

# Designer Query Discriminator Analysis Worksheets and Templates

## Tool 1: Master DQD Assessment Worksheet

### System Identification

Field	Input
<b>System Name</b>	[Enter system being analyzed]
<b>System Type</b>	Economic / Political / Social / Technological / Ecological
<b>Analysis Date</b>	[Current date]
<b>Analyst</b>	[Your name]
<b>System Age</b>	[How long system has existed]
<b>Geographic Scope</b>	[Local / Regional / National / Global]



## DQD Core Component Analysis

### Designer Traceability (DT) Assessment

**Formula:** DT = (Designed Rules + External Constraints) / Total System Features

System Rule/Feature	Description	Designer Identifiable (Y/N)	Design Evidence	Authority Source
[Rule 1]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 2]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 3]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 4]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 5]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 6]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 7]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]
[Rule 8]	[Rule description]	Y/N	[Documentation/evidence]	[Who created it]

### DT Calculation:

- **Total System Features:** [Count all rules/features]
- **Designed Features:** [Count with identifiable designers]
- **DT Score:** [Designed / Total] = \_\_\_\_\_

**Design Intensity Analysis:**

<b>Design Aspect</b>	<b>Intensity Level (1-5)</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Design Motivation</b>
<b>Rule Specificity</b>	[How detailed/prescriptive]	[Examples]	[Why so specific]
<b>Control Centralization</b>	[How centralized design authority]	[Examples]	[Why centralized]
<b>Modification Difficulty</b>	[How hard to change]	[Examples]	[Why resistant to change]
<b>External Imposition</b>	[How much imposed from outside]	[Examples]	[Who benefits from imposition]

**Goal Alignment (GA) Assessment**

**Formula:** GA = (Regenerative Processes + Circular Flows) / Total System Processes

<b>System Process</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Regenerative (Y/N)</b>	<b>Extractive (Y/N)</b>	<b>Ecological Impact</b>	<b>Beneficiary Analysis</b>
[Process 1]	[Process description]	Y/N	Y/N	[Environmental effect]	[Who benefits most]
[Process 2]	[Process description]	Y/N	Y/N	[Environmental effect]	[Who benefits most]
[Process 3]	[Process description]	Y/N	Y/N	[Environmental effect]	[Who benefits most]
[Process 4]	[Process description]	Y/N	Y/N	[Environmental effect]	[Who benefits most]
[Process 5]	[Process description]	Y/N	Y/N	[Environmental effect]	[Who benefits most]

**GA Calculation:**

- Total System Processes:** [Count]
- Regenerative Processes:** [Count enhancing ecological/social wellbeing]
- GA Score:** [Regenerative / Total] = \_\_\_\_\_

**Goal Analysis Framework:**

<b>Goal Category</b>	<b>Stated Goal</b>	<b>Revealed Goal</b>	<b>Alignment Assessment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<b>Primary Purpose</b>	[Official mission]	[Actual function based on outcomes]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting data]
<b>Resource Use</b>	[Stated resource goals]	[Actual resource patterns]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting data]
<b>Stakeholder Value</b>	[Stated beneficiaries]	[Actual benefit distribution]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting data]
<b>Environmental Impact</b>	[Stated environmental goals]	[Actual environmental effects]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting data]

**Enforcement Dependency (ED) Assessment**

**Formula:** ED = (Enforcement-Dependent Processes) / Total System Processes

<b>System Process</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requires External Enforcement (Y/N)</b>	<b>Enforcement Mechanism</b>	<b>Self-Regulation Potential</b>
[Process 1]	[Process description]	Y/N	[How enforced]	[Could it self-regulate]
[Process 2]	[Process description]	Y/N	[How enforced]	[Could it self-regulate]
[Process 3]	[Process description]	Y/N	[How enforced]	[Could it self-regulate]
[Process 4]	[Process description]	Y/N	[How enforced]	[Could it self-regulate]
[Process 5]	[Process description]	Y/N	[How enforced]	[Could it self-regulate]

**ED Calculation:**

- Total System Processes:** [Count]
- Enforcement-Dependent Processes:** [Count requiring external enforcement]
- ED Score:** [Enforcement-dependent / Total] = \_\_\_\_\_

### Enforcement Analysis:

Enforcement Type	Description	Effectiveness (1-5)	Cost (1-5)	Sustainability
<b>Legal/Regulatory</b>	[Government enforcement]	[How well it works]	[Resource requirement]	[Long-term viability]
<b>Economic Sanctions</b>	[Financial penalties]	[How well it works]	[Resource requirement]	[Long-term viability]
<b>Social Pressure</b>	[Community enforcement]	[How well it works]	[Resource requirement]	[Long-term viability]
<b>Technical Controls</b>	[System-imposed limits]	[How well it works]	[Resource requirement]	[Long-term viability]
<b>Cultural Norms</b>	[Traditional enforcement]	[How well it works]	[Resource requirement]	[Long-term viability]



## Tool 2: DQD Final Calculation and Classification

### Master DQD Calculation

**Formula:** DQD = (DT + GA + ED) / 3

Component	Score	Calculation Details	Weight (if applicable)
<b>DT (Designer Traceability)</b>	____	[Designed features / Total features]	Standard: 1.0
<b>GA (Goal Alignment)</b>	____	[Regenerative processes / Total processes]	Standard: 1.0
<b>ED (Enforcement Dependency)</b>	____	[Enforcement-dependent / Total processes]	Standard: 1.0

**Final DQD Score:** [(DT + GA + ED) / 3] = \_\_\_\_

### System Classification

DQD Range	System Type	Characteristics	Examples
<b>0.0 - 0.33</b>	Natural	Emergent, self-organizing, minimal design	Photosynthesis, Ecosystems
<b>0.34 - 0.66</b>	Hybrid	Partially designed, incorporates natural principles	Democratic governance, Cooperatives
<b>0.67 - 1.0</b>	Unnatural	Externally designed, extractive, enforcement-dependent	Factory farming, Surveillance systems

**Your System Classification:** [Based on DQD score]

## Authenticity Assessment

### Design Authenticity Indicators:

- **Emergence vs. Imposition:** [How much system emerged naturally vs. was imposed]
- **Local Adaptation:** [How well system adapts to local conditions]
- **Stakeholder Participation:** [How much affected parties participated in design]
- **Biomimetic Elements:** [Which aspects follow natural principles]

### Extractive vs. Regenerative Analysis:

System Aspect	Extractive Indicators	Regenerative Indicators	Overall Assessment
<b>Resource Use</b>	[Evidence of extraction]	[Evidence of regeneration]	[Extractive/Regenerative/Mixed]
<b>Value Distribution</b>	[Evidence of concentration]	[Evidence of distribution]	[Extractive/Regenerative/Mixed]
<b>Environmental Impact</b>	[Evidence of degradation]	[Evidence of enhancement]	[Extractive/Regenerative/Mixed]
<b>Social Effects</b>	[Evidence of harm/exclusion]	[Evidence of benefit/inclusion]	[Extractive/Regenerative/Mixed]



## Tool 3: Historical and Comparative Analysis

### System Evolution Timeline

Time Period	DQD Score	Key Changes	Design Events	Natural/Unnatural Shift
[Period 1]	[Estimated DQD]	[Major system changes]	[Design interventions]	[Direction of change]
[Period 2]	[Estimated DQD]	[Major system changes]	[Design interventions]	[Direction of change]
[Period 3]	[Estimated DQD]	[Major system changes]	[Design interventions]	[Direction of change]
[Current]	[Calculated DQD]	[Recent changes]	[Recent design events]	[Current trend]

### Evolution Pattern Analysis:

- **Design Trajectory:** [Becoming more or less designed over time]
- **Goal Alignment Trend:** [Becoming more or less regenerative]
- **Enforcement Trend:** [Becoming more or less dependent on external enforcement]
- **Overall Naturalization:** [Moving toward natural or unnatural classification]

### Comparative System Analysis

#### Similar Systems Comparison:

System	DQD Score	DT	GA	ED	Key Differences	Success Factors
Your System	____	____	____	____	[Baseline]	[Current strengths]
Comparison 1	____	____	____	____	[How it differs]	[Why it works better/worse]
Comparison 2	____	____	____	____	[How it differs]	[Why it works better/worse]
Natural Benchmark	____	____	____	____	[How natural system differs]	[Natural system advantages]

#### Learning from Comparisons:

- **Best Practices to Adopt:** [What successful similar systems do well]
- **Pitfalls to Avoid:** [What failed similar systems did wrong]
- **Natural Principles to Integrate:** [How to become more natural/regenerative]



## Tool 4: Design Intent Investigation

### Designer Identification Matrix

Design Element	Designer/Authority	Design Date	Design Motivation	Beneficiary	Power Source
[Element 1]	[Who designed it]	[When]	[Why they designed it]	[Who it serves]	[What gives them authority]
[Element 2]	[Who designed it]	[When]	[Why they designed it]	[Who it serves]	[What gives them authority]
[Element 3]	[Who designed it]	[When]	[Why they designed it]	[Who it serves]	[What gives them authority]
[Element 4]	[Who designed it]	[When]	[Why they designed it]	[Who it serves]	[What gives them authority]

### Design Motivation Analysis

#### Stated vs. Revealed Motivations:

Design Aspect	Stated Motivation	Revealed Motivation (based on outcomes)	Alignment	Evidence
<b>System Purpose</b>	[Official stated purpose]	[What system actually does]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting evidence]
<b>Stakeholder Benefit</b>	[Who system claims to serve]	[Who actually benefits]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting evidence]
<b>Resource Use</b>	[Stated resource efficiency]	[Actual resource patterns]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting evidence]
<b>Problem Solving</b>	[Problems system claims to solve]	[Problems system actually creates/solves]	[Aligned/Misaligned]	[Supporting evidence]

### Power Structure Analysis

#### Design Authority Assessment:

Authority Level	Who Holds It	Power Source	Legitimacy	Accountability
<b>Ultimate Design Authority</b>	[Top decision maker]	[Basis of power]	[Why people accept it]	[How held accountable]
<b>Implementation Authority</b>	[Who implements]	[Basis of power]	[Why people accept it]	[How held accountable]
<b>Modification Authority</b>	[Who can change system]	[Basis of power]	[Why people accept it]	[How held accountable]
<b>Enforcement Authority</b>	[Who ensures compliance]	[Basis of power]	[Why people accept it]	[How held accountable]

#### Consent and Participation Analysis:

- **Voluntary Participation:** [How much choice people have in system participation]
- **Informed Consent:** [How well people understand system implications]
- **Democratic Input:** [How much affected parties influence design]
- **Exit Options:** [How easily people can leave/opt out]

# Tool 5: DQD Repair and Naturalization Strategies

## Current System Problems Identification

### High DQD Issues:

DQD Component	Problem Area	Specific Issue	Impact Assessment	Root Cause
<b>High DT</b>	[Over-design area]	[Specific over-designed element]	[How it harms system]	[Why it was over-designed]
<b>Low GA</b>	[Misaligned goals]	[Specific misalignment]	[How it harms ecology/society]	[Why goals became misaligned]
<b>High ED</b>	[Enforcement dependency]	[Specific enforcement need]	[System fragility created]	[Why external enforcement needed]

## Naturalization Strategy Framework

### Strategy 1: Reduce Designer Traceability (DT)

**Target DT Reduction:** From \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_

Over-Designed Element	Naturalization Approach	Emergence Strategy	Implementation Steps	Expected DT Impact
[Element 1]	[How to make more emergent]	[Specific emergence method]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Element 2]	[How to make more emergent]	[Specific emergence method]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Element 3]	[How to make more emergent]	[Specific emergence method]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]

### Natural Templates for DT Reduction:

- **Ecosystem Self-Organization:** No central designer, emergent patterns → [Application to your system]
- **Market Mechanisms:** Emergent price discovery without central planning → [Application to your system]
- **Language Evolution:** Organic development without central authority → [Application to your system]

### Strategy 2: Improve Goal Alignment (GA)

**Target GA Improvement:** From \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_

Misaligned Process	Regenerative Alternative	Ecological Benefit	Implementation Steps	Expected GA Impact
[Process 1]	[Regenerative replacement]	[Environmental/social benefit]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Process 2]	[Regenerative replacement]	[Environmental/social benefit]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Process 3]	[Regenerative replacement]	[Environmental/social benefit]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]

### Biomimetic Templates for GA Improvement:

- **Mycelial Networks:** Mutual benefit and resource sharing → [Application to your system]
- **Coral Reef Symbiosis:** Multiple species thriving together → [Application to your system]
- **Forest Nutrient Cycling:** Waste becomes input for other processes → [Application to your system]

**Strategy 3: Reduce Enforcement Dependency (ED)****Target ED Reduction:** From \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_

Enforcement-Dependent Process	Self-Regulation Strategy	Intrinsic Motivation Design	Implementation Steps	Expected ED Impact
[Process 1]	[How to make self-regulating]	[Internal motivation system]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Process 2]	[How to make self-regulating]	[Internal motivation system]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]
[Process 3]	[How to make self-regulating]	[Internal motivation system]	[Step-by-step plan]	[Predicted improvement]

**Self-Regulation Templates:**

- **Immune System:** Automatic threat response without external control → [Application to your system]
- **Homeostasis:** Self-balancing biological systems → [Application to your system]
- **Open Source Communities:** Self-organizing collaboration without central enforcement → [Application to your system]

### Integrated DQD Reduction Plan

#### Phase 1 (Foundation - 0-12 months):

- [Basic naturalization interventions]
- [Expected DQD improvement]

#### Phase 2 (Transformation - 1-3 years):

- [Major structural changes]
- [Expected DQD improvement]

#### Phase 3 (Maturation - 3+ years):

- [Full naturalization achievement]
- [Expected DQD improvement]

#### Success Metrics:

- **Target DQD Score:** \_\_\_\_\_
- **Classification Goal:** [Natural/Hybrid target]
- **Monitoring Indicators:** [How to track progress]
- **Validation Methods:** [How to confirm DQD reduction]

# Tool 6: Text and Document Analysis Templates

## Founding Document Analysis

### Document Information:

- **Document Type:** [Constitution, Charter, Manifesto, etc.]
- **Date Created:** [When written]
- **Authors:** [Who wrote it]
- **Authority:** [What gives it power]

**DT Text Analysis:** Count and categorize design language:

Language Type	Count	Examples	Percentage
"We/I" Statements	[Number]	[Quote examples]	[% of total sentences]
Prescriptive Rules	[Number]	[Quote examples]	[% of total sentences]
Shall/Must Language	[Number]	[Quote examples]	[% of total sentences]
Prohibitions	[Number]	[Quote examples]	[% of total sentences]
Emergent Language	[Number]	[Quote examples]	[% of total sentences]

**DT Text Score:** [Designed language / Total language] = \_\_\_\_\_



## Patent and IP Analysis

### System Components with IP Protection:

Component	Patent/IP Type	Owner	Control Level	Innovation vs. Control
[Component 1]	[Patent type]	[Patent holder]	[Exclusive/Shared]	[Innovation benefit vs. control harm]
[Component 2]	[Patent type]	[Patent holder]	[Exclusive/Shared]	[Innovation benefit vs. control harm]
[Component 3]	[Patent type]	[Patent holder]	[Exclusive/Shared]	[Innovation benefit vs. control harm]

### IP Impact on Naturalness:

- Innovation Incentive:** [How IP encourages innovation]
- Access Restriction:** [How IP limits natural development]
- Control Concentration:** [How IP centralizes control]
- Alternative Paths:** [Open source or commons alternatives]

## Regulatory and Legal Framework Analysis

### Legal Structure Assessment:

Legal Requirement	Design Intention	Natural Alternative	Enforcement Mechanism
[Requirement 1]	[Why this rule exists]	[How nature handles this]	[How rule is enforced]
[Requirement 2]	[Why this rule exists]	[How nature handles this]	[How rule is enforced]
[Requirement 3]	[Why this rule exists]	[How nature handles this]	[How rule is enforced]

### Legal Complexity Analysis:

- Complexity Score:** [1-5, where 5 is extremely complex]
  - Accessibility:** [How easily ordinary people can understand]
  - Compliance Cost:** [Resources required for compliance]
  - Simplification Potential:** [How rules could be simplified]
-



## Tool 7: Validation and Quality Assurance

### Historical Validation Protocol

#### Test Cases for DQD Accuracy:

Historical System	Predicted DQD	Actual Outcome	Accuracy Assessment	Lessons Learned
[System 1]	[Calculated DQD]	[What happened]	[Prediction accuracy]	[What this teaches]
[System 2]	[Calculated DQD]	[What happened]	[Prediction accuracy]	[What this teaches]
[System 3]	[Calculated DQD]	[What happened]	[Prediction accuracy]	[What this teaches]

#### Validation Accuracy:

- Overall Prediction Rate:** [% of accurate predictions]
- False Positives:** [Predicted unnatural but worked well]
- False Negatives:** [Predicted natural but failed]
- Calibration Adjustments:** [How to improve accuracy]

### Cross-Framework Integration Check

#### Integration with Other KOSMOS Tools:

Framework	DQD Alignment	Correlation	Contradictions	Resolution
<b>7ES Analysis</b>	[How DQD aligns with structural analysis]	[Positive/negative correlation]	[Any contradictions]	[How to resolve]
<b>FDP Assessment</b>	[How DQD aligns with ethical analysis]	[Positive/negative correlation]	[Any contradictions]	[How to resolve]
<b>OCF Prediction</b>	[How DQD aligns with stability analysis]	[Positive/negative correlation]	[Any contradictions]	[How to resolve]

#### Expected Correlations:

- High DQD should correlate with low FDP scores
- High DQD should correlate with high OCF scores
- High DQD should correlate with 7ES vulnerabilities



## Bias Detection and Correction

### Analytical Bias Assessment:

Potential Bias	Risk Level (1-5)	Detection Method	Correction Strategy
<b>Cultural Bias</b>	[Risk level]	[How to detect]	[How to correct]
<b>Political Bias</b>	[Risk level]	[How to detect]	[How to correct]
<b>Disciplinary Bias</b>	[Risk level]	[How to detect]	[How to correct]
<b>Temporal Bias</b>	[Risk level]	[How to detect]	[How to correct]

### Objectivity Safeguards:

- **Multiple Perspectives:** [Include diverse viewpoints in analysis]
- **Adversarial Review:** [Have others challenge your assessment]
- **Historical Grounding:** [Compare to validated historical cases]
- **Natural Benchmarks:** [Compare to known natural systems]

# Integration Guidelines

## Using DQD Tools in Sequence

1. **Master DQD Assessment** - Calculate baseline authenticity scores
2. **Historical/Comparative Analysis** - Validate against similar systems
3. **Design Intent Investigation** - Understand origin motivations
4. **Repair Strategy Development** - Plan naturalization interventions
5. **Document Analysis** - Examine founding texts and legal frameworks
6. **Validation and QA** - Ensure analytical accuracy and objectivity

## Quality Assurance Protocol

- All three DQD components (DT, GA, ED) thoroughly analyzed
- Historical and comparative validation completed
- Design intent and authority structures examined
- Naturalization strategies grounded in biological templates
- Text and document analysis supporting conclusions
- Cross-framework integration verified
- Bias detection and correction applied

## Documentation Standards

- Include complete calculation methodology and data sources
- Document all assumptions about system design and emergence
- Provide evidence for design intent and authority claims
- Note cultural, political, and temporal factors affecting analysis
- Archive analysis for longitudinal validation and comparison

These DQD tools provide the authenticity assessment needed to distinguish genuinely regenerative systems from those designed for extraction, enabling targeted interventions that align human systems with natural principles.

---