



PIRATE MANIFESTO'S BALLOTS: RESULTS

Carlos Ayala Vargas

(Aiarakoa)

Partido Pirata National Board's Chairman

23rd November, 2008



INDEX

RULES.....3

BALLOTS.....3

 FIRST VOTING.....3

 SECOND VOTING.....3

 THIRD VOTING.....3

 FOURTH VOTING.....4

 FIFTH VOTING.....4

 SIXTH VOTING.....4

 SEVENTH VOTING.....5

CONCLUSIONS.....5



RULES

- *Quorum*: 9 out of 11 eligible voters casting their votes (to be checked for each ballot)
- Supermajority: At least 7 votes supporting an amendment
- Veto: At most 2 votes rejecting an amendment

BALLOTS

- FIRST VOTING:

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 7 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 2 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 4 votes, had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 6 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 2 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 3 votes, had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **amendments 6th & 18th rejected**; however, it seems that **after grammar & orthographic correction, we should talk about this paragraph** -as there was only one vote supporting the original wording- if we want to assure enough consensus to get the Manifesto signed by most -even all- pirate parties worldwide.

- SECOND VOTING:

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 9 votes, reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 7 votes
 - Option Two: 0 votes; amendment rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 2 votes; amendment rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 8 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 6 vote
 - Option Two: 0 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 2 votes, had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **amendments 8th & 11th rejected**.

- THIRD VOTING:

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 7 votes, not reaching *quorum*



- Option One: 6 votes
- Option Two: 2 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 6 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 5 votes
 - Option Two: 1 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **13th Amendment rejected.**

- **FOURTH VOTING:**

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 6 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 6 votes
 - Option Two: 0 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 5 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 5 votes
 - Option Two: 0 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **14th Amendment rejected.**

- **FIFTH VOTING:**

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 9 votes, reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 5 votes
 - Option Two: 4 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 8 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 4 votes
 - Option Two: 4 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **15th Amendment rejected.**

- **SIXTH VOTING:**

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 8 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 7 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been passed due to having 7 votes supporting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 7 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 6 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: **ballot not valid due to *quorum* not being reached**; however,



supermajority would be reached if PPUS vote were counted; so, it seems that **after grammar & orthographic correction, we should talk about this paragraph** if we want to assure enough consensus to get the Manifesto signed by most -even all- pirate parties worldwide.

- SEVENTH VOTING:

- Counting PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 7 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 2 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 4 votes, had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
- Ignoring PPUS vote:
 - Cast votes: 6 votes, not reaching *quorum* (PPDE's vote is "no vote", i.e., abstention)
 - Option One: 1 vote
 - Option Two: 2 votes; had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it
 - Option Three: 3 votes, had the *quorum* been reached, this amendment would have been rejected due to having more than two votes rejecting it

Conclusion: anyway, **amendments 12th & 17th rejected**. However, as the vote was so divided, it seems that **after grammar & orthographic correction, we should talk about this paragraph** if we want to assure enough consensus to get the Manifesto signed by most -even all- pirate parties worldwide.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall conclusions from the person responsible for this procedures -trying to take advantage from these ballots to be able to learn from them thinking in future ballots-:

- Inner democracy is non negotiable. While some issues regarding PPI ballots need to be improved -learning from this experience-, and besides the specific rules for future ballots, having ballots for PPI decision-making procedures is the only way we can be sure that joint platforms, rules & other main PPI elements will be found acceptable by all of us.
- *Reasonably* high turnout -making the average turnout of all ballots, it gives us (counting with PPUS' votes) 7'57143 out of 11 votes (68'83 % of eligible voters)-
- Consensus not reached mainly due to two parties not having had enough time to arrange internal debate & votings; however, there were also additional abstentions in 5 out of 7 ballots -it explains why only 2 out of 7 ballots would reach *quorum* if PPUS' votes were accepted-; of course, those abstentions are fully allowed, though they have to be taken into account when thinking why so few ballots reached the required *quorum*.
- Issues on 1st, 6th & 7th ballots should be discussed after the orthographic & grammar correction:
 - While no amendment reached enough support in 1st ballot, at the same time the original wording was largely rejected -i.e., only one ballot supported it-.
 - Counting PPUS vote, the Amendment voted in 6th ballot achieved supermajority, and has been discarded due to not having reached *quorum*.
 - Vote in 7th ballot is so divided that it seems to need some extra debate.
- Learning from these ballots, we should think for future ballots how to deal with:



- Multi-choice ballots in the cases where vote is divided.
- Turnouts lower than required -if we decide that certain *quorum* is required, how to work to mobilize eligible voters to reach that *quorum*-.
- When representatives are appointed, they have to:
 - Often check mailing lists and wiki pages to be aware of notices and recent changes.
 - This includes the controversy about *Stallman's Amendment*:
 - From the time Stallman made his proposal, until the time it was made Amendment by Helmut Pozimski, 7 days and 17 hours passed; enough time to have proposed the Amendment before Helmut did.
 - From the time Jens dropped Helmut's 3rd Amendment, until the extra week deadline was reached, 42 hours passed; enough time to have rescued the dropped Amendment.
 - Be countersigned by their parties; parties have to check earlier who is acting on its behalf, to avoid misunderstands like the ones which generated all the controversy:
 - The *Stallman's Amendment* droppage.
 - The droppage of Helmut Pozimski's amendments with two days to deadline.
- For future amending process, the Amendments Central has to be redesigned; some representatives have complained about it being written in a spaghetti-like style, not quite comfortable to read.
- We need a joint IT Group to develop shared telematic-voting tools to be easily used in this cases; as far as I know, some parties had no tool to cover this need.
- To make proper deliver of internal & external papers -in terms of [brand identity](#)-, I think we should need to develop some PPI paper templates; I'm using PIRATA templates to create Pirate Manifesto documents, however, they're not PPI standards.
- Though they were not eligible voters, I think we should invite South American pirate parties -e.g., [Chilean Pirate Party](#), represented by Enrique Herrera Noya- to this additional round of debates regarding 1st, 6th & 7th ballots; they will be able to get themselves involved in the Pirate Manifesto development and ... the more we are, the stronger we become -as we agreed several months ago, while only eligible voters would be able to propose and vote amendments, all worldwide pirate parties are up to sign the Final Draft-.