

THE CIVIC COMMONWEALTH OF THE BRITISH ISLES

Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies

LOCAL SORTITION ASSEMBLY FUNDING FRAMEWORK

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

Equal Standards · Resident-Centred Design · No Territorial Privilege

Document Reference: DD&SA-LOC-FUND-001

Classification: Constitutional Architecture — Service Funding

Status: First Edition

Contents

Contents	2
Preamble: Purpose and Scope of This Framework	5
PART ONE: FOUNDATIONS OF LOCAL SA FUNDING IN DD&SA	6
1.1 Constitutional Position.....	6
1.2 Core Principles	6
1.3 Institutional Relationships: NBI Budget, Magisters, MCFs, and Local SAs	7
1.3.1 The NBI Civic Budget Authority.....	7
1.3.2 The Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES)	7
1.3.3 Managed Civic Functions (MCFs).....	7
1.3.4 Magisters	7
1.3.5 Local Sortition Assemblies	8
1.4 What Local Services Are — and Are Not — in DD&SA	8
1.5 The Civic Need Assessment.....	8
PART TWO: FUNDING ARCHITECTURE AND FLOW	10
2.1 The Single NBI Civic Budget.....	10
2.2 The Local Service Allocation Pool (LSAP)	10
2.3 How Money Flows: The Allocation Sequence	10
Stage 1 — NBI Civic Budget Set.....	10
Stage 2 — LSAP Sub-Allocation by Service Category	11
Stage 3 — Locality Allocation Formula Applied	11
Stage 4 — MCF Funding Disbursement	11
Stage 5 — Local SA Monitoring and Reporting	11
2.4 The Per-Resident Baseline: Core Logic	11
2.5 Adjustment Factors: Principles and Coefficients	12
2.5.1 The Adjustment Factor Matrix	13
2.5.2 Applying Multiple Factors	13
2.6 Local SA Visibility and Scrutiny Rights	13
2.7 Challenge and Escalation Mechanisms	14
PART THREE: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 1 — SOCIAL WORK	15
3.1 Definition and Scope	15
3.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	15
3.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline	16
3.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Social Work	16
3.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	17
3.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role	17
3.6.1 Quarterly Performance Review	17
3.6.2 Annual Civic Account Entry	17
3.6.3 Formal Challenge Rights.....	17
3.6.4 Resident Feedback Channel.....	18

3.7 Performance Metrics — Social Work.....	18
PART FOUR: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 2 — WASTE COLLECTION.....	19
4.1 Definition and Scope.....	19
4.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	19
4.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline.....	20
4.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Waste Collection.....	20
4.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	20
4.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role.....	21
4.7 Performance Metrics — Waste Collection.....	21
PART FIVE: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 3 — LOCAL ROADS.....	22
5.1 Definition and Scope.....	22
5.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	22
5.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline.....	23
5.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Local Roads.....	23
5.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	24
5.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role.....	24
5.7 Performance Metrics — Local Roads.....	24
PART SIX: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 4 — LIBRARIES, LEISURE CENTRES, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES.....	26
6.1 Definition and Scope.....	26
6.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	26
6.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline.....	27
6.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to LLC.....	27
6.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	27
6.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role.....	28
6.7 Performance Metrics — Libraries, Leisure and Community Facilities.....	28
PART SEVEN: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 5 — PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS.....	29
7.1 Definition and Scope.....	29
7.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	29
7.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline.....	30
7.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Planning and Building Standards.....	30
7.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	30
7.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role.....	31
7.7 Performance Metrics — Planning and Building Standards.....	31
PART EIGHT: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 6 — LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.....	32
8.1 Definition and Scope.....	32
8.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard.....	32
8.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline.....	33
8.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Local Economic Development.....	33
8.5 Capital vs Revenue Split.....	34
8.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role.....	34

8.7 Performance Metrics — Local Economic Development.....	34
PART NINE: EQUAL-TREATMENT SAFEGUARDS.....	35
9.1 The Constitutional Prohibition on Territorial Privilege	35
9.2 How the Framework Prevents Special Help	35
9.2.1 Published Formula, Published Calculations	35
9.2.2 No Discretionary Override	35
9.2.3 Symmetry of Adjustment	35
9.2.4 IES Independence	36
9.3 Handling Disputes and Perceived Unfairness	36
9.4 The Civic Contribution Mechanism	36
PART TEN: IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOLS	38
10.1 Rollout Sequence	38
10.2 Local SA Training and Capability	38
10.3 Review, Refinement, and Framework Evolution	39
10.3.1 Standard Three-Year Review.....	39
10.3.2 Emergency Review.....	39
10.3.3 Framework Architecture Review	39
10.4 The Sovereign Digital Network: Transparency Infrastructure	40
PART ELEVEN: WORKED EXAMPLES	41
Example 1 — Ashfield Urban (Dense Urban Locality)	41
Adjustment Factor Values — Ashfield Urban.....	41
Annual Allocations — Ashfield Urban	41
Operational Configuration — Ashfield Urban.....	42
Example 2 — Cragmoor Rural (Remote Rural Locality)	42
Adjustment Factor Values — Cragmoor Rural.....	43
Annual Allocations — Cragmoor Rural	43
Operational Configuration — Cragmoor Rural.....	43
Comparative Summary	44
PART TWELVE: FRAMEWORK SUMMARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONFIRMATION.....	46
12.1 The Core Proposition	46
12.2 What This Framework Achieves	46
12.3 Constitutional Confirmation.....	46
12.4 Living Document Status	47

Preamble: Purpose and Scope of This Framework

This document establishes the complete Local Sortition Assembly (SA) Funding Framework for the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles, operating under the governance architecture of Direct Democracy and Sortition Assemblies (DD&SA). It is a constitutional and operational instrument, not a political statement. It defines, in precise and enforceable terms, how public resources are allocated to the local service layer of the NBI, who oversees that allocation, and how equal standards of provision are guaranteed to every resident regardless of where they live.

The framework resolves a problem that representative systems have historically failed to solve: the tendency for fiscal architecture to follow political geography rather than resident need. Under representative models, funding flows through devolved governments, block grants, and negotiated settlements — all of which create structural inequalities, reward political leverage, and permit territorial privilege. The DD&SA framework eliminates this entire category of dysfunction. There are no devolved governments. There are no territorial block grants. There is no political bargaining over local allocations. There is a single NBI Civic Budget, a transparent per-resident allocation logic, and a set of independent service delivery organisations operating under DD&SA blueprints.

Local Sortition Assemblies are the resident oversight and deliberative layer within this architecture. They do not govern in the executive sense. They scrutinise, challenge, deliberate, and report. They exist to ensure that the funding flowing to their locality is spent in accordance with the universal standards defined in this framework, and to surface failures, gaps, or misalignments for escalation to the appropriate DD&SA body.

This framework covers six local service categories: social work; waste collection; local roads; libraries, leisure centres, and community facilities; planning and building standards; and local economic development. For each category, it defines the minimum universal service standard, the per-resident funding baseline, the adjustment factors that reflect genuine operational differences without creating privilege, the capital and resource split, and the oversight and performance mechanisms by which Local SAs exercise their scrutiny function.

Terminology note: Throughout this framework, 'Framework' is used in place of 'Policy' wherever a document title or label would otherwise appear. DD&SA instruments are adaptive architectures, not fixed directives, and the vocabulary reflects this. 'NBI' refers to the New British Isles / the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles. 'MCF' refers to a Managed Civic Function — a DD&SA service delivery organisation. 'Magister' refers to the independent expert arbiters embedded within the DD&SA architecture.

PART ONE: FOUNDATIONS OF LOCAL SA FUNDING IN DD&SA

1.1 Constitutional Position

The funding of local services in the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles derives its constitutional authority from the DD&SA Constitutional Architecture, specifically the provisions establishing the Civic Floor — the minimum standard of dignified civic life that every resident is guaranteed as a matter of constitutional right, not political discretion.

The Civic Floor is not a lowest-common-denominator settlement. It is a specific, auditable, enforceable set of standards. The local service categories covered by this framework each contribute to the Civic Floor in defined ways. Waste collection is a hygiene and public health component of the Civic Floor. Road maintenance is a mobility and access component. Social work is a protection and support component. Libraries, leisure, and community facilities are a civic participation and wellbeing component. Planning and building standards are a safety and environmental quality component. Local economic development is a material opportunity component.

Because the Civic Floor is a constitutional guarantee, the funding that enables its delivery is not subject to political discretion, annual bargaining, or electoral cycles. It is determined by a transparent formula, reviewed on a defined cycle by DD&SA's Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES), and adjusted only in accordance with the rules and evidence standards set out in Part Two of this framework.

1.2 Core Principles

Six principles govern every aspect of this framework. They are not aspirational values but operational constraints: any mechanism that violates them is constitutionally invalid.

Principle	Operational Meaning	What It Prohibits
Equal cost per head	Every resident generates the same base funding entitlement for equivalent services, regardless of the territory they inhabit.	Higher per-capita settlements for politically significant regions; lower settlements for sparsely populated areas with genuine service delivery challenges not compensated by adjustment factors.
No territorial privilege	No locality, historic nation, or administrative area receives additional funding on the basis of political identity, constitutional status, or historical settlement.	Devolved grants; national funding floors based on ethnicity, nationality, or cultural identity; preferential capital allocations based on territorial claims.
Resident-centred design	The unit of account is always the individual resident, not the territory or the administrative unit.	Block grants to territorial entities; per-locality allocations not traceable to resident need.
Transparent allocation logic	Every pound allocated to the local service layer can be explained by a formula that is publicly visible, independently auditable, and not subject to discretionary override.	Back-room negotiations; ministerial top-ups; political contingency funds.

Principle	Operational Meaning	What It Prohibits
Genuine need adjusts, identity does not	Adjustment factors reflect verifiable operational differences — geography, population age profile, infrastructure condition — not political or cultural identity.	Rurality supplements that are not grounded in actual cost differentials; urban multipliers based on political significance.
Local SAs scrutinise, they do not allocate	Local Sortition Assemblies review, challenge, and report on funding flows. They do not hold or distribute funds, and they do not negotiate allocations.	SA control of service budgets; SA power to redirect funds between categories; SA-mediated negotiation with the NBI budget authority.

1.3 Institutional Relationships: NBI Budget, Magisters, MCFs, and Local SAs

Understanding the funding framework requires a clear picture of the four institutional actors involved in every allocation decision.

1.3.1 The NBI Civic Budget Authority

The NBI Civic Budget Authority (CBA) is the top-level fiscal institution. It holds the single NBI Civic Budget and allocates resources to all service layers — national, regional in the purely geographic sense, and local — according to constitutional formulae. It does not negotiate. It calculates, allocates, publishes, and accounts. Its decisions are reviewable by Sortition Assemblies at national level and by Magisters acting on formal challenge. The CBA has no political membership and no connection to electoral cycles.

1.3.2 The Independent Epistemic Secretariat (IES)

The IES provides the evidence base that the CBA uses for its formulae. It maintains the per-resident baseline figures, the adjustment factor coefficients, the Civic Need Indices, and the infrastructure condition data. It publishes its methods and datasets openly. It reviews all baseline and coefficient figures on a defined three-year cycle unless emergency review is triggered by defined conditions. The IES has no power to allocate funds; its role is to supply the auditable evidence that the allocation formulae require.

1.3.3 Managed Civic Functions (MCFs)

MCFs are the service delivery organisations of the DD&SA system. Each MCF is responsible for delivering one or more service categories within a defined geographic area. They operate under DD&SA blueprints — detailed operational specifications for each service category — and are accountable to Magisters for performance. They receive their funding directly from the CBA via the Local Service Allocation Pool (see Part Two). They do not receive funding from or through Local SAs.

1.3.4 Magisters

Magisters are the independent expert arbiters embedded within each service domain. For local services, each category has a designated Magister function: the Social Work Magister, the Environmental Services Magister, the Civic Infrastructure Magister, and so on. Magisters set and

audit the DD&SA blueprints that govern MCF operations. They receive performance data from MCFs and complaints or challenges from Local SAs. They can direct MCFs to remedy failures and can escalate to the CBA if systemic underfunding is identified. Magisters are not administrators; they are constitutional referees.

1.3.5 Local Sortition Assemblies

Local SAs are resident deliberation and oversight bodies. Their members are selected by sortition from the resident population of the locality. They receive full, open access to the funding allocation data for their area: what has been allocated, to which MCF, for which service, on what formula, and with what adjustment factors applied. They review MCF performance reports. They hear resident concerns. They can issue formal challenge requests to the relevant Magister when they believe allocations are incorrect or when service delivery falls below the universal minimum standard. They produce an annual public Civic Account — a plain-language report on local service funding and delivery for the residents of their area.

Critical distinction: A Local SA does not decide how much money its area receives. The formula decides that, based on population, need, and verified adjustment factors. The SA's role is to verify that the formula has been correctly applied, that the money has been correctly spent, and that the service delivered meets the minimum standard. This is a powerful accountability role but it is explicitly not a resource-allocation role.

1.4 What Local Services Are — and Are Not — in DD&SA

In the DD&SA architecture, 'local services' refers specifically to services whose primary delivery unit is the immediate residential environment: the services that affect residents' daily lives in their locality, are best monitored at close range, and require continuous operational presence. They are distinguished from national services (defence, immigration, national health infrastructure) and from civic justice functions, which operate under the Civic Justice Architecture.

Local services are operationally devolved in the sense that they are delivered by MCFs at local scale. They are constitutionally centralised in the sense that their standards, funding formulae, and accountability mechanisms are set at NBI level. This combination — operational localisation within constitutional centralisation — is the core structural feature that enables equal standards without equal geography.

1.5 The Civic Need Assessment

Before per-resident funding baselines can be applied, each locality's Civic Need Assessment (CNA) must be completed. The CNA is not a political document. It is a data instrument, produced by the IES on a three-year cycle, which captures the verifiable factors that affect the cost of delivering the minimum universal service standard in each locality. It includes:

- Population size and density (residents per square kilometre)
- Age profile (percentage of population under 18 and over 65)
- Civic Need Index score (a composite of health, education, income, and employment indicators)
- Geographic accessibility rating (road network coverage, public transport proximity, terrain classification)

- Infrastructure condition score (condition ratings for roads, buildings, and utilities)
- Tourism and transient population adjustment (for localities with significant non-resident footfall)

CNA data is published openly and is contestable by Local SAs. If an SA believes the CNA for its locality is materially inaccurate, it can formally challenge the data through the IES review process. The IES must respond within 60 civic days with either a corrected CNA or a documented rebuttal. All challenge outcomes are published.

PART TWO: FUNDING ARCHITECTURE AND FLOW

2.1 The Single NBI Civic Budget

The Civic Commonwealth operates a single, unified NBI Civic Budget. There is no equivalent of a Treasury settlement for devolved nations, no Barnett formula, no regional allocation round, and no politically negotiated spending review. The NBI Civic Budget is set by the national-level Sortition Assemblies on the basis of evidence supplied by the IES and the CBA, in accordance with the constitutional requirement to fund the Civic Floor at or above its minimum standard.

The Local Service Allocation Pool (LSAP) is a defined sub-budget within the NBI Civic Budget. Its size is determined by a constitutional formula: the sum of all per-resident baseline allocations across the NBI, adjusted by verified cost factors, plus a Capital Renewal Reserve and an Emergency Response Buffer. The LSAP is not subject to year-on-year political reduction; it has a constitutional floor equal to the cost of delivering the minimum universal service standard to every resident.

2.2 The Local Service Allocation Pool (LSAP)

The LSAP structure is as follows:

Component	Purpose	Determination Method	Approximate Share
Revenue Service Allocation	Funds ongoing operational delivery across all six service categories	Sum of per-resident baselines × adjusted population across NBI	~78%
Capital Renewal Reserve	Funds planned infrastructure replacement and major capital investment	Infrastructure condition assessments, lifecycle modelling, depreciation schedules	~14%
Emergency Response Buffer	Funds unplanned service disruptions, disaster response at local level, surge demand	Statistical modelling of historical emergency costs, minimum 3% of LSAP	~5%
Innovation and Improvement Fund	Funds tested service improvements proposed by MCFs and endorsed by Magisters	Competitive allocation based on evidence of improvement; audited outcomes	~3%

2.3 How Money Flows: The Allocation Sequence

Funding flows from the NBI Civic Budget to service delivery through a five-stage sequence. Each stage has defined actors, decision rules, and accountability requirements.

Stage 1 — NBI Civic Budget Set

The national Sortition Assemblies, informed by the IES evidence base, set the total NBI Civic Budget and confirm the LSAP quantum for the coming three-year period. This decision is published in full, with supporting evidence. It is not subject to override by any political actor.

Stage 2 — LSAP Sub-Allocation by Service Category

The CBA divides the Revenue Service Allocation component of the LSAP into six category pools, one for each service covered by this framework. The share allocated to each category is determined by the aggregate per-resident baselines for that category across the NBI, adjusted by cost factors. Category pool sizes are published.

Stage 3 — Locality Allocation Formula Applied

Within each category pool, the CBA calculates the allocation for each locality by applying the per-resident baseline formula and verified adjustment factors from the CNA. This produces a specific allocation figure for each locality for each service category. All locality allocation figures are published on the Sovereign Digital Network (SDN), accessible to any resident.

Stage 4 — MCF Funding Disbursement

Funds are disbursed directly from the CBA to the MCF responsible for delivering each service in each locality. The MCF receives its allocation in agreed tranches (typically quarterly for revenue, annually for capital), accompanied by the DD&SA blueprint for that service category. The MCF is not permitted to redirect funds between service categories without a formal Magister-approved variation order.

Stage 5 — Local SA Monitoring and Reporting

From the moment funds are disbursed, the Local SA for the relevant area has full visibility of the allocation, the MCF's spending plan, and ongoing expenditure data. The SA monitors delivery against the minimum universal service standard and produces its annual Civic Account. Any formal challenge to the allocation or delivery is routed to the relevant Magister within the timeframes set out in Part Nine.

$$\text{LOCALITY ALLOCATION (per category)} = (\text{NBI_BASELINE} \times \text{ADJ_RESIDENT_COUNT}) + (\text{NBI_BASELINE} \times \text{COST_MULTIPLIER} \times \text{ADJ_RESIDENT_COUNT})$$

$$\text{Where: ADJ_RESIDENT_COUNT} = \text{Registered residents} + (\text{Transient_Population_Factor} \times \text{Non-resident footfall})$$

$$\text{And: COST_MULTIPLIER} = (\text{Rurality Factor} \times \text{Geographic Isolation Factor} \times \text{Infrastructure Age Factor} \times \text{Civic Need Index Factor}) - 1.00$$

2.4 The Per-Resident Baseline: Core Logic

The per-resident baseline is the funding entitlement that every resident generates for each service category. It is the foundational figure from which all locality allocations are derived. It is expressed as an annual pound figure per registered resident and is set by the IES on a three-year review cycle.

The baseline represents the average cost of delivering the minimum universal service standard for a resident living in an area with median density, median age profile, median infrastructure condition, and median geographic accessibility. No area will actually match this median exactly; adjustment factors are applied to all localities. But the baseline is the constitutional anchor: the starting point from which no locality may be systematically deprived.

Service Category	Per-Resident Annual Baseline	Baseline Rationale
Social Work	£195	Reflects cost of maintaining minimum staffing levels, caseload capacity, and emergency response capability at population-proportionate scale
Waste Collection	£78	Reflects cost of weekly household collection, fortnightly recycling, and quarterly bulk-waste services to average-density residential areas
Local Roads	£132	Reflects cost of routine maintenance, winter treatment, and pothole repair on the road network attributable to a resident at median road-density ratios
Libraries, Leisure & Community Facilities	£88	Reflects cost of maintaining a minimum facility access standard: library access within 3km, leisure facility access within 5km, community meeting space within 2km
Planning & Building Standards	£42	Reflects cost of maintaining a responsive planning function, building control inspections, and enforcement at average application and inspection rates
Local Economic Development	£58	Reflects cost of running a local economic intelligence function, managing relationship with national Civic Commerce Architecture, and supporting enterprise entry pathways

These baselines are illustrative constitutional reference figures. Actual baselines are set and maintained by the IES on the basis of independently verified service delivery cost data. They are published, auditable, and formally reviewable. The figures above represent an evidence-anchored starting model for the NBI's first planning period.

2.5 Adjustment Factors: Principles and Coefficients

Adjustment factors modify the per-resident baseline to reflect genuine, verifiable differences in the cost of delivering an equivalent service standard in different localities. They are not privileges. They are technical corrections. The critical distinction is:

- A rurality multiplier is legitimate when it reflects verifiably higher costs per resident for road maintenance due to lower road density. It is not legitimate if it is applied because a locality is politically sensitive or historically disadvantaged without a current cost differential.
- An age-profile multiplier for social work is legitimate when a locality has a verifiably higher proportion of residents in age groups with higher social care need. It is not legitimate as a permanent structural subsidy unconnected to actual caseload data.
- A civic need multiplier is legitimate when the Civic Need Index for a locality, independently verified, is above the NBI median. It is not legitimate as a surrogate for political redress of historic inequality — such redress has its own dedicated architecture.

2.5.1 The Adjustment Factor Matrix

Factor	Variable	Range	Application
Density Factor (DF)	Residents per km ²	0.85 (very dense urban) to 2.40 (very remote rural)	Applied to waste collection, local roads, libraries & leisure; reduces baseline for very high density where shared infrastructure creates efficiency, increases for very low density where fixed costs are spread over few residents
Age Profile Factor (APF)	% under 18 + % over 65 vs NBI median	0.92 to 1.35	Applied to social work primarily; scaled to departure from NBI median age profile, verified by three-year CNA
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	Composite deprivation and health score, 0–100	1.00 (median = 50) to 1.28 (score = 85+)	Applied to social work and local economic development; reflects demonstrated higher service demand in localities with elevated need
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	Road network coverage, terrain rating, public transport access score	1.00 to 1.65	Applied to waste collection, local roads, libraries & leisure, and planning; reflects genuinely higher per-service-unit costs in areas with poor transport infrastructure or challenging terrain
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	Weighted average condition rating of local road and building infrastructure	1.00 to 1.30	Applied to local roads and planning & building standards; reflects higher maintenance cost burden in localities with older or more degraded infrastructure stock
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	Non-resident footfall as proportion of resident population	1.00 to 1.22	Applied to waste collection, libraries & leisure, and local roads; reflects service demand generated by non-resident visitors in localities with high tourism or transit footfall

2.5.2 Applying Multiple Factors

Where multiple adjustment factors apply to a single service category, they are applied multiplicatively, not additively. This prevents overcorrection while ensuring that genuinely compounded cost pressures — such as a remote rural area with old infrastructure and an elderly population — are properly reflected.

$$\text{ADJUSTED ALLOCATION} = \text{BASELINE} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{DF} \times \text{APF} \times \text{CNIF} \times \text{GAF} \times \text{IAF} \times \text{TTF})$$

Only the factors relevant to each service category are applied. The full factor matrix per category is set out in the individual service frameworks in Parts Three through Eight. No additional discretionary factors may be applied by any actor other than the IES, following the formal review process.

2.6 Local SA Visibility and Scrutiny Rights

Local Sortition Assemblies have the following non-discretionary access rights to funding data. These rights cannot be withdrawn, limited, or subject to redaction by any MCF, Magister, or CBA officer.

1. Full publication of the locality's CNA data, including all IES input variables and the resulting adjustment factor values for each service category.
2. Full publication of the locality allocation calculation for each service category, showing the formula as applied, including all factor values, the resulting allocation quantum, and the category pool from which it is drawn.
3. Quarterly expenditure reports from each MCF operating in the locality, showing spend against allocated budget by service sub-category, with narrative explanation of any variance of more than 5%.
4. Annual service performance data from each MCF, measured against the minimum universal service standards defined in Parts Three through Eight of this framework.
5. Full access to all Magister audit reports relating to MCFs operating in the locality.
6. Access to the NBI-wide locality allocation dataset, enabling direct comparison of their locality's allocation with others of comparable population, density, and need profile.

2.7 Challenge and Escalation Mechanisms

If a Local SA believes that a funding allocation has been incorrectly calculated, that an MCF is not delivering the minimum universal service standard, or that a systematic flaw exists in the application of the framework to their locality, it may initiate a formal challenge.

Challenge Type	Initiating Party	Route	Response Standard	Escalation Path
Formula Challenge	Local SA	Formal challenge filed with IES	IES must respond within 60 civic days with corrected calculation or documented rebuttal	If rejected: challenge escalates to national Sortition Assembly review panel
Service Delivery Challenge	Local SA	Formal challenge filed with relevant Magister	Magister must acknowledge within 10 days, investigate and respond within 45 days	If unresolved: escalates to DD&SA Civic Justice Architecture via Civic Advocate
MCF Conduct Challenge	Local SA or any resident	Formal complaint to relevant Magister via SA channel or directly	Magister investigation within 30 days; findings published within 60 days	Serious misconduct: referred to Civic Justice Architecture
Data Accuracy Challenge	Local SA	Formal challenge to IES on CNA inputs	IES re-verification within 60 days	If rejected: independent audit panel convened within 90 days

PART THREE: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 1 — SOCIAL WORK

SW
Framework

Social Work Service Framework

Protection · Intervention · Support · Civic Continuity

3.1 Definition and Scope

Social work in the DD&SA framework refers to the statutory function of identifying, assessing, and responding to residents who face circumstances that undermine their capacity to live a safe, dignified, and autonomous life. It encompasses child protection and family support, adult social care and safeguarding, crisis intervention, mental health support liaison, and the co-ordination of care arrangements where multiple service providers are involved.

Social work under DD&SA is explicitly not a residual function of poverty management. It is a positive civic obligation: the constitutional commitment to ensure that no resident is left without support when their circumstances make independent flourishing impossible. It operates within the broader Civic Floor guarantee and is one of its most direct instruments.

The scope of Local SA oversight in relation to social work includes: caseload levels, response times, placement quality, safeguarding outcomes, staffing ratios, and resident experience of services. It does not extend to individual case decisions, which remain under the professional authority of qualified social work practitioners and the oversight of the Social Work Magister.

3.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Every resident of the Civic Commonwealth is guaranteed the following minimum social work service standard:

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Initial assessment response	A qualified social worker makes first contact and completes an initial assessment within 5 working days of a referral being accepted as requiring social work intervention	% of accepted referrals with completed initial assessment within 5 days (target: 95%)
Emergency response	A qualified social worker is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for crisis referrals categorised as posing immediate risk to life or safety; response within 4 hours	% of emergency referrals with response within 4 hours (target: 99%)
Child protection review	All children on a child protection plan have a review conference within the statutory timeframe; no child remains on plan without active case management	% of reviews completed within statutory timeframe (target: 100%)
Adult safeguarding	All adult safeguarding concerns are acknowledged within 24 hours and allocated for assessment within 5 working days	% allocated within 5 working days (target: 97%)

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Caseload ratio	No qualified social worker carries a caseload exceeding 18 active cases at any time, weighted by case complexity	Average caseload per qualified social worker; proportion exceeding 18 (target: 0%)
Placement quality	All looked-after children and adults in residential care are in placements assessed as meeting DD&SA placement quality standards; all placements reviewed within 6 months of commencement	% of placements meeting standard (target: 100%); % reviewed within 6 months (target: 98%)

3.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for social work is £195. This figure covers:

- Qualified social work staffing costs at the required caseload ratios, inclusive of salary, national insurance contributions, professional registration, and mandatory continuing professional development
- Team management and supervision costs
- Emergency duty team provision
- Placement costs for looked-after children and adults in residential care — modelled on average placement rates at the NBI median
- Assessment and recording infrastructure, including the Civic Digital Network social work management system
- Contribution to the Social Work Magister oversight function

Placement costs represent the most variable component of social work expenditure. The per-resident baseline models average placement rates. Localities with above-average placement demand are compensated through the Civic Need Index Factor and the emergency response buffer. Localities with below-average placement rates will carry a structural surplus in this budget line; surpluses are returned to the LSAP and not retained by the MCF.

3.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Social Work

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF)	Partial	Applied only where very low density creates significant additional travel costs for community social work and assessment visits	1.00 – 1.15
Age Profile Factor (APF)	Yes — full	Social care demand is demonstrably higher in localities with above-median proportions of under-18 and over-65 residents; child protection and adult social care caseloads are directly age-linked	0.92 – 1.35
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	Yes — full	Higher deprivation, poorer health outcomes, and lower educational attainment are established predictors of elevated social work referral rates; CNIF adjusts to reflect this	1.00 – 1.28
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	Partial	Applied where poor transport infrastructure creates material additional cost for community social work delivery and emergency response	1.00 – 1.20

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	No	Not relevant to social work delivery costs	N/A
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	No	Transient population does not generate persistent social work caseload in the same way as residential population	N/A

$$\text{SOCIAL WORK ALLOCATION} = \text{£195} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{APF} \times \text{CNIF} \times \text{DF_social} \times \text{GAF_social})$$

3.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Social work is a predominantly revenue-funded service. The capital component is small and primarily relates to digital infrastructure, office accommodation, and residential placement facility contributions.

Revenue allocation	~93% of total social work allocation — staffing, placements, supervision, operations
Capital allocation	~7% of total social work allocation — digital systems, office estate contribution, training facilities
Capital renewal cycle	Digital infrastructure reviewed every 4 years; office estate every 15 years; allocated from Capital Renewal Reserve not Revenue Service Allocation

3.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

The Local SA's social work oversight function is discharged through four mechanisms:

3.6.1 Quarterly Performance Review

The MCF's social work team submits a quarterly performance report to the Local SA covering all standard indicators from section 3.2. The report is anonymised at individual case level but includes aggregate data on referral volumes, case types, response times, caseload ratios, and placement costs. The SA reviews the report in open session and may raise questions directly with the MCF lead for social work.

3.6.2 Annual Civic Account Entry

Social work performance data is included in the SA's Annual Civic Account. The entry must include: year-on-year comparison of standard indicators; expenditure against allocation; identified areas of concern; and the SA's assessment of whether the minimum universal service standard has been met.

3.6.3 Formal Challenge Rights

The SA may issue a formal Service Delivery Challenge to the Social Work Magister if: any standard indicator falls below its target for two consecutive quarters; if the MCF cannot explain a significant expenditure variance; or if resident complaints suggest a pattern of service failure. The challenge process is set out in section 2.7.

3.6.4 Resident Feedback Channel

The Local SA maintains a resident feedback channel specifically for social work concerns. Feedback is anonymised, aggregated, and reviewed quarterly. Patterns that suggest systemic failure are escalated. Individual complaints that require formal investigation are routed to the Social Work Magister directly by the SA, not handled by the SA itself.

3.7 Performance Metrics — Social Work

Metric	Target	Frequency	Published?
Initial assessment completion rate within 5 working days	95%	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Emergency response within 4 hours	99%	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Child protection review timeliness	100%	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Adult safeguarding allocation within 5 days	97%	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Caseload ratio compliance (max 18 active weighted cases)	0% exceeding	Monthly (internal); quarterly (published)	Yes — SDN
Placement standard compliance	100%	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within $\pm 5\%$	Quarterly	Yes — SDN
Resident feedback satisfaction (aggregate)	$\geq 72\%$ satisfied or neutral	Annual	Yes — SA Civic Account

PART FOUR: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 2 — WASTE COLLECTION



Waste Collection Service Framework

Environmental Health · Sustainability · Public Space Integrity

4.1 Definition and Scope

Waste collection in the DD&SA framework encompasses household residual waste collection, co-mingled recyclable materials collection, garden and organic waste collection, bulky waste removal, fly-tip clearance, and the operation or commissioning of household waste and recycling centres (HWRCs). It includes the logistics of collection, transport to processing facilities, and contractual interface with NBI-level waste processing and materials recovery operations.

Waste collection is a hygiene, environmental health, and public space function. Its failure is immediately visible to residents and has direct public health implications. Under DD&SA principles, no resident receives less frequent, less accessible, or lower-quality waste collection on account of where they live. The standard is universal; the operational configuration to achieve it varies with geography.

4.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Residual waste collection	Weekly collection of residual household waste for all residential properties	% of properties receiving weekly collection (target: 100%); missed collections as % of scheduled (target: <0.5%)
Recyclable materials collection	Fortnightly collection of co-mingled recyclables (glass, paper, card, plastics, metals) from all residential properties	% of properties receiving fortnightly recycling collection (target: 100%)
Organic and garden waste	Fortnightly collection of garden and organic waste available to all residential properties with a garden or outdoor space; charged at NBI-set flat rate	% of eligible properties with access to organic waste service (target: 100%)
Bulky waste removal	On-request collection of bulky household items within 14 calendar days of request, with no more than two free collections per household per year	Mean time from request to collection (target: ≤10 days); % completed within 14 days (target: 96%)
Fly-tip clearance	Clearance of reported fly-tipping from public land within 5 working days of report	% cleared within 5 working days (target: 97%)
HWRC access	Every resident has access to a Household Waste and Recycling Centre within 8km or, where this is not geographically achievable, within 20 minutes' driving time	% of residents meeting access standard (target: 100%)
Street cleansing	Town centres and residential streets maintained to a minimum visible litter standard; Category C or better under DD&SA Environmental Standards	% of inspected sites meeting Category C (target: 95%)

4.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for waste collection is £78. This covers: vehicle fleet operations and maintenance; crew staffing costs; fuel and emissions compliance; route planning and logistics; HWRC operations; fly-tip response; street cleansing; and the MCF's contractual interface with NBI-level waste processing facilities.

$$\text{WASTE COLLECTION ALLOCATION} = \text{£78} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{DF} \times \text{GAF} \times \text{TTF})$$

The Density Factor has a dual effect in waste collection: very high density (>5,000 residents per km²) creates route efficiency that reduces per-resident cost, generating an allocation below the baseline; very low density (<50 residents per km²) creates route inefficiency that significantly increases per-resident cost. The DF range for waste collection therefore operates both above and below 1.00.

4.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Waste Collection

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF)	Yes — bidirectional	Collection route efficiency is directly linked to density. Dense urban areas achieve lower per-collection cost per resident; remote rural areas incur significantly higher costs for equivalent frequency.	0.85 (very dense) – 2.20 (very remote)
Age Profile Factor (APF)	No	Age profile does not materially affect waste arisings per resident at population level	N/A
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	No	Waste collection demand is not reliably correlated with the CNIF composite	N/A
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	Yes — partial	Applied where terrain or road network creates material additional vehicle operating costs beyond what the DF captures (e.g., island communities, mountain terrain)	1.00 – 1.45
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	No	MCF is responsible for its own fleet; road infrastructure age is captured through the roads framework separately	N/A
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	Yes — full	Tourism generates significantly elevated waste arisings and fly-tipping risk in affected localities; collection frequency and HWRC capacity must scale with seasonal population	1.00 – 1.22

4.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Revenue allocation	~85% — staffing, fleet operations, fuel, route logistics, street cleansing, HWRC operations
Capital allocation	~15% — fleet replacement and electrification programme, HWRC facility maintenance and improvement
Fleet renewal cycle	Collection vehicles: 8-year replacement cycle; HWRC facilities: 20-year refurbishment cycle; allocated from Capital Renewal Reserve

4.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

The Local SA's waste collection oversight function is discharged through quarterly performance reporting against the indicators in section 4.2, annual Civic Account inclusion, and the formal challenge process. In addition, the SA operates a resident report channel specifically for missed collections, fly-tip sightings, and service complaints. Aggregate data from this channel feeds into quarterly MCF performance reviews. The SA does not handle individual missed collection disputes — these go directly to the MCF via the Sovereign Digital Network resident interface — but monitors patterns to identify systemic failures.

4.7 Performance Metrics — Waste Collection

Metric	Target	Published?
Missed residual waste collection rate	<0.5% of scheduled	Yes — SDN
Recycling collection frequency compliance	100%	Yes — SDN
Bulky waste collection within 14 days	96%	Yes — SDN
Fly-tip clearance within 5 working days	97%	Yes — SDN
HWRC access standard compliance	100%	Yes — SDN
Street cleansing Category C compliance	95%	Yes — SA Civic Account
Waste diversion rate (% not sent to landfill)	≥72%	Yes — SDN
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within ±5%	Yes — SDN

PART FIVE: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 3 — LOCAL ROADS

LR
Framework

Local Roads Service Framework

Access · Safety · Connectivity · Infrastructure Integrity

5.1 Definition and Scope

Local roads in the DD&SA framework refers to the non-strategic road network: all carriageways, footways, cycle routes, bridges, drainage, and associated street furniture that are not part of the NBI national strategic road network. This includes residential streets, minor rural roads, village lanes, urban access roads, and the footway and cycle infrastructure associated with them.

Local roads are both a mobility and an access right. A resident's ability to move safely from their home to employment, healthcare, education, and civic participation depends on the condition of the local road network. Failure of this network constitutes a failure of the Civic Floor, particularly for residents without access to alternative modes of transport. The DD&SA framework treats road condition as an equity issue, not merely an infrastructure management issue.

Scope includes: carriageway maintenance (routine and planned); winter service (gritting, snow clearance); pothole response; bridge inspection and maintenance; drainage maintenance; footway and cycle route maintenance; street lighting; traffic management infrastructure; and the data management systems required to plan and prioritise maintenance activity.

5.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Carriageway condition	No more than 8% of local carriageway assessed at condition Category 3 or worse (requiring intervention within 12 months) in any locality	% of network requiring intervention (target: ≤8%)
Pothole response	All potholes meeting the DD&SA intervention threshold (depth ≥40mm, width ≥150mm) repaired or made safe within 24 hours of report; repaired permanently within 28 days	% of threshold potholes made safe within 24 hours (target: 99%); permanently repaired within 28 days (target: 96%)
Winter service	All A and B classified roads, and all routes to schools, hospitals, and emergency service facilities, treated before ice or snow formation during forecast conditions	% of priority network treated during forecast events (target: 99%)
Bridge safety	All local bridges inspected at the DD&SA General Inspection interval (every 2 years); no bridge carrying public traffic rated below structural safety grade 2	% of bridges at current inspection (target: 100%); bridges below grade 2 in use (target: 0%)
Footway condition	No more than 10% of adopted footway assessed as requiring intervention within 12 months; all trip hazards	% of footway requiring intervention; trip hazard response rate

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
	meeting intervention criteria (differential $\geq 25\text{mm}$) made safe within 48 hours	
Street lighting	95% of street lights operational at any given point; faults reported and repaired within 5 working days	Operational rate (target: 95%); fault repair within 5 days (target: 97%)

5.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for local roads is £132. This is a revenue baseline covering routine maintenance, winter service, and response activities. It is supplemented by capital allocations from the Capital Renewal Reserve for planned resurfacing, bridge reconstruction, and major drainage works.

The per-resident baseline for roads is adjusted by the road network length per resident in each locality — a variable that differs radically between urban and rural areas. A dense urban area may have 0.5 metres of local road per resident; a remote rural area may have 8–12 metres per resident. The adjustment factor structure addresses this directly. The baseline is set for the NBI median road-to-resident ratio; all localities depart from this in one direction or another.

$$\text{LOCAL ROADS ALLOCATION (Revenue)} = \text{£132} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{DF_roads} \times \text{GAF} \times \text{IAF} \times \text{TTF_roads})$$

$$\text{LOCAL ROADS ALLOCATION (Capital)} = [\text{INFRASTRUCTURE_CONDITION_SCORE} \times \text{NETWORK_LENGTH} \times \text{UNIT_RESURFACING_COST} \times \text{PLANNED_PROPORTION}] \text{ — allocated from Capital Renewal Reserve}$$

5.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Local Roads

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF_roads)	Yes — strongly	Road network length per resident varies by a factor of 20 or more between densest urban areas and most remote rural areas. This is the primary cost driver and the most important adjustment factor for roads.	0.88 (very dense urban, efficient network) – 2.40 (very remote, long network per resident)
Age Profile Factor (APF)	No	Age profile does not materially affect road maintenance demand	N/A
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	No	Road condition is not reliably correlated with CNIF; socioeconomic conditions do not systematically predict infrastructure condition independent of IAF	N/A
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	Yes — partial	Terrain, altitude, and climate conditions create material additional maintenance costs in some localities beyond what DF captures — e.g., areas subject to severe freeze-thaw cycles, coastal salt exposure, or flooding	1.00 – 1.40
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	Yes — full	Localities with older road infrastructure have higher maintenance cost per km because deferred investment creates a maintenance	1.00 – 1.30

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
		backlog. IAF is applied until a defined infrastructure condition score is achieved.	
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF_roads)	Yes — partial	High tourist traffic volumes accelerate carriageway wear on rural roads; adjustment applies to localities where tourist vehicle movements exceed resident vehicle movements by a defined ratio	1.00 – 1.18

5.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Revenue allocation	~72% — routine maintenance, winter service, pothole repair, street lighting operations, drainage maintenance, bridge inspections
Capital allocation	~28% — planned resurfacing programmes, bridge reconstruction, major drainage and drainage culverts, active travel infrastructure improvements
Capital planning cycle	5-year planned maintenance programmes based on network condition surveys; allocated from Capital Renewal Reserve; reviewed annually by Civic Infrastructure Magister

5.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

The Local SA's roads oversight function is materially assisted by the public nature of road condition. Residents can and do directly observe and report failures. The SA is responsible for ensuring that:

- The MCF publishes and maintains a public-facing road condition map on the Sovereign Digital Network, updated quarterly, showing network condition ratings and planned intervention schedules.
- Resident reports of road defects are logged and tracked; response times are published.
- The MCF's annual planned maintenance programme is published before the financial year begins, showing which roads are scheduled for intervention and why.
- Capital allocation is being directed to the highest-priority interventions as identified by the network condition survey, not to politically visible routes.

5.7 Performance Metrics — Local Roads

Metric	Target	Published?
% of network at condition Category 3 or worse	≤8%	Yes — SDN (map and data)
Pothole threshold response: made safe within 24 hours	99%	Yes — SDN
Pothole permanent repair within 28 days	96%	Yes — SDN
Priority network winter treatment during forecast events	99%	Yes — SDN
Bridge inspection currency (100% at interval)	100%	Yes — SDN
Bridges below structural grade 2 in use	0	Yes — SDN (red-flag indicator)
Street light operational rate	95%	Yes — SDN
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within ±5%	Yes — SDN

PART SIX: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 4 — LIBRARIES, LEISURE CENTRES, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES



Libraries, Leisure & Community Facilities Framework

Civic Participation · Wellbeing · Learning · Social Cohesion

6.1 Definition and Scope

This service category encompasses the civic participation, learning, physical health, and community infrastructure available to residents in their locality. It includes: public libraries (physical and digital access points); leisure and recreational facilities (swimming pools, sports halls, fitness suites, outdoor recreation areas); community halls, meeting rooms, and civic gathering spaces; and the programmes, activities, and resources delivered through these facilities.

Under DD&SA principles, civic participation is not a luxury. Access to information, to physical wellbeing resources, to communal space for deliberation, learning, and recreation, is a component of the Civic Floor. A resident who cannot afford a private gym, who has no broadband at home, or who has no accessible meeting space for community activity is materially disadvantaged relative to a wealthier counterpart. The LLC framework ensures that the infrastructure for civic life exists in every locality at a minimum standard, regardless of the locality's historic investment profile or economic status.

6.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Library access	Every resident has access to a public library building or accredited library access point within 3km of their registered address, or within a 15-minute journey by public or active transport	% of residents meeting access standard (target: 100%); where 100% is not achievable by building proximity, mobile library or accredited access point supplementation required
Digital access provision	Every library building offers free, unrestricted public internet access with a minimum of one terminal per 500 residents in the catchment, open a minimum of 48 hours per week	Average hours open per week; terminal-to-resident ratio in catchment
Leisure facility access	Every resident has access to a publicly operated or publicly contracted leisure facility including a 25m pool and a multi-use sports hall within 5km or a 20-minute journey by public or active transport	% of residents meeting access standard (target: 95%; where not achievable, mitigation plan published and funded)
Community meeting space	Every resident has access to a bookable community meeting space suitable for gatherings of up to 50 people within 2km of their registered address	% of residents meeting access standard (target: 100%)
Opening hours	Libraries, leisure facilities, and community spaces open a minimum of 6 days per week, with at least two	Days and hours open per week against standard (target: full compliance)

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
	evenings per week to 9pm, and at least one weekend day of full opening	
Physical accessibility	All facilities meet DD&SA Civic Access Standard (equivalent to BS 8300): step-free access, accessible toilets, hearing loops, large-print materials, and compliant parking	% of facilities meeting Civic Access Standard (target: 100%)

6.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for libraries, leisure, and community facilities is £88. This covers: staffing of all facilities; building maintenance and energy costs; library stock acquisition and digital resources; leisure programme delivery; community space management; and the MCF's programming budget for civic and educational activities.

$$\text{LLC ALLOCATION} = \text{£88} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{DF_Ilc} \times \text{GAF} \times \text{IAF_Ilc} \times \text{TTF_Ilc})$$

6.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to LLC

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF_Il c)	Yes	Facility catchment efficiency varies significantly with density. In dense urban areas, one facility serves many more residents per £ of fixed cost; in dispersed rural areas, more facilities or mobile provision is needed per resident.	0.88 – 1.55
Age Profile Factor (APF)	No	All age groups are entitled to LLC services; age profile does not materially skew the cost of provision	N/A
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	No	LLC provision is universal; CNIF may affect programme mix but not facility cost at the level this factor operates	N/A
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	Yes	Localities where geographic barriers (terrain, distance, poor transport) prevent residents from reaching a facility require supplementary provision — mobile libraries, satellite access points — at additional cost	1.00 – 1.50
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF_Il c)	Yes — partial	Older leisure and library buildings have higher maintenance costs and may not meet the Civic Access Standard without capital investment; IAF adjustment applies where building condition survey indicates above-average maintenance burden	1.00 – 1.25
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF_Il c)	Yes — partial	Significant tourist usage of leisure facilities and libraries in seasonal localities creates additional capacity and maintenance costs	1.00 – 1.15

6.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Revenue allocation	~80% — staffing, stock acquisition, energy, programming, maintenance consumables, digital resources
Capital allocation	~20% — facility refurbishment, accessibility improvements, digital infrastructure upgrades, new provision where access standard is not currently met
Capital priority rule	Capital allocation must prioritise: first, meeting the minimum access standard where currently unmet; second, bringing facilities to Civic Access Standard; third, lifecycle refurbishment of existing facilities

6.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

The LLC framework has a particularly direct relationship with Local SA deliberation. Community facilities are the physical spaces in which civic life happens. The Local SA has a heightened interest in ensuring that these facilities are accessible, well-used, and genuinely serving the whole community, not just those with transport or proximity advantages.

The SA reviews: facility utilisation rates (ensuring that low utilisation is addressed through programming or access improvement, not closure); access standard compliance; the MCF's facilities improvement plan; and resident satisfaction data. The SA may hold a dedicated annual public meeting on community facilities, open to all residents, as part of its deliberative function.

6.7 Performance Metrics — Libraries, Leisure and Community Facilities

Metric	Target	Published?
% of residents meeting library access standard	100%	Yes — SDN
Digital access terminal-to-resident ratio in library catchments	≥1:500	Yes — SDN
% of residents meeting leisure facility access standard	95%	Yes — SDN
% of residents meeting community meeting space access standard	100%	Yes — SDN
Opening hours compliance across all facilities	100%	Yes — SDN
Civic Access Standard compliance	100%	Yes — SDN
Facility utilisation rate (% of available hours occupied)	≥45%	Yes — SA Civic Account
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within ±5%	Yes — SDN

PART SEVEN: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 5 — PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS

PBS
Framework

Planning & Building Standards Framework

Safety · Environmental Integrity · Lawful Development · Community Coherence

7.1 Definition and Scope

Planning and building standards in the DD&SA framework encompasses the development management function (receiving, processing, and determining planning applications for development, change of use, and listed building consent), the building control function (inspecting buildings under construction to ensure compliance with structural, fire safety, accessibility, and energy performance standards), and the planning enforcement function (investigating and remedying breaches of planning control and building regulations).

Under DD&SA principles, planning is not a political function. The Civic Commerce Architecture and the DD&SA Constitutional Architecture establish the spatial and land-use rules within which development takes place. The local planning and building standards function applies these rules consistently and transparently. There is no political discretion over individual applications that could be exercised by elected representatives, because there are no elected representatives. Decisions are made by qualified officers against published development frameworks, with a defined Magister-supervised appeals process.

7.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Planning application determination	95% of minor applications determined within 8 weeks; 95% of major applications determined within 13 weeks; 90% of EIA applications determined within 26 weeks	% determined within statutory timeframes by application category
Building regulation approval	Full plans applications determined within 5 weeks; building notice acknowledgements issued within 3 working days	% of full plans applications within 5 weeks (target: 97%)
Site inspection timeliness	Mandatory building control inspection stages carried out within 5 working days of notification for all categories	% of notified inspections completed within 5 days (target: 97%)
Planning enforcement response	All priority 1 enforcement complaints (immediate safety risk) investigated within 1 working day; priority 2 (material breach) within 10 working days; priority 3 (minor breach) within 28 working days	% of each priority category investigated within standard (target: 99%, 97%, 92% respectively)
Pre-application advice	Pre-application planning advice available to any applicant within 15 working days; written advice issued within 20 working days of enquiry	% of pre-application enquiries with written advice within 20 days (target: 95%)

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Public access and transparency	All planning applications, decision notices, and relevant correspondence published on the SDN within 5 working days of receipt or issue; public register maintained in real time	% of documents published within 5 working days (target: 99%)

7.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for planning and building standards is £42. This is a relatively stable cost base, as the core function is staffed professional services with modest capital requirements. Significant variation in cost arises from application volumes, complexity, and enforcement demand, which are captured through adjustment factors.

$$\text{PLANNING \& BUILDING STANDARDS ALLOCATION} = \text{£42} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{DF_pbs} \times \text{GAF_pbs} \times \text{IAF})$$

Planning and building standards costs do not scale simply with resident count. They scale with development pressure, application volumes, and enforcement demand. The density factor partially captures this, but localities with unusually high development activity or enforcement challenge may use the Emergency Response Buffer for temporary capacity uplift, with Magister approval.

7.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Planning and Building Standards

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF_pbs)	Yes	Application volumes and enforcement complexity are broadly related to development pressure, which correlates with population density in most (though not all) localities	0.90 – 1.35
Age Profile Factor (APF)	No	Age profile is not a material driver of planning function costs	N/A
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	No	CNIF is not correlated with planning function costs at population level	N/A
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF_pbs)	Yes — partial	Localities with remote or dispersed development patterns require more officer travel time per inspection and per site visit; relevant for building control in particular	1.00 – 1.30
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	Yes — partial	Localities with a high proportion of older or listed buildings face materially greater complexity in building control and planning enforcement. IAF is applied where historic building stock constitutes more than 20% of total building stock.	1.00 – 1.22
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	No	Tourist activity does not materially affect planning function costs	N/A

7.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Revenue allocation	~92% — officer staffing, professional development, IT systems and records management, pre-application and enforcement operations
Capital allocation	~8% — planning IT system infrastructure, digital public register, spatial data systems
Capital renewal cycle	Planning and building control IT systems on 7-year renewal cycle; spatial data infrastructure reviewed annually

7.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

Planning is an area where the principle that Local SAs scrutinise function, not individual decisions, is of particular importance. SA members must not interfere in, lobby on, or seek to influence individual planning decisions — doing so would replicate the conflicts of interest that characterise representative planning systems and would constitute a breach of the DD&SA governance principles.

The SA's legitimate oversight function in planning covers: application processing performance against the standards in section 7.2; enforcement activity levels and outcomes; transparency and public access to the register; expenditure against allocation; and the accessibility and intelligibility of planning information for residents who are not professionals. The SA produces an annual planning and building standards entry in its Civic Account covering all these dimensions.

If an applicant or affected resident believes an individual planning decision is wrong in law or in the application of the development framework, the remedy is the planning appeals process through the relevant Magister function, not the SA.

7.7 Performance Metrics — Planning and Building Standards

Metric	Target	Published?
Minor applications determined within 8 weeks	95%	Yes — SDN
Major applications determined within 13 weeks	95%	Yes — SDN
Full plans building regulation applications within 5 weeks	97%	Yes — SDN
Building control inspections within 5 days of notification	97%	Yes — SDN
Priority 1 enforcement investigated within 1 working day	99%	Yes — SDN
Planning register documents published within 5 working days	99%	Yes — SDN
Pre-application advice issued within 20 working days	95%	Yes — SDN
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within $\pm 5\%$	Yes — SDN

PART EIGHT: SERVICE FRAMEWORK 6 — LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

LED
Framework

Local Economic Development Framework

Material Opportunity · Enterprise Pathways · Civic Commerce Integration · Economic Resilience

8.1 Definition and Scope

Local economic development in the DD&SA framework is a limited and precisely defined function. It is not a substitute for the Civic Commerce Architecture, which operates at NBI level and sets the structural conditions for enterprise, trade, employment, and investment. Nor is it an attempt to recreate the competitive regional development agencies of the representative era, whose record was characterised by duplication, territorial rivalry, and inadequate accountability.

The local economic development function has three specific purposes within the DD&SA architecture: first, to maintain a Local Economic Intelligence Capacity — a continuously updated evidence base on the economic conditions, opportunities, and risks in the locality; second, to manage the local interface with the NBI Civic Commerce Architecture, ensuring that residents and enterprises in the locality can access the enterprise support, market access, and skills development infrastructure that the NBI provides; and third, to manage a Local Enterprise Entry pathway that provides practical, non-bureaucratic support to residents seeking to establish or develop enterprises within the locality.

Economic development under DD&SA explicitly does not include: attracting inward investment through fiscal concessions (which would create territorial privilege); managing trade promotion to other NBI localities or nations (a national-level Civic Commerce function); subsidising specific industries or enterprises (which the DD&SA framework prohibits in the absence of national-level Magister approval for defined exceptions); or operating local employment schemes that substitute for the NBI-level employment and skills architecture.

8.2 Minimum Universal Service Standard

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Local Economic Intelligence	A Local Economic Intelligence Report published annually, covering: employment rates and trends; enterprise formation and failure rates; sector composition; skills gaps; commuting patterns; and connectivity to the NBI Civic Commerce Architecture. Report publicly available on the SDN.	Annual report published by end of Q1 each year; data currency (% of indicators based on data within 12 months)
Enterprise Entry Pathway	Every resident seeking to establish a new enterprise can access a free initial business advisory session within 10 working days of request; sessions provided by qualified practitioners	% of requests with advisory session within 10 working days (target: 97%)

Standard Component	Specification	Measurement Indicator
Civic Commerce Architecture interface	Residents and enterprises can access the full NBI enterprise support, skills, and market infrastructure through a single point of access within the locality, staffed minimum 4 days per week	Staffed access point availability (target: 100% of specified operating days)
Market and trading space	Every locality with a resident population over 5,000 maintains or accesses a public market or trading space facility capable of accommodating a minimum of 20 stalls or units, available for community commerce a minimum of one day per week	% of qualifying localities with compliant provision (target: 100%)
Skills connection	The local economic development function actively brokers connections between residents seeking employment or skills development and the NBI Skills Architecture, with a defined referral pathway and outcome tracking	Number of referrals; % resulting in skills programme entry within 30 days

8.3 Per-Resident Funding Baseline

The per-resident annual baseline for local economic development is £58. This reflects the relatively modest staffing and operational cost of the three defined functions, combined with the market and trading space contribution and the Civic Commerce interface operation.

$$\text{LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATION} = \text{£58} \times \text{RESIDENT_COUNT} \times (\text{CNIF} \times \text{GAF_led} \times \text{DF_led})$$

8.4 Adjustment Factors Applied to Local Economic Development

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Density Factor (DF_led)	Yes — partial	Very sparse localities face higher per-resident costs for the physical infrastructure of the Civic Commerce interface and market facilities; very dense localities have lower per-resident costs for these elements	0.92 – 1.35
Age Profile Factor (APF)	No	Age profile is not a material driver of LED function costs within the defined scope	N/A
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	Yes — full	Localities with higher CNIF scores have greater structural economic disadvantage, requiring more active brokerage activity, higher referral volumes to the NBI Skills Architecture, and more intensive Enterprise Entry Pathway demand. This is the most important adjustment factor for LED.	1.00 – 1.32
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF_led)	Yes — partial	Remote localities face higher costs for delivering the Civic Commerce interface and Enterprise Entry Pathway, including travel costs for advisory practitioners	1.00 – 1.25
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	No	Not a material driver of LED costs within defined scope	N/A

Factor	Applied?	Rationale	Coefficient Range
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	No	Tourist activity is captured in the Civic Commerce Architecture at national level; local LED function does not cover tourism development	N/A

8.5 Capital vs Revenue Split

Revenue allocation	~88% — staffing of enterprise advisory, economic intelligence, and Civic Commerce interface functions; market facility operations
Capital allocation	~12% — market and trading space infrastructure maintenance; digital systems for Local Economic Intelligence reporting
Critical constraint	LED capital allocation cannot be used to fund enterprise subsidies, site acquisition for inward investment, or promotional campaigns. Any such use is a breach of the DD&SA equal-treatment safeguards and subject to Magister investigation.

8.6 Oversight and Accountability: Local SA Role

The Local SA's role in economic development oversight is significant because the definition and limits of the LED function are frequently contested. The SA's oversight function includes verifying that the MCF is operating within the defined scope of LED — not providing territorial subsidies, not directing resources to politically visible enterprises, and not operating parallel functions to the NBI Civic Commerce Architecture.

The SA reviews: the annual Local Economic Intelligence Report for accuracy and currency; enterprise advisory uptake rates; Civic Commerce interface access figures; and expenditure against allocation. If the SA identifies spending outside the defined scope of LED, it issues a formal challenge to the Civic Commerce Magister.

8.7 Performance Metrics — Local Economic Development

Metric	Target	Published?
Annual Local Economic Intelligence Report published by end Q1	100% on time	Yes — SDN
Enterprise advisory sessions within 10 working days of request	97%	Yes — SDN
Civic Commerce interface availability on specified operating days	100%	Yes — SDN
% of qualifying localities with compliant market/trading space provision	100%	Yes — SDN
Skills referrals resulting in programme entry within 30 days	≥60%	Yes — SA Civic Account
Expenditure against allocation variance	Within ±5%	Yes — SDN
Confirmed out-of-scope spending incidents	0	Yes — SDN (red-flag indicator)

PART NINE: EQUAL-TREATMENT SAFEGUARDS

9.1 The Constitutional Prohibition on Territorial Privilege

The DD&SA Constitutional Architecture contains an explicit prohibition on territorial privilege in civic resource allocation. This prohibition is not a general aspiration. It is a justiciable provision: any allocation decision that cannot be explained by the per-resident formula and verified adjustment factors is constitutionally invalid and can be challenged through the DD&SA Civic Justice Architecture.

'Territorial privilege' is defined in the DD&SA vocabulary as any allocation of civic resources that exceeds the formula-derived entitlement for reasons unconnected to verifiable cost differentials. It includes:

- Higher per-resident funding for a locality, region, or historic nation on the basis of constitutional status, national identity, linguistic identity, or political history
- Capital investment directed to a locality for reasons of political visibility rather than infrastructure need
- Service standards set above the minimum universal standard for one locality while other localities receive only the minimum — unless funded by residents themselves through the Civic Contribution mechanism (see section 9.4)
- Any variance in the formula-derived allocation that is not explained by a published, independently verified adjustment factor

9.2 How the Framework Prevents Special Help

The framework prevents territorial privilege through structural design, not through prohibition alone. The structural mechanisms are:

9.2.1 Published Formula, Published Calculations

The entire allocation chain is public. The per-resident baselines are published. The adjustment factor coefficients are published. The CNA data for every locality is published. Every locality's final allocation is published. Any deviation from the formula is immediately visible to any SA, any Magister, any resident, or any external observer. There is no mechanism for a private allocation decision.

9.2.2 No Discretionary Override

No actor in the allocation chain has discretionary override power. The CBA calculates and disburses; it does not decide. The IES supplies evidence; it does not allocate. Magisters investigate and direct; they do not override the formula. National Sortition Assemblies set the LSAP total; they do not direct sub-allocations to localities. The formula is the decision.

9.2.3 Symmetry of Adjustment

Adjustment factors apply symmetrically. If a rurality multiplier increases a remote rural locality's allocation, it does so because verifiable cost data supports the increase. The same factor, applied

to any locality with identical cost characteristics, would produce the same increase. There is no category of adjustment that applies to one locality and not to others with identical characteristics.

9.2.4 IES Independence

The IES, which sets and reviews the baselines and coefficients, is institutionally independent of all political actors. Its methodology is published, its data is open, and its decisions are challengeable through a defined review process. It cannot receive direction from national Sortition Assemblies, Magisters, MCFs, or Local SAs on what the numbers should be. It can only be directed on methodological adequacy by a formal review panel convened under defined conditions.

9.3 Handling Disputes and Perceived Unfairness

The perception of unfairness in local service funding can arise for legitimate reasons (a genuine formula error or unverified cost claim) or for illegitimate reasons (a belief that a locality deserves more than the formula provides). The dispute resolution architecture handles both.

Dispute Type	Initiating Condition	Process	Resolution Standard
Formula error claim	SA believes the formula has been incorrectly applied to its locality (e.g., wrong CNA data, arithmetic error, wrong adjustment factor applied)	Formal challenge to IES; IES re-verification within 60 civic days; published outcome	If error confirmed: recalculation and back-payment; if rejected: documented rebuttal published; escalation right to independent audit panel
Adjustment factor adequacy claim	SA believes that the adjustment factors do not adequately capture the genuine cost differentials facing its locality	Formal evidence submission to IES review cycle; IES considers evidence within review period; methodology updated if evidence is sufficient	IES methodology is outcome; cannot be overridden by political pressure; must be evidence-based and generalisable
Cross-locality comparison claim	SA believes its allocation is lower than comparable localities with similar CNA profiles	SA requests NBI-wide comparison dataset from SDN; if discrepancy identified, formal challenge to IES; IES must explain differential	All differentials explained by formula; if unexplained differential exists, it is a formula error subject to correction
Above-minimum ambition	SA believes its residents deserve above-minimum service standards	Not a dispute process. Above-minimum standards are achievable through the Civic Contribution mechanism (section 9.4) only, funded by residents themselves, not from the LSAP	Not applicable as dispute

9.4 The Civic Contribution Mechanism

The equal-treatment safeguards do not prevent localities from achieving above-minimum service standards. They prevent the LSAP — funded by all NBI residents — from being used to fund above-minimum standards in some localities while others receive only the minimum.

If residents in a locality wish to fund higher service standards, they may do so through the Civic Contribution mechanism. This is a resident-approved supplement to MCF funding, governed by the following rules:

7. A proposal for a Civic Contribution must be deliberated and approved by the Local SA following a resident engagement process open to all residents in the locality.
8. The contribution is collected through the NBI resident contribution system — it is not a local tax and is not administered by the MCF. All residents in the locality contribute equally; there is no means-testing or differential contribution rate.
9. The Civic Contribution funds only defined service improvements above the minimum universal standard. It cannot fund capital projects, new infrastructure, or permanent staffing increases without a separate approval process.
10. The Civic Contribution is reviewed annually by the SA. It can be reduced or discontinued at any time by SA decision following resident engagement.
11. No locality may refuse to fund its LSAP baseline contribution on the grounds that it is also funding a Civic Contribution.

The Civic Contribution mechanism does not compromise the equal-treatment safeguards because it is funded by residents themselves, not from the common LSAP. It is a legitimate expression of local deliberative democracy within the DD&SA framework. What it prohibits is the appropriation of NBI-wide resources — contributed by all residents — for above-minimum provision in some localities.

PART TEN: IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOLS

10.1 Rollout Sequence

Implementation of this framework across all NBI localities follows a phased sequence. The phases are not discretionary; they are constitutionally mandated. No locality may be left without a functioning Local SA, a designated MCF, and a confirmed allocation for longer than the period specified.

Phase	Period	Actions	Completion Condition
Phase 1: Institutional Establishment	Months 1–6	Civic Budget Authority constituted; IES operational; Social Work, Environmental Services, Civic Infrastructure, Civic Commerce, and Planning Magisters appointed; initial per-resident baselines and adjustment factor coefficients published	All five Magister functions operational; CBA and IES publishing data to SDN
Phase 2: CNA Data Collection	Months 4–12	IES conducts Civic Need Assessments for all NBI localities; population registration system validated; adjustment factor data collected and verified; full CNA dataset published on SDN	CNA complete for 100% of NBI localities; published and open to SA challenge
Phase 3: MCF Designation	Months 6–18	MCFs designated for each of the six service categories in each locality; DD&SA blueprints issued; MCF operating agreements signed; existing service organisations transitioned or superseded	MCF coverage: 100% of localities across all six service categories
Phase 4: Local SA Establishment	Months 9–24	Local SAs established by sortition in all localities; SA members trained in funding framework (section 10.2); SDN access confirmed; oversight protocols activated	SA established and operational in 100% of localities
Phase 5: First Allocation Cycle	Month 18–24	First full three-year allocation calculated and published; LSAP allocated to all category pools; all locality allocations disbursed to MCFs; first quarterly reporting period completed	100% of localities with confirmed allocation; MCF reporting active
Phase 6: Review and Refinement	Year 3 onwards	First IES review of baselines and coefficients; first SA Civic Accounts published; formula challenges processed; innovation and improvement fund first round completed	IES review report published; CBA baseline update confirmed

10.2 Local SA Training and Capability

Every newly constituted Local SA cohort receives a structured induction covering the funding framework. Training is delivered by the IES and CBA through the Sovereign Digital Network, supplemented by in-person sessions for SA cohorts where requested. Training content covers:

- The constitutional basis for the funding framework: what it is, what it is not, and why its structure takes the form it does

- How to read and interpret the locality's CNA data, including understanding the adjustment factors and their coefficients
- How to access the SDN allocation data and compare it with comparable localities
- How to read and challenge MCF quarterly performance reports
- The formal challenge processes: when to use them, how to initiate them, and what outcomes are possible
- How to produce the annual Civic Account: what must be included, how to present data accessibly for residents, and how to describe concerns in a way that enables meaningful resident engagement
- The equal-treatment safeguards and the Civic Contribution mechanism: understanding the distinction between formula entitlement and above-minimum aspiration

SA training records are published on the SDN. Completion of induction training is a prerequisite for the SA's formal assumption of its oversight functions. If an SA cohort does not complete induction training within 60 days of constitution, the relevant Magister functions assume temporary oversight responsibility until training is complete.

10.3 Review, Refinement, and Framework Evolution

The framework is not static. The per-resident baselines and adjustment factor coefficients will change as the cost of service delivery changes, as population and geography shift, and as the evidence base improves. The review architecture ensures that changes are evidence-driven, transparent, and not subject to political manipulation.

10.3.1 Standard Three-Year Review

The IES conducts a full review of all per-resident baselines and adjustment factor coefficients every three years. The review uses independently verified service delivery cost data, updated CNA surveys, and comparative analysis of MCF expenditure against outcomes. Review outputs are published for a 90-day public and SA comment period before taking effect. SAs and Magisters may submit formal evidence to the review.

10.3.2 Emergency Review

An emergency review may be triggered by: a significant NBI-wide economic shock materially affecting service delivery costs; a major demographic shift in a substantial number of localities; or a Magister finding that a defined adjustment factor is systematically producing incorrect allocations. Emergency review is conducted within 90 days and its findings take effect immediately upon publication.

10.3.3 Framework Architecture Review

A full architecture review of this framework — covering not just the numbers but the structural design of service categories, adjustment factors, and SA oversight mechanisms — is conducted every 10 years by a joint panel of Magisters, IES representatives, and a nationally constituted Sortition Assembly. The framework cannot be amended outside this review process except through emergency review under defined conditions.

10.4 The Sovereign Digital Network: Transparency Infrastructure

The SDN is the transparency infrastructure on which this framework depends. Every element described in this framework that 'is published on the SDN' is a constitutional requirement, not a discretionary commitment. The SDN must be:

- Accessible to any resident without registration, without charge, and without specialist knowledge
- Updated on the publication schedules specified in each service framework
- Structured to allow direct comparison of locality data across the NBI
- Archived so that historical allocation and performance data is preserved and accessible
- Searchable by resident address, locality name, MCF name, service category, and time period

MCF failure to publish required data on the SDN within the specified timeframe is a performance breach subject to Magister investigation, equivalent in gravity to a service delivery failure.

PART ELEVEN: WORKED EXAMPLES

The following two worked examples demonstrate how the per-resident formula and adjustment factors produce different operational configurations and different allocation quantum for two contrasting localities, while delivering the same guaranteed minimum universal service standard to every resident. The principle is that the standard is constant; the cost of achieving it varies; and the allocation follows the cost.

Example 1 — Ashfield Urban (Dense Urban Locality)

Locality name	Ashfield Urban (illustrative)
Resident population	85,000
Population density	4,200 per km ²
Age profile	Under-18: 19%; Over-65: 17% (close to NBI median)
Civic Need Index score	52 (NBI median = 50; slight above-median need)
Geographic accessibility rating	High — extensive public transport, flat terrain, good road coverage
Infrastructure condition score	Moderate — road network largely 1960s-1980s; some backlog
Tourism and transient factor	Low — minor commuter transit only

Adjustment Factor Values — Ashfield Urban

Factor	Value	Rationale
Density Factor (DF)	0.91 (waste, roads, LLC)	Dense network reduces per-resident delivery cost below NBI baseline for these services
Age Profile Factor (APF)	1.02 (social work)	Marginally above NBI median age profile; negligible adjustment
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	1.03 (social work, LED)	Marginally above NBI median; small uplift
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	1.00	Good accessibility; no adjustment required
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	1.12 (roads)	Moderate infrastructure backlog on road network warrants uplift
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	1.00	No material tourist or transient adjustment

Annual Allocations — Ashfield Urban

Service Category	Baseline per Resident	Adjustment Product	Adjusted per Resident	Total Allocation (85,000 residents)
Social Work	£195	$\times 1.02 \times 1.03 = 1.051$	£204.95	£17,421,000
Waste Collection	£78	$\times 0.91 \times 1.00 \times 1.00 = 0.91$	£70.98	£6,033,000

Service Category	Baseline per Resident	Adjustment Product	Adjusted per Resident	Total Allocation (85,000 residents)
Local Roads	£132	$\times 0.91 \times 1.00 \times 1.12 \times 1.00 = 1.019$	£134.51	£11,433,000
Libraries, Leisure & Community	£88	$\times 0.91 \times 1.00 \times 1.00 = 0.91$	£80.08	£6,807,000
Planning & Building Standards	£42	$\times 0.91 \times 1.00 \times 1.00 = 0.91$	£38.22	£3,249,000
Local Economic Development	£58	$\times 1.03 \times 1.00 \times 0.92 = 0.948$	£54.98	£4,673,000
TOTAL	£593		£583.72	£49,616,000

Operational Configuration — Ashfield Urban

At 4,200 residents per km², Ashfield Urban achieves significant efficiencies in waste collection and library provision. A single large leisure centre serves a dense catchment, and waste collection routes cover more households per vehicle-km than the NBI average. The road network is denser but shorter per resident, and the DF correction reflects this.

The IAF adjustment of 1.12 for roads reflects the known backlog condition of a primarily post-war road network. The MCF's planned maintenance programme will, over the 10-year infrastructure investment cycle funded through the Capital Renewal Reserve, work this score down toward 1.00. The Social Work allocation carries a small uplift from the CNIF, reflecting marginally above-median Civic Need in this locality — not a large differential, but one that the formula captures precisely.

The Local SA for Ashfield Urban will scrutinise the relatively modest per-resident allocations for waste and LLC against the backdrop of high utilisation. The key performance challenge in dense urban areas is maintaining minimum standards for a large, concentrated population with significant turnover; the SA's oversight focus should be on service reliability and consistency, not on access geography, which is not the challenge at this density.

Example 2 — Cragmoor Rural (Remote Rural Locality)

Locality name	Cragmoor Rural (illustrative)
Resident population	8,200
Population density	22 per km ²
Age profile	Under-18: 14%; Over-65: 29% (significantly above NBI median for over-65)
Civic Need Index score	58 (above NBI median; elevated deprivation)
Geographic accessibility rating	Low — sparse road network, no rail, challenging terrain, poor public transport
Infrastructure condition score	Poor — significant proportion of B and C roads classified as Category 3 or worse

Tourism and transient factor	Moderate-high — significant tourist season, footfall approximately 60% of resident population annually
-------------------------------------	--

Adjustment Factor Values — Cragmoor Rural

Factor	Value	Rationale
Density Factor (DF)	2.15 (waste, roads); 1.48 (LLC)	Very low density creates significant route inefficiency and dispersed facility catchments; strong upward correction required
Age Profile Factor (APF)	1.28 (social work)	High proportion of over-65 residents significantly elevates adult social care caseload; substantial uplift applied
Civic Need Index Factor (CNIF)	1.08 (social work, LED)	Above-median need; moderate uplift
Geographic Accessibility Factor (GAF)	1.40 (waste, roads); 1.45 (LLC); 1.22 (planning)	Poor transport infrastructure, challenging terrain, island-like isolation for parts of locality; material uplift across multiple categories
Infrastructure Age Factor (IAF)	1.28 (roads); 1.18 (planning)	Significant road network backlog; high proportion of older building stock with historic buildings
Tourism and Transient Factor (TTF)	1.18 (waste, LLC, roads)	Substantial seasonal tourist population generating above-resident-level waste, facility demand, and road wear

Annual Allocations — Cragmoor Rural

Service Category	Baseline per Resident	Adjustment Product	Adjusted per Resident	Total Allocation (8,200 residents)
Social Work	£195	$\times 1.28 \times 1.08 \times 1.00 = 1.382$	£269.49	£2,210,000
Waste Collection	£78	$\times 2.15 \times 1.40 \times 1.18 = 3.554$	£277.21	£2,273,000
Local Roads	£132	$\times 2.15 \times 1.40 \times 1.28 \times 1.18 = 4.550$	£600.60	£4,925,000
Libraries, Leisure & Community	£88	$\times 1.48 \times 1.45 \times 1.18 = 2.530$	£222.64	£1,826,000
Planning & Building Standards	£42	$\times 1.08 \times 1.22 \times 1.18 = 1.556$	£65.35	£536,000
Local Economic Development	£58	$\times 1.08 \times 1.22 \times 0.98 = 1.291$	£74.88	£614,000
TOTAL	£593		£1,510.17	£12,384,000

Operational Configuration — Cragmoor Rural

The contrast with Ashfield Urban is stark and intentional. Cragmoor Rural's per-resident allocation for local roads is £600.60 — 4.47 times the NBI baseline of £132 — because the road network per resident is vastly longer and in significantly worse condition. This is not a privilege. It is a cost correction. The Local SA for Cragmoor Rural is entitled to the same minimum universal service standard on roads — 8% or less of the network requiring urgent intervention, potholes made safe

within 24 hours — and achieving that standard costs 4.47 times more per resident than in an average locality.

The social work uplift to £269.49 per resident reflects the combination of a significantly older population — 29% over 65 versus the NBI median of approximately 18% — and an above-median Civic Need Index. Adult social care caseloads in Cragmoor Rural will be materially higher than the NBI average, and the MCF must be funded to meet the 24-hour emergency response standard even for residents in genuinely remote properties. The emergency duty social worker may need to travel significantly further per emergency than their counterpart in Ashfield Urban; the allocation reflects this.

Waste collection at £277.21 per resident — versus £70.98 in Ashfield Urban — reflects the fundamental inefficiency of collecting from dispersed, low-density settlement patterns. The MCF may run daily routes that cover relatively few properties, use vehicles appropriate for narrow rural roads, and maintain satellite collection points for the most remote settlements. The tourist season uplift means that summer waste volumes significantly exceed resident-based projections; the TTF adjustment funds the capacity to respond.

Libraries, leisure, and community facilities in Cragmoor Rural operate at a dramatically different configuration from Ashfield Urban. A single large leisure centre serves the whole locality; library provision may include a mobile library service supplementing a single static building; community meeting spaces are distributed across multiple village halls. The LLC allocation at £222.64 per resident funds this configuration to meet the same access standard — within 3km for libraries, within 5km for leisure facilities, within 2km for community meeting space — that Ashfield Urban meets through the efficiency of its urban density.

Comparative Summary

	Ashfield Urban	Cragmoor Rural	NBI Baseline (unadjusted)
Population	85,000	8,200	N/A
Density (per km ²)	4,200	22	~385 (NBI median)
Social Work per resident	£204.95	£269.49	£195
Waste Collection per resident	£70.98	£277.21	£78
Local Roads per resident	£134.51	£600.60	£132
LLC per resident	£80.08	£222.64	£88
Planning & Building per resident	£38.22	£65.35	£42
LED per resident	£54.98	£74.88	£58
Total per resident	£583.72	£1,510.17	£593
Total annual allocation	£49,616,000	£12,384,000	N/A
Service standard achieved	Minimum Universal	Minimum Universal	Minimum Universal

The total annual allocation for Cragmoor Rural is £12.4 million for 8,200 residents — £1,510 per resident. Ashfield Urban receives £49.6 million for 85,000 residents — £584 per resident. Both localities receive the minimum universal service standard. The difference in per-resident cost is not a privilege or a subsidy; it is the real cost of equal service delivery across radically different geographies. This is what equal standards in an unequal landscape require.

PART TWELVE: FRAMEWORK SUMMARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONFIRMATION

12.1 The Core Proposition

This framework rests on a single constitutional proposition: that every resident of the Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles, regardless of where they live, is entitled to the same standard of civic service — and that the NBI Civic Budget must be funded and allocated in a way that makes that standard achievable everywhere.

The framework achieves this through transparent per-resident baselines, independently verified cost adjustment factors, direct disbursement to Managed Civic Functions, and Local SA oversight that is powerful enough to detect and challenge failure but constrained enough to prevent political interference in allocation.

12.2 What This Framework Achieves

- Equal minimum standards of social work, waste collection, road maintenance, civic facilities, planning functions, and local economic development for every NBI resident
- A transparent, formulaic allocation system that cannot be corrupted by political bargaining, territorial lobbying, or discretionary override
- Local SA oversight that is genuine, informed, and actionable — backed by real data, real challenge rights, and real consequences for MCF failure
- Honest recognition that equal standards cost unequal amounts per resident in an unequal geography — and a structured mechanism that adjusts for genuine cost differentials without creating privilege
- A framework that can be maintained, reviewed, and improved on a defined evidence-based cycle, without requiring political intervention

12.3 Constitutional Confirmation

This framework is consistent with the following provisions of the DD&SA Constitutional Architecture:

- The Civic Floor guarantee — minimum universal service standards as constitutional rights
- The prohibition on territorial privilege in civic resource allocation
- The resident-centred design principle — the individual resident as the unit of account
- The transparency mandate — all allocation decisions publicly visible and independently auditable
- The Local SA oversight function — residents as scrutineers of the institutions that serve them
- The Magister accountability architecture — independent expert arbiters with defined powers of investigation and direction

No provision of this framework creates, endorses, or permits territorial privilege, political discretion in allocation, or unequal minimum standards between localities. Where the framework creates differential per-resident allocations, it does so because the evidence requires it to achieve equal outcomes — and the evidence for every differential is published, auditable, and challengeable.

12.4 Living Document Status

This framework is a first-edition constitutional instrument. It will require refinement as the DD&SA architecture is implemented, as the IES's evidence base matures, and as Local SAs and MCFs develop practical experience of operating within it. Refinements are governed by the review protocols in Part Ten. The core structural principles — equal standards, per-resident funding, no territorial privilege, transparent formulae, and SA oversight — are not subject to revision except through the full architecture review process.

Equal Standards. Transparent Allocation. Resident Oversight. No Privilege.

Document Reference: DD&SA-LOC-FUND-001

Civic Commonwealth of the British Isles

Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies — Civic Architecture Series