



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*
 - 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 not having 7 or more votes supporting 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: 8 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 3 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
 - Option Three: 3 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: 7 votes, not reaching *quorum*
 - Option One: 3 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
 - 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 abstention 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-.