashboard, updated monthly, which tracks key risk indicators against established thresholds. When any indicator crosses its threshold:

235. Green: normal operating conditions — standard monitoring continues.
236. Amber: emerging concern — Secretariat initiates investigation. Sortition Panel notified. IES issues guidance within 30 days.
237. Red: significant systemic risk — Secretariat presents emergency report to relevant Assembly within 10 days. emergency Sortition Systemic Review Panel convened. IES publishes interim public report.
238. Critical: existential systemic risk — NSA Constitutional Accountability debate within 5 days. Dissolution Covenant assessment initiated. emergency Architecture revision process begun.

### 50.3 Adaptive Architecture

The Civic Justice Architecture is a living institutional instrument, not a static code. It is subject to structured review by the NSA every five years, incorporating: IES systemic analysis. Sortition Systemic Review Panel recommendations. evidence from civic justice scholarship and comparable international practice. and public consultation through the SDN. The Architecture may be amended by the NSA on the basis of these reviews, subject to the constitutional amendment procedures of the Civic Commonwealth Constitution. Core principles (Chapter 2) and absolute prohibitions (Chapter 1.5) may not be amended by the NSA alone. they require a supermajority NSA resolution and a national civic referendum.

# PART EIGHT

## Education, Culture, and Public Understanding

### Chapter 51: Civic Justice Literacy — Public Education

#### 51.1 Why Public Literacy Matters

A civic justice system that the public does not understand is a system that will be mistrusted, misused, and undermined. The legitimacy of the Civic Justice Architecture depends not merely on its structural integrity but on the public's genuine understanding of how it works, why it works as it does, and what it requires of residents both as potential parties and as civic participants in its oversight.

The Civic Commonwealth has an institutional obligation to invest seriously in civic justice literacy as a public good — not as an optional extra, but as a constitutional requirement equivalent in importance to any other element of civic education.

#### 51.2 Civic Justice Education Framework

The Civic Justice Literacy programme operates through four channels:

239. Civic education system integration: from the age of 12, all students in Commonwealth schools receive age-appropriate education in the Civic Justice Architecture, including: how the system works. what restorative justice means. the rights of all parties. and how to engage with civic justice processes. The curriculum is developed by the IES Education Division in partnership with the Civic Justice Secretariat and reviewed every three years.
240. Community information programme: the Civic Justice Secretariat, working with MCFs, delivers regular community information sessions, available in all languages spoken within each community, covering the Architecture in accessible, plain-language terms. These sessions are available digitally through the SDN and in person.
241. SDN civic justice portal: a comprehensive, accessible, plain-language resource on the civic justice system, available at all times through the SDN. The portal includes: process guides. rights information. forms and templates. a facility for submitting referrals. and a library of appropriately anonymised case summaries demonstrating how the system works in practice.
242. Public reporting: the regular public reports produced by the Secretariat (Chapter 25) are written in plain language accessible to the general public, not in institutional or technical language. The IES reviews these reports for clarity and accessibility before publication.

### **51.3 Addressing Public Assumptions from the Prior System**

The most significant challenge in civic justice public literacy is the deeply embedded public assumption — cultivated over centuries — that justice means punishment, and that any system without imprisonment is a system without consequences. The Civic Justice Literacy programme directly addresses this assumption through: honest comparative analysis of outcomes under carceral versus restorative systems. evidence from restorative justice research on harm reduction, recidivism reduction, and satisfaction rates among those who experienced harm. and the direct testimony of participants in restorative processes, gathered (with consent) and shared as civic learning.

The IES is responsible for ensuring that public information about civic justice is epistemically grounded and does not contribute to either naive optimism or unjustified pessimism about the Architecture's outcomes.

## Chapter 52: Magister and MCF Training Programmes

### 52.1 Training as a Constitutional Obligation

The quality of training for Magisters and MCFs is not a human resources function. It is a constitutional obligation. The Architecture is only as good as the people who implement it. Investment in training — its design, delivery, quality, and continuing development — is investment in civic justice itself.

### 52.2 Magister Training Curriculum

The full Magister training curriculum covers the following domains across the twelve-month supervised practice period:

Module	Content	Hours
Constitutional Foundation	The Civic Commonwealth Constitution. the Civic Rules Framework. the Constitutional Grammar Document. the role of the IES and NSA	40
Civic Justice Architecture	Complete study of this Architecture. all process pathways. evidence standards. consequence framework	80
Evidence and Investigation	Evidence categories and assessment. investigation methodology. bias controls. digital evidence. IES epistemic standards	60
Restorative Justice Theory and Practice	History and evidence base. circle process. mediation. facilitated dialogue. trauma-informed practice. cross-cultural considerations	80
Harm Assessment and Consequences	Harm Matrix application. Proportionality Framework. consequence design. monitoring and review	40
Communication and Facilitation	Hearing facilitation. difficult conversations. de-escalation. communication with vulnerable parties. plain-language writing	60
Bias and Integrity	Unconscious bias. anti-capture skills. conflict of interest identification. corruption recognition. whistleblower protocols	40
Supervised Practice	Case observation (minimum 10). co-led processes (minimum 5). portfolio development. supervised independent cases (minimum 5)	400
Continuing Development	Annual refresher. participation in institutional learning. IES audit engagement. peer supervision	Ongoing

## 52.3 MCF Training Curriculum

The MCF training programme of nine months covers: restorative justice theory and practice (80 hours). circle facilitation and mediation (60 hours). trauma-informed support practice (40 hours). civic justice process knowledge (40 hours). communication and accessibility (40 hours). self-care and professional sustainability (20 hours). and supervised practice equivalent to Magister supervised practice requirements, scaled to the MCF role.

## 52.4 Quality Assurance of Training

All training programmes are designed in partnership between the Civic Justice Secretariat, the IES Education Division, and practitioners with direct civic justice experience. Training quality is assessed annually by a Sortition Training Review Panel, which evaluates trainee outcomes, practitioner performance, and programme content against current evidence. Training providers who do not meet quality standards are subject to contract review and replacement.

## Chapter 53: Community-Facing Communication Standards

---

### 53.1 Communication Principles

All communications from the Civic Justice Architecture to residents, communities, and the public shall adhere to the following principles:

243. Plain language: no technical, legal, or institutional jargon. terms are defined when first used. language is accessible to a person with standard civic education.
244. Dignity: all communications treat every party with respect, regardless of their role in the civic matter.
245. Transparency: communications explain the process being described, not merely the outcome. residents understand what is happening and why.
246. Timeliness: communications are sent at the earliest practicable opportunity. delays are explained promptly.
247. Accessibility: communications are available in all languages and formats needed by the recipient. visual, audio, and easy-read versions are available for all standard communications.
248. Completeness: communications contain all information the recipient needs to understand their situation and their rights. they do not withhold material information except for documented and proportionate confidentiality reasons.

### 53.2 Prohibited Communication Practices

The following communication practices are prohibited in all civic justice contexts:

- Using terminology that implies guilt before a determination has been made.
- Communicating in a manner designed to coerce, frighten, or disorient any party.
- Providing misleading information about a party's rights or the process.
- Releasing information about any party to media or public channels without the party's consent and the Magister's authorisation.
- Using complex, technical, or exclusionary language that disadvantages parties without civic or legal backgrounds.

## Chapter 54: Cultural Foundations of Non-Carceral Justice

---

### 54.1 The Cultural Dimension of Justice

Justice is not merely institutional. It is cultural. The success of the Civic Justice Architecture over time depends not only on the design of its processes but on the gradual development of a civic culture that understands harm through a restorative lens: a culture in which the community's first response to harm is "what is needed to restore and heal?" rather than "who deserves to suffer?". This cultural shift cannot be legislated. It must be cultivated through sustained civic education, community practice, and institutional leadership.

### 54.2 Building Restorative Culture

The Civic Commonwealth's programme for building restorative civic culture includes:

249. Civic education from early childhood that introduces the concept of harm, impact, and repair as natural civic responses to conflict.
250. Community circle practice in schools, civic institutions, and community settings as a routine tool for conflict resolution, not merely a justice system intervention.
251. MCF community presence: MCFs are not solely reactive justice system practitioners. They are civic community builders, present in communities, facilitating restorative conversations before they become civic matters.
252. Cultural recognition events: public celebration of restorative justice achievements, including the stories (with consent) of those who have participated in processes that healed significant harm — normalising the possibility of restoration.
253. Media partnership: the Civic Justice Secretariat and IES engage proactively with civic media to promote accurate, nuanced, and evidence-based public conversation about justice, harm, and restoration, challenging the punitive assumptions deeply embedded in prior media culture.

### 54.3 Indigenous and Cultural Justice Traditions

The Civic Commonwealth recognises that many of the restorative justice practices that inform this Architecture have their deepest roots in indigenous and traditional community justice systems — particularly from Māori tikanga, Indigenous North American peace-making, and African ubuntu frameworks. The Architecture draws on this wisdom with appropriate acknowledgement and in partnership with relevant communities. Cultural adaptation of civic justice processes, to ensure that they are genuinely accessible and meaningful within specific cultural contexts, is encouraged under IES guidance and Secretariat oversight.

## Chapter 55: Institutional Memory and Long-Term Resilience

---

### 55.1 The Importance of Institutional Memory

Institutional memory is the capacity of an organisation or system to retain, learn from, and build upon its accumulated experience. Systems without institutional memory repeat their mistakes, lose their accumulated wisdom when personnel change, and become vulnerable to the reintroduction of practices they have previously identified as harmful. The Civic Justice Architecture is specifically designed to build and protect institutional memory.

### 55.2 Institutional Learning Architecture

The institutional learning function of the Civic Justice Secretariat operates on three timescales:

254. Case-level learning: every closed civic matter generates a structured case learning report, identifying: what worked well in the process. what could have been done better. any novel evidentiary or process challenges encountered. and any patterns that may have systemic significance. These reports feed into the quarterly IES audit and the annual Architecture Review.
255. Pattern-level learning: the IES Justice Division conducts quarterly synthesis of case learning reports, identifying emerging patterns, recurrent challenges, and areas of consistent excellence. Synthesis reports are published and shared with all Magisters, MCFs, and Sortition Panels.
256. Architecture-level learning: the five-yearly Architecture Review (Chapter 50.3) draws on accumulated case and pattern learning to produce evidence-based recommendations for substantive amendments to the Architecture. This review constitutes the primary mechanism by which the Architecture adapts and improves over time.

### 55.3 Long-Term Resilience Safeguards

To ensure that the Civic Justice Architecture remains robust against political pressure, institutional fatigue, and the gradual erosion of standards that afflicts all institutional systems over time, the following long-term resilience mechanisms are built in:

- The IES independence guarantee: the IES cannot be abolished, defunded, or directed by any Assembly without a supermajority NSA resolution and civic referendum.
- The sortition oversight guarantee: the right of the civic community to oversight of civic justice institutions through random selection cannot be removed from this Architecture without constitutional amendment at the highest level.
- The Dissolution Covenant assessment: where any part of the Civic Justice Architecture has been systematically undermined, captured, or corrupted beyond remediation, the Dissolution Covenant procedure enables the NSA to dissolve that institution and reconstitute it from the ground up, without abandoning the principles on which it was built.

- The Mandated Challenger in Architecture Review: every five-yearly Architecture Review requires a formal Mandated Challenge report — a rigorous assessment of the strongest arguments that the current Architecture is failing — before amendments are considered.
- Cross-generational knowledge transfer: the Civic Justice Secretariat is required to maintain a Knowledge Transfer programme, ensuring that the knowledge accumulated by experienced Magisters, MCFs, and institutional officers is systematically documented and passed to the next generation of practitioners before those practitioners retire or rotate out.

# PART NINE

## Technical Annexes

### Annex A: Model Procedural Scripts

#### A.1 Opening Script — Consequence Hearing (Standard)

*For use by the Magister at the commencement of every Consequence Hearing. Adapt language as appropriate to the specific circumstances and parties.*

Good [morning/afternoon]. I am [Name], a Magister of the Civic Justice Architecture of the Civic Commonwealth. Today we are here for a Consequence Hearing in connection with the civic matter recorded as [Reference Number]. I want to begin by making sure that everyone in this room understands what this process is, and what it is not.

This is not a trial. I am not a judge. Nobody here is going to be found guilty of a crime or sentenced to prison. What we are here to do is to understand, as fully and honestly as possible, what happened, what harm resulted, and what can be done to make things as right as possible going forward.

Everyone here has the right to speak, to be heard, and to be treated with complete respect. If at any point you need to take a break, please let me or [MCF Name] know and we will pause. If you have any questions about the process at any point, please raise them with your Civic Advocate.

I have read the Final Investigative Findings in this matter. I have considered the evidence carefully. What I have not yet decided is what the outcome should be — that will emerge from this hearing, from what each of you shares, and from the structured process we are about to go through together.

Before we begin, I want to confirm: is there anything anyone needs right now in terms of comfort, accessibility, or support that has not already been provided?

#### A.2 Opening Script — Community Circle

*For use by the MCF or Circle Facilitator at the opening of every Community Circle.*

Welcome to this Community Circle. I am [Name], and I will be facilitating today's process. I want to begin by thanking each of you for choosing to be here. Being present in a circle like this — to speak honestly about something that has caused harm — takes courage. I recognise that.

In a moment we will begin our first round. Before we do, I want to remind everyone of the agreements we made when we prepared for this circle: we speak from our

own experience. we speak one at a time. we do not interrupt. what is shared in this circle belongs to this circle. and we each have the right to pass when it is our turn. This circle belongs to everyone in it. My role is to hold the space and to keep us moving through the process. But the wisdom in this circle is yours.

### **A.3 Triage Officer Script — Initial Referral Contact**

*For use by the Triage Officer when making initial contact with the person making a referral.*

Thank you for contacting the Civic Justice Secretariat. My name is [Name] and my role is to help you understand what the next steps might be. I want to start by listening to you. You don't need to have all the answers, and you don't need to be sure about anything. Can you tell me, in your own words, what has happened and what your concern is?

[After listening:] Thank you for sharing that with me. I'm going to ask you a few questions to help me understand the situation better, so that we can work out the most appropriate way to support you. Everything you tell me is confidential to the Civic Justice Secretariat, and I will explain what that means in more detail as we go. You can stop or take a break at any point.

### **A.4 Magister Script — Consequence Determination Reading**

*For use when the Magister delivers the Consequence Determination orally at the conclusion of the Consequence Hearing.*

We have now completed the Consequence Hearing in this matter. I want to take a few minutes to explain what I have found and what the appropriate way forward is before I invite responses from each of you.

Based on everything I have heard and considered in this matter, I have found [summary of findings at applicable standard of proof]. The harm involved in this matter has been assessed at [Harm Level], based on [brief dimension summary].

Within the Proportionality Framework applicable to this harm level, I am proposing the following civic consequences: [clear statement of each consequence element]. I want to be clear about why I have reached each of these conclusions. [Reasoning, in plain language.]

These are my proposed consequences. Before they become a Civic Compact, I want to hear from each of you. Do these feel proportionate and fair? Are there elements of the restoration that we have not yet considered? I am asking genuinely — the Civic Compact is most likely to succeed if it is genuinely owned by everyone in this room.

## Annex B: Standard Intake and Referral Forms

### B.1 Civic Matter Referral Form

All fields marked [Required] must be completed. Fields marked [Optional] help us to respond more effectively.

Field	Notes	Required?
Date of referral	Auto-completed on SDN submission. enter manually for paper form	Required
Name of person making referral	May be left blank for anonymous referral (see note below)	Optional
Contact details of person making referral	Required if you wish to receive updates on this referral	Optional
Would you like your identity kept confidential?	Yes / No / Partially (specify)	Required
Brief description of the civic matter	In your own words. you do not need to use formal language	Required
Approximate date(s) when the matter occurred	As accurately as you are able to say	Required
Location where the matter occurred	Address, civic area, or description of location	Required
Names or descriptions of parties involved	Including those you believe caused harm and those who experienced it	Optional
Is there an ongoing risk of harm?	Yes / No / Unsure	Required
Have you taken any steps to resolve this matter already?	Describe if yes	Optional
What outcome would you like to see?	You are not bound by what you say here. this helps us understand your needs	Optional
Do you need a Civic Advocate?	Yes / No / I would like more information first	Required
Do you require any support for this process?	e.g., interpreter, communication support, accessibility requirements	Optional

Anonymous referrals are accepted. If you do not provide your name, we will not be able to update you on the progress of your referral or to include you directly in the process. Anonymous referrals that contain credible information will be investigated to the same standard as identified referrals.

## B.2 Civic Advocate Request Form

Field	Notes	Required?
Case reference number	Provided by Secretariat following intake	Required
Your name		Required
Your contact details		Required
Do you have any preferences for your Civic Advocate?	e.g., language, cultural background, gender — these will be accommodated where possible	Optional
Do you have any accessibility requirements?		Optional
Is there anything you would like your Advocate to know before your first meeting?		Optional

## Annex C: Investigation Templates and Checklists

### C.1 Investigation Plan Template

Section	Content Required
Matter identification	Case reference. parties. preliminary classification. Magister and team members
Investigative questions	Numbered list of specific questions the investigation is designed to answer
Evidence sources	For each question: what evidence sources will be consulted (persons, documents, physical, digital, expert)
Timeline	Stage-by-stage timeline with target completion dates and responsible investigator
Resource requirements	Specialist expertise. translation. accessibility. SDN digital evidence tools. physical evidence storage
Conflict of interest assessment	Assessment of each team member against all parties. any management measures required
Confidentiality classification	Overall classification and specific elements requiring enhanced protection
Mandated Challenger trigger	Statement of the specific findings that would trigger IES Mandated Challenger referral
Bias assessment	Initial assumptions the team may hold. steps taken to challenge those assumptions. diversity of team perspective
Approval signatures	Magister. Secretariat review officer. IES (for Level 4+)

### C.2 Witness Interview Checklist

To be completed by the interviewing officer before and after every witness interview:

257. Advance notice provided in writing — minimum 5 working days (non-emergency)?
258. Topics to be covered communicated in advance?
259. Witness informed of right to have a support person present?
260. Any accessibility or communication requirements identified and met?
261. Setting appropriate — private, comfortable, non-institutional where possible?
262. Interviewer's role explained at outset?
263. Recording consent obtained (if recorded)?
264. Interview conducted using structured open questioning — non-leading, non-adversarial?
265. Witness given opportunity to add anything not covered by questions?
266. Witness provided with copy of summary for review within 5 working days?
267. Interview record completed and uploaded to SDN within 24 hours of interview?

## Annex D: The Harm Classification Matrix (Complete)

The following matrix provides detailed guidance for Magisters applying the Harm Matrix in civic matters. Each cell represents the assessed weight of a specific combination of harm dimension and dimension level (Low/Medium/High). Magisters do not use this matrix arithmetically. they use it as a structured framework for deliberative professional judgement.

Dimension	Low	Medium	High
Severity	Minimal distress or disruption. no lasting impact. person affected reports matter has not significantly altered their daily life.	Moderate impact on daily functioning. short to medium-term distress, financial loss, or physical effect. recovery expected within weeks to months.	Significant alteration to life circumstances. lasting or permanent physical, psychological, or material harm. may involve serious physical injury, chronic psychological condition, or major financial ruin.
Duration	Single or brief incident. harm ceased before or at point of referral.	Harm continued over days, weeks, or months. or the consequences of an isolated incident have persisted for a medium period.	Harm ongoing. or consequences of harm are permanent or indefinitely continuing.
Breadth	One individual primarily affected.	A small group (2-20 persons) or a family/household unit primarily affected.	A community, organisation, or significant segment of the civic population affected.
Reversibility	Harm is fully reversible through straightforward restitution or apology. no lasting damage.	Harm is substantially but not fully reversible. some lasting impact remains even with full restitution.	Harm is irreversible or can only be partially mitigated. permanent change to the circumstances of those affected.
Intent	Inadvertent. no reasonable foreseeing of harm. genuine mistake.	Reckless — risk of harm was apparent or should have been apparent but was not adequately considered. or intent to a minor harmful act without awareness of its actual consequences.	Deliberate — harm was intended or the probability of serious harm was accepted as a likely consequence of the conduct.

Dimension	Low	Medium	High
Power Dimension	No power imbalance relevant to the matter.	Some power imbalance present (e.g., employer/employee, institutional provider/service user) and relevant to how the harm was caused or could continue.	Significant exploitation of a position of trust, authority, or vulnerability. the harm depended on the power imbalance for its commission.
Civic Context	No civic infrastructure dimension. purely interpersonal or material.	Some civic dimension — affects community civic participation, civic trust, or civic services in a limited way.	Directly targets or significantly damages civic constitutional structures, sortition integrity, democratic processes, or the epistemic commons.

The overall harm level is determined by professional deliberative assessment of the complete dimension profile. A single high dimension does not automatically produce the highest harm level classification, but a high dimension in Severity combined with high Intent and Power Dimension will typically produce a Level 4 or above assessment even if other dimensions are lower.

## Annex E: Decision-Recording Formats

---

### E.1 Consequence Determination Format

Every formal Consequence Determination shall be recorded in the following structured format:

CIVIC JUSTICE ARCHITECTURE — CONSEQUENCE DETERMINATION Case  
Reference: [Number] Magister: [Name] Date of Determination: [Date] Jurisdictional  
Level: [Local / Regional / National]

#### Section 1 — Matter Summary

[Plain-language summary of the civic matter, identifying the parties without unnecessary identification detail, the nature of the matter, and the process pathway followed.]

#### Section 2 — Investigative Findings

[Summary of the Final Investigative Findings, including the evidence base, the standard of civic proof applied, and the specific findings of fact established to that standard.]

#### Section 3 — Mandated Challenge Engagement

[Where applicable: summary of the Mandated Challenge Report and the Magister's specific response to each significant challenge raised.]

#### Section 4 — Harm Level Assessment

[Dimension-by-dimension assessment using the Harm Matrix. overall harm level determination with reasoning.]

#### Section 5 — Consequence Determination

[Each consequence element stated clearly, with specific reference to the Proportionality Framework, the evidence base for that element, and the reasoning for placement within the applicable range.]

#### Section 6 — Mitigating and Contextual Factors

[Explicit consideration of all relevant mitigating and contextual factors identified in Chapter 22.4, with their effect on the determination stated.]

#### Section 7 — Civic Compact Terms

[The specific obligations, schedules, monitoring arrangements, and completion criteria constituting the Civic Compact.]

## **Section 8 — Appeal Rights**

[Plain-language statement of the right to appeal, the process for doing so, and the contact details for the Secretariat.]

## **Section 9 — Plain Language Summary**

[A maximum 300-word summary in plain language, suitable for communication to all parties and, in anonymised form, for public reporting.]

## Annex F: Sample Cases and Walkthroughs

---

### F.1 Sample Case One — Level 2 Matter: Financial Harm between Neighbours

#### Background

Resident A contracted with Resident B to carry out renovation work on Resident A's property. Resident B received a deposit of £1,800 but completed only a fraction of the work before ceasing contact. Resident A submitted a referral to the Civic Justice Secretariat.

#### Triage

Triage classification: Level 2 (moderate financial harm, limited breadth, potentially reversible, intent unclear pending investigation). Process pathway: Direct Mediation, with potential escalation to Facilitated Dialogue.

#### MCF Contact and Preparation

The assigned MCF contacted both parties within three working days. Resident B explained that a personal crisis had arisen that prevented them from completing the work, and that they had intended to return the deposit but had not done so due to financial difficulty. Resident B expressed genuine regret and willingness to engage with mediation. Resident A remained understandably frustrated but agreed to mediation, stating they primarily wanted the money returned and an explanation.

#### Mediation

In the mediation session, Resident B provided a full account of their personal circumstances. Resident A heard this account and acknowledged that the situation was more complex than they had initially understood. Both parties reached agreement: Resident B would repay £1,200 immediately (the portion reflecting uncompleted work) and £600 in three monthly instalments, would provide a written explanation, and would include a formal acknowledgement that Resident A had been left in a difficult position.

#### Civic Compact

The agreement was recorded as a Civic Compact. The MCF confirmed the three monthly payments were made in full. The matter was formally closed with a Completion Notice.

#### Learning

This case illustrates the value of direct mediation for matters where the harm arose primarily from communication breakdown and circumstantial difficulty rather than from deliberate conduct. The outcome — full restitution and acknowledged impact — was achieved in under six weeks without requiring Magisterial involvement.

### F.2 Sample Case Two — Level 4 Matter: Severe Psychological Harm in Civic Role Context

#### Background

Multiple referrals were received over a period of two months from members of a Local Sortition Assembly describing sustained intimidation, verbal aggression, and deliberate exclusion behaviour by an Assembly Presiding Officer directed at female and non-binary

Assembly members. The pattern of referrals triggered a triage classification of Level 4 (severe psychological harm. medium-term duration. multiple parties affected. significant power dimension through civic role exploitation. deliberate pattern).

### **Investigative Process**

A Magister was assigned within three days. Investigation commenced with document review of Assembly meeting records, followed by structured interviews with eight affected members (all offered Civic Advocates. six accepted), four neutral member witnesses, and the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer denied the characterisation of their conduct. the investigation therefore proceeded under the Reasoned Civic Conclusion standard for the interim, with an awareness that the final standard might require Established Civic Account depending on the evidence gathered.

The evidence review produced substantial documentary and testimonial corroboration of the pattern of conduct. The IES Mandated Challenger reviewed the evidence and produced a Mandated Challenge Report noting that the strongest alternative interpretation — that the conduct reflected genuine procedural strictness without discriminatory intent — was substantially weaker than the primary account given the demographic pattern and the specific documented communications. The Magister addressed the Mandated Challenge in the Final Investigative Findings and concluded that the Established Civic Account standard was met.

### **Consequence Hearing**

The Presiding Officer was temporarily excluded from the role pending the Consequence Hearing, following Sortition Integrity Panel authorisation. The Consequence Hearing was conducted over two sessions. Affected Assembly members chose to have their accounts presented by the MCF rather than directly. A Community Accountability Process was held, attended by eight affected members and the Presiding Officer, facilitated by an experienced Circle Facilitator. The Presiding Officer, confronted with the full accounts, acknowledged the harm caused for the first time.

### **Consequence Determination**

Harm Level 4. Consequence Determination: permanent removal from the Presiding Officer role. exclusion from any civic facilitation or leadership role for 48 months. completion of a structured 30-hour impact and empathy development programme. formal Civic Apology to each affected member. Sortition Panel review at 18 months. The matter was referred to the relevant RSA for an audit of LSA governance structures to identify what enabled the conduct to persist without challenge.

### **Learning**

This case illustrates the importance of pattern recognition in triage, the power of the Mandated Challenger in ensuring epistemic rigour, and the value of a Community Accountability Process in enabling genuine acknowledgement. The referral to the RSA for structural audit demonstrates the Architecture's systemic dimension — individual accountability is not sufficient where institutional conditions enabled the harm.

## **F.3 Sample Case Three — Level 5 Matter: Systemic Failure in Civic Health Delivery**

### **Background**

Analysis of civic health outcome data by the IES revealed a statistically significant pattern of delayed diagnostic referrals in a specific Regional civic health service, correlated with specific demographic characteristics of patients. The IES referred the pattern to the Civic Justice Secretariat as a potential Systemic Failure under Chapter 4.5.

### **Systemic Investigation**

The NSA assumed jurisdiction. A dedicated systemic investigation team was convened, including: two Magisters, an IES epistemic monitor, a public health specialist, a demographic data analyst, and an MCF community liaison team. Investigation covered: three years of referral data, staff interview programme, patient experience collection (thirty-five structured interviews with affected residents), review of regional health governance decisions, and review of resource allocation processes.

### **Findings**

The investigation established, to the Established Civic Account standard, that systemic under-resourcing of the affected health service, combined with implicit bias in referral decision-making and inadequate diversity in the clinical workforce, had produced a pattern of delayed diagnosis causing quantifiable long-term health harm to a significant number of residents in the affected demographic. No individual was found to have acted with deliberate discriminatory intent, but a pattern of collective institutional negligence and structural failure was established.

### **Structural Remedy Framework**

The NSA adopted a Structural Remedy Framework requiring: immediate restoration of full resourcing, mandatory clinical workforce diversity programme, establishment of a clinical peer review process for referral decisions, a comprehensive patient contact programme to identify all who may have been affected, a Restitution Programme to meet the additional health and financial costs of those affected, and a five-year structural monitoring programme under a dedicated Sortition Structural Remedy Panel. The Regional Health Authority issued a formal Institutional Civic Apology.

### **Learning**

This case illustrates the importance of the systemic dimension of the Architecture: harm that no individual intended and no individual could have prevented through individual conduct required a systemic response addressing root causes. Individual accountability for systemic failure is directed at institutional accountability — changing the conditions — not at finding individuals to punish for what institutional design produced.

## Annex G: Glossary of Civic Justice Terminology

This glossary provides brief definitions of all terms used in this Architecture. Full definitions appear in Chapter 3. Where a term is also defined in the Constitutional Grammar Document, the CGD definition prevails.

Term	Definition
Behavioural Commitment	A specific, measurable undertaking made by a responsible party to change identified conduct, recorded in the Civic Compact.
Civic Advocate	A trained, certified, independent civic practitioner who supports any party in understanding and engaging with the civic justice process.
Civic Apology	A formal acknowledgement of responsibility, genuine regret, and commitment to restoration issued as part of a Civic Compact.
Civic Compact	The formal, binding document recording the agreed or determined resolution of a civic matter, including all restorative obligations.
Civic Consequence	A restorative, reparative, or protective obligation imposed through the Civic Justice Architecture. not a punishment.
Civic Floor	The unconditional minimum standard of dignified treatment and civic entitlement applying to every resident of the Civic Commonwealth.
Civic Justice Secretariat	The administrative body responsible for the operational management of the Civic Justice Architecture.
Civic Matter	Any situation involving harm, rule breach, dispute, integrity breach, or systemic failure referred to the Civic Justice Architecture.
Community Circle	A structured restorative process in which all affected parties participate in facilitated, values-based dialogue.
Community Contribution	A non-punitive restorative obligation to contribute meaningfully to the community as part of a Civic Compact.
Consequence Determination	The formal written output of a Consequence Hearing, setting out the established findings and civic consequences.
Consequence Hearing	The formal civic justice process at which findings are presented, restorative dialogue occurs, and consequences are determined.
Constitutional Review Panel	A sortition panel convened for Level 6 matters and constitutional issues, operating at NSA level.
Dissolution Covenant	The constitutional mechanism enabling institutional reconstruction where an institution has been irreparably compromised.

Term	Definition
Established Civic Account	The highest standard of civic proof, required for Level 4 and above determinations.
Facilitated Dialogue	A structured pre-hearing restorative process led by a Magister and MCF.
Harm Matrix	The seven-dimension structured framework for assessing and classifying harm in civic matters.
IES (Independent Epistemic Secretariat)	The constitutionally independent body responsible for epistemic governance across the Civic Commonwealth.
Integrity Breach	An act or omission by a person in a civic trust position that abuses that position or undermines civic institutional integrity.
Jurisdictional Coordination Meeting	A meeting to determine lead jurisdiction in multi-level civic matters.
LSA (Local Sortition Assembly)	The local-level civic assembly with justice jurisdiction for Level 1-2 matters in its area.
Magister	The civic officer who leads civic justice processes: investigation, consequence hearings, and determinations.
Mandated Challenge Report	The formal IES document setting out the strongest available challenge to the Magister's emerging conclusion.
Mandated Challenger	The IES-appointed officer whose role is to rigorously challenge dominant interpretive accounts of evidence.
MCF (Magisterial Community Facilitator)	The trained civic practitioner who facilitates restorative processes and supports all parties.
NSA (National Sortition Assembly)	The national-level civic assembly with justice jurisdiction for Level 5-6 matters.
Proportionality Framework	The structured framework governing the range of civic consequences applicable to each harm level.
Protective Separation	The emergency non-custodial measure requiring geographic or institutional distance from those at risk.
Reasoned Civic Conclusion	The intermediate standard of civic proof, required for Level 2-3 determinations.
Referral	The formal notification to the Civic Justice Secretariat that a civic matter requires civic justice process.
Reintegration Plan	The structured plan supporting a person's return to full civic participation following completion of a Civic Compact.
Restitution Agreement	A Civic Compact element detailing material, financial, or service-based actions to repair quantifiable harm.
RSA (Regional Sortition Assembly)	The regional-level civic assembly with justice jurisdiction for Level 3-4 matters.
SDN (Sovereign Digital Network)	The Civic Commonwealth's public-purpose digital infrastructure supporting all civic justice case management.

Term	Definition
Sortition Justice Panel	A randomly selected panel of residents providing independent oversight at specified stages of civic justice.
Structural Remedy Framework	The formal plan of institutional changes required to address systemic failures.
Systemic Failure	A pattern of civic outcomes or conditions producing widespread harm or risk, classified under Chapter 4.5.
Triage	The initial assessment of a referral to determine classification, urgency, and process pathway.

## Annex H: Cross-Reference Index

The following index maps key functional requirements to the relevant chapters of this Architecture, enabling rapid navigation for practitioners and institutional designers.

Function or Requirement	Primary Chapter(s)	Supporting Chapters
Accepting referrals	Ch 12	Ch 5, Ch 18
Advocate access and rights	Ch 10, Ch 16	Ch 47
Anti-bias safeguards	Ch 17	Ch 43, Ch 50
Anti-capture safeguards	Ch 43	Ch 17, Ch 44, Ch 45
Appeals process	Ch 47	Ch 8, Ch 24
Children (special provisions)	Ch 15.2, Ch 16	Ch 14.4, Ch 18.4
Civic Advocate role	Ch 10	Ch 16, Ch 47
Civic Compact	Ch 29	Ch 28, Ch 33, Ch 41
Community Circles	Ch 27	Ch 38
Community Contribution	Ch 30	Ch 34
Conflict of interest	Ch 6.7	Ch 7, Ch 44
Consequence Determination format	Annex E	Ch 19, Ch 23
Corruption	Ch 44	Ch 43, Ch 49
Digital evidence and SDN	Ch 18	Ch 14.1.4
Education and literacy	Ch 51	Ch 52, Ch 53, Ch 54
Emergency procedures	Ch 48	Ch 12.3, Ch 35
Evidence collection	Ch 14	Ch 13, Ch 15
Escalation	Ch 41	Ch 29, Ch 33
Extended protocols (severe harm)	Ch 42	Ch 22, Ch 35
Facilitated Dialogue	Ch 26.3	Ch 19
Harm Matrix	Ch 21, Annex D	Ch 22
IES oversight	Ch 11	Ch 17, Ch 43, Ch 46
Institutional learning	Ch 55	Ch 50
Intake and triage	Ch 12	Ch 18
Integrity breach (general)	Ch 4.3	Ch 49
Integrity breach (Magister)	Ch 49	Ch 43, Ch 44
Jurisdictional architecture	Ch 5	Ch 12

Function or Requirement	Primary Chapter(s)	Supporting Chapters
Magister role and accountability	Ch 6	Ch 23, Ch 49
Mandated Challenger	Ch 11	Ch 20, Ch 22
MCF role	Ch 7	Ch 26, Ch 27
Mediation	Ch 26	Ch 12.3
Monitoring and follow-up	Ch 33	Ch 29
Prohibited consequences (absolute)	Ch 1.5	Ch 35, Ch 42
Proof standards	Ch 20	Ch 22, Ch 23
Proportionality Framework	Ch 22	Ch 21, Ch 23
Public reporting	Ch 25	Ch 51
Reintegration	Ch 32	Ch 33
Restitution	Ch 28	Ch 29
Sortition Panel selection	Ch 8.3	Ch 46
Sortition Panel types	Ch 8.2	Ch 24, Ch 46
Structural remedies	Ch 40	Ch 4.5, Ch 50
Systemic failure	Ch 4.5	Ch 40, Ch 50
Systemic risk monitoring	Ch 50	Ch 43, Ch 55
Training (Magister and MCF)	Ch 52	Ch 6.4, Ch 7.3
Transparency and records	Ch 25	Ch 18
Vulnerable parties	Ch 15.2, Ch 16	Ch 10
Whistleblower protections	Ch 45	Ch 43

## Methodological Transparency Statement

*CJA-001 | Master Edition | Civic Commonwealth Constitutional Corpus*

All concepts, structures, and design principles in this Blueprint Framework originate from the author.

AI systems were used as drafting instruments to expand, organise, and articulate the author's original ideas.

The author retained full control over all reasoning, architecture, terminology, and conclusions.

AI assistance was limited to:

- generating alternative phrasings
- expanding sections based on the author's notes
- producing structural outlines
- stress-testing clarity and coherence

No external sources were inserted without explicit author approval.

This Framework should therefore be understood as wholly original intellectual work, produced through a combination of human authorship and AI-assisted drafting tools.

# CIVIC JUSTICE ARCHITECTURE — END OF INSTRUMENT

*CJA-001 | Master Edition | Civic Commonwealth Constitutional Corpus*

This instrument is subject to review and amendment as provided in Chapter 50.3.

The core principles of Chapter 2 and the absolute prohibitions of Chapter 1.5 may not be amended without a supermajority NSA resolution and a national civic referendum.