# **Konnaxion Smart Vote: Weighted Voting System Structure and Logic (Internal White Paper)**

## **Introduction**

Konnaxion’s **Smart Vote** module is a decision-making mechanism that links voting power to verified expertise and ethical standing. Instead of a one-person-one-vote system, Smart Vote uses a **weighted voting** model where each participant’s vote is **scaled by their merit in relevant knowledge domains and an ethics factor**. The goal is to ensure that decisions are *informed, fair, and transparent*, empowering subject-matter experts without excluding general participation. This document details the structure and logic of this weighted voting system, focusing on how domain-specific weights are assigned and applied (using the UNESCO ISCED-F field classification as the domain ontology), how individual merit profiles and ethics multipliers work, how consultations are tagged with domains, and how final vote influence is calculated. All components are designed with **neutrality, auditability, and inclusivity** in mind, so that partners and internal teams can trust the system’s fairness and rigor.

## **Domain-Based Weight Attribution (Using UNESCO ISCED-F Classification)**

Each user’s expertise is categorized and quantified across a comprehensive set of knowledge domains. Smart Vote adopts UNESCO’s **ISCED-F (International Standard Classification of Education – Fields of Education and Training)** taxonomy as the canonical domain structure. The ISCED-F provides a hierarchical ontology of academic and professional fields, classifying knowledge into **broad fields, narrow fields, and detailed fields** based on content. This ensures a globally recognized, standardized set of domains for attributing weights. For example, **Natural Sciences (Broad Field code 05)** contains narrower fields like *Biological Sciences*, *Environment*, *Physical Sciences*, each with further detailed sub-fields (e.g. Biology as a detailed field under Biological Sciences). The diagram below illustrates a fragment of this hierarchy for one broad field:

*Figure: Hierarchical domain structure based on UNESCO ISCED-F classification. Broad fields (e.g. “Natural Sciences”) are subdivided into narrow fields (“Biological and Related Sciences”, “Environment”, “Physical Sciences”), which in turn have detailed fields (“Biology”, “Environmental Sciences”, “Physics”, etc.) with assigned codes. Konnaxion uses this structured taxonomy to define knowledge domains for weighting purposes.*

Using the ISCED-F framework means that **domain-based weight attribution** is both comprehensive and precise. Every piece of user expertise evidence (education, work, contributions) is mapped to one or more of these domains. **Weights are assigned per domain**, aligning with the ISCED-F field codes. This standardized approach avoids ambiguity — for instance, an achievement in “Civil Engineering” would fall under the broader *Engineering & Technology* domain. Konnaxion’s system covers all major domains (e.g. Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Health Sciences, Engineering & Technology, Business & Law, etc.), mirroring UNESCO’s field structure. By anchoring to an international classification, Smart Vote ensures that domain definitions are neutral and well-understood, which aids in transparency and cross-institutional collaboration. Domain weight attribution is purely *positive*: users earn higher weight in fields where they have expertise, but lack of expertise in a domain does not incur any negative weight (no user is penalized for not knowing a field – they simply won’t have bonus weight there).

## **Per-User Merit Profiles (Multi-Dimensional Merit Vectors)**

Every participant has a **merit profile** which is essentially a multi-dimensional vector of their competencies across all defined domains. In practice, this is a list of weight values (scores) for each domain in the UNESCO ISCED-F taxonomy, forming an individual’s “expertise fingerprint.” **Figure 1** below shows an example of a user’s merit profile as horizontal bars across five sample domains (for illustration):

*Figure 1: Example of a user’s merit profile across several knowledge domains. Each bar represents the user’s* ***merit score*** *or weight in that domain (higher value indicates greater verified expertise). In this example, the user has strong expertise in “Engineering & Tech” and “Natural Sciences”, moderate expertise in “Health Sciences”, and lower or negligible merit in “Social Sciences” and “Arts & Humanities.”*

These merit scores are **earned and dynamically updated** based on evidence of the user’s qualifications and contributions. Konnaxion’s platform (via the **Ekoh** merit evaluation system) aggregates multiple data points to calculate these weights:

* **Certified Knowledge and Credentials:** Formal education degrees, professional certifications, and KonnectED courses completed in a given field contribute to the merit score for that domain. For example, a PhD in Economics or a KonnectED certification in Sustainable Agriculture would raise the user’s weight in the corresponding domain. Each domain weight is tied to concrete evidence – using the UNESCO classification, credentials are mapped to their relevant field code and increase that field’s score in the user’s profile.
* **Documented Impact and Experience:** Verified achievements such as published research, patents, industry experience, or measurable project outcomes in a domain also elevate the merit score. The system considers *documented impact* (e.g. a history of successful projects in Information Technology, or recognized community work in Public Health) as indicators of practical expertise. These contributions are tagged to domains and reflected in the merit profile.
* **Platform Contributions and Peer Recognition:** On Konnaxion’s platform itself, users build merit by contributing high-quality content, solutions, or insights in specific domains. For instance, solving problems in a **keenKonnect** challenge or providing valuable expertise in discussions will be recognized. Peer reviews, upvotes, or other reputation signals in a domain feed into the merit scoring. An AI module (the Smart Vote “Ekoh” engine) continuously evaluates a user’s domain-specific contributions and adjusts their weights accordingly (with proper safeguards to prevent gaming the system). This ensures **merit profiles are living and evidence-driven**, evolving as the user learns and accomplishes more.

A user’s merit profile is therefore a **vector [w1, w2, ..., wN]** (with N domains) capturing their expertise breadth and depth. Importantly, these weights are **positive or zero values only** – a user with no background in a domain simply has a zero or baseline weight in that field, but is not assigned any negative influence. **There is no penalty for lack of expertise in a given domain**; everyone retains a base voting capacity (discussed below), so newcomers or laypersons are not disadvantaged beyond not receiving an extra boost in specialized areas. Meanwhile, those with high merit in a domain are rewarded with proportionally higher influence *in that domain’s context*. This design upholds *inclusivity without diluting decision quality* – novices can still participate meaningfully, while experts have additional sway where it is most warranted.

## **Ethics Multiplier (Cross-Cutting Role)**

In addition to domain-specific merits, Smart Vote incorporates an **Ethics Multiplier** that affects a user’s voting weight **across all domains**. This multiplier is a factor (e.g. a percentage or coefficient) derived from the user’s ethical behavior and alignment with community values. It is **applied on top of domain weights** as a global scaling factor. If domain merits determine *how knowledgeable* a user is in relevant fields, the ethics multiplier adjusts *how much influence* that knowledge should carry based on trust and integrity.

The ethics multiplier is computed by evaluating the user’s conduct: examples include adherence to community guidelines, honesty in contributions, respectful discourse, and any history of malfeasance (plagiarism, misinformation, toxic behavior, etc.). **Positive ethical behavior increases the multiplier (above 1.0), boosting the user’s overall voting weight**, while unethical behavior reduces the multiplier (toward or below 1.0, down to 0 in extreme cases). This means a highly ethical expert might enjoy an extra influence boost, whereas an expert who behaves irresponsibly could see their otherwise high domain weights scaled down significantly. In severe cases, unethical actors can be **excluded entirely** by dropping their multiplier to zero (effectively nullifying their votes until issues are resolved).

Crucially, the ethics factor ensures that **competence is coupled with integrity**. It guards against scenarios like a knowledgeable but malicious user skewing decisions. All participants are incentivized to uphold ethical standards, as doing so directly enhances their influence (and unethical actions will diminish their influence). The multiplier is uniform across domains – it does not matter where the user’s expertise lies; their good or bad behavior influences their weight in any consultation. This acts as a *cross-cutting check* on the system, aligning decision-making power with shared values and trustworthiness. Technically, if a user’s domain merit contributions would give them a weight factor *W* for a particular vote (from expertise alone), and their ethics multiplier is *E*, the **effective weight** becomes *E × W*. For example, if a user is highly rated in the relevant field (say W = 1.5, meaning 150% of a normal vote) but has a poor ethics standing (E = 0.5), their weighted vote counts as 0.75 (i.e. 75% of a normal vote) despite their expertise. Conversely, an ethical contributor (E > 1) gets amplified influence, reflecting community trust. The ethics multiplier is transparently computed and visible, reinforcing accountability.

## **Consultation Tagging and Domain Relevance**

When a new issue, proposal, or consultation is created, it is **tagged with the relevant knowledge domains** along with a percentage relevance for each. This step defines the “domain mix” of the topic. A consultation might span multiple domains – for example, a policy proposal on *“Renewable Energy Infrastructure”* could be tagged as 50% Engineering & Technology, 30% Natural Sciences, and 20% Social Sciences (to capture technical, scientific, and societal aspects respectively). These percentages (summing to 100%) indicate the weight of each domain in the context of that particular decision.

*Figure 2: Example of a consultation topic tagged with domain relevance percentages. In this illustrative case, a consultation is defined to be* ***50% Engineering & Tech****,* ***30% Natural Sciences****, and* ***20% Social Sciences****. This distribution means the topic is primarily technical, with significant scientific and social dimensions. The tagging is determined by subject matter experts or content curators when setting up the consultation, following the UNESCO-aligned domain structure.*

Domain tagging ensures that when votes are cast, **only the relevant portions of a user’s merit profile are considered**. In effect, each consultation defines a weighting vector that will be applied to the users’ domain merit vectors. Using the above example, a user’s influence on the *Renewable Energy* issue will derive 50% from their Engineering merit, 30% from their Natural Science merit, and 20% from their Social Science merit. If a domain is not tagged (0% relevance), then a user’s expertise in that domain has no extra effect on that vote. This mechanism **limits cross-domain influence** strictly to where it’s applicable: even a renowned medical expert (high merit in Health Sciences) would have no special advantage in a vote about engineering policy, unless the consultation explicitly has a health component. By design, *expertise only amplifies influence within relevant domains*, and outside of those, everyone’s vote is counted equally.

The process of determining domain relevance is typically done by content creators or moderators using guidelines to map the consultation to UNESCO fields. Often, it involves breaking down the subject matter into its constituent disciplines. The percentages may be coarse-grained (e.g. split between two broad fields) or fine-grained across several sub-fields, but the sum is normalized to 100%. This explicit tagging and weighting of domains adds transparency to how expertise is applied: participants can see which knowledge areas are deemed relevant and to what extent. It also fosters interdisciplinary fairness; if a decision spans multiple domains, **experts from all those domains share influence proportional to the domain’s relevance**, rather than one domain’s experts overwhelming the outcome. Furthermore, because tags follow the standard classification, it’s clear what each tag means (for instance, tagging “03 Social Sciences” vs “07 Engineering” has a defined scope per UNESCO’s taxonomy).

**No participant is excluded from voting on any consultation**, regardless of expertise (in line with Konnaxion’s inclusive ethos). The tagging simply means that if you lack expertise in the domains that matter for this issue, your vote **still counts with the base weight** (see next section) but you won’t receive any additional weighting. This is the “no penalty outside one’s domain” principle in action – you vote as a normal participant in topics where you’re not an expert, and as an *augmented* participant in topics where you are. The result is a balanced approach: **domain experts heavily shape outcomes in their areas of competence, while general participants still contribute to the collective voice**. The Smart Vote system thereby blends meritocracy with democracy, ensuring both relevance and inclusion.

## **Aggregation Formula for Final Voting Influence**

Once we have the pieces – user merit profiles, ethics multipliers, and consultation domain relevance – Smart Vote computes each vote’s effective weight through a clear aggregation formula. Conceptually, for a given consultation with domain relevance vector **R** (e.g. R = {Engineering: 50%, NatSci: 30%, SocSci: 20%} as in Figure 2), and a user *i* with merit profile **Mᵢ** (e.g. Mᵢ = {Engineering: 0.9, NatSci: 0.7, SocSci: 0.2} in normalized merit units), and an ethics multiplier **Eᵢ**, the user’s **voting weight Wᵢ** for that consultation is calculated as:

Wi  =  1  +  Ei×∑d∈Domains(Mi[d]×R[d]).Wᵢ \;=\; 1 \;+\; Eᵢ \times \sum\_{d \in \text{Domains}} \left( Mᵢ[d] \times R[d] \right).

In this formula, the summation runs over all domains *d* that are relevant (non-zero R[d]) for the consultation, multiplying the user’s merit in that domain by the domain’s relevance percentage. This effectively gives the **merit-based contribution** of the user’s vote. That contribution is then multiplied by the user’s ethics factor Eᵢ, and added to 1 which represents the **base vote weight**. The base weight of “1” ensures that every participant has at least their one full vote counted regardless of expertise. A user with no expertise in any relevant domain has Mᵢ[d] = 0 for all those domains, yielding a weight of Wᵢ = 1 (i.e. they vote normally, no augmentation). A highly skilled and ethical expert, on the other hand, might end up with Wᵢ > 1 (for instance, base 1 + some extra), meaning their vote counts more due to their proven competence in the topic. The system typically normalizes merit values such that an *average qualified person* might have Mᵢ ~ 1.0 in their field, and an outstanding expert might have higher (the exact scaling can be tuned). However, **there are upper limits and calibration** to avoid any single vote becoming disproportionately dominant – the weights are kept within reasonable ranges to balance expert influence with broader consensus.

It’s worth noting that the aggregation can be seen as a dot-product of the user’s merit vector with the consultation’s domain vector, scaled by ethics. If the consultation has multiple tags, a user strong in all those areas will benefit across each. If a user is strong in only one of several relevant domains, they contribute more on that dimension but less on others, aligning with a partial influence. This formula encapsulates Smart Vote’s core logic: *votes are weighted by expertise applied only where it’s relevant, and tempered by ethical standing*. The outcome of a vote is then determined by summing all participants’ weighted votes (e.g. for or against a proposal).

Smart Vote output includes both the **merit-weighted result and the raw vote count** for transparency. The **“raw vote”** is simply the unweighted tally (everyone counting as 1), while the **“weighted vote”** reflects the calculated influences Wᵢ. This distinction is crucial for transparency and trust. For example, the system might report that a proposal received 60% approval by raw votes, but 70% approval in weighted votes. Stakeholders can see how expert weighting shifted the outcome. Smart Vote even allows filtering results by different subsets or weight thresholds – for instance, one can view what the top 10% most qualified contributors think versus the overall populace. This multi-layer result analysis helps validate that the weighting mechanism is fair and not skewing decisions in undesirable ways. If raw and weighted outcomes diverge greatly, it invites scrutiny (which the system welcomes through auditability). In practice, seeing both results side by side builds confidence: participants know that the **collective voice is preserved**, and that any differences introduced by weighting are coming from vetted domain experts and ethical contributors.

## **Domain Expertise Assignment and Updates (Evidence-Based Merit Allocation)**

Ensuring that domain weights are assigned accurately and kept up-to-date is a fundamental aspect of Smart Vote’s credibility. Konnaxion employs a robust, evidence-based process to **assign and update domain-specific expertise** for each user:

* **Initial Onboarding and Verification:** When a user joins (or when the Smart Vote system is initialized for existing users), they provide information about their background. This may include uploading degrees, certificates, resumes, or linking to professional profiles. Konnaxion’s **KonnectED** platform plays a key role here by offering verifiable learning modules and certifications in various fields. Each verified credential is mapped to one or more UNESCO ISCED-F domains. For example, a KonnectED certificate in *Data Science* would boost the user’s weight in *Computer Science* and *Mathematics* domains. External credentials (like a university degree in Chemistry) are also recognized and mapped to *Natural Sciences*. The system uses a combination of automated checks and moderator oversight to validate these qualifications.
* **Ongoing Contributions and Impact Tracking:** As users participate in Konnaxion’s ecosystem (education, collaborative projects, discussions, research), the system continuously gathers signals of expertise. If a user publishes a well-received article on a platform like **Ethikos** (debate forum) in the domain of *Environmental Policy*, or contributes a design in **keenKonnect** (innovation lab) related to *Civil Engineering*, those actions are tagged to the relevant domain codes (e.g. Environmental Studies, Engineering) and their merit profile is incrementally adjusted. The **dynamic weight adjustment AI module** monitors metrics such as peer reviews, solution acceptance, content quality, and real-world impact of user contributions. It then increases the domain weight when merited – for instance, documenting that a user led a successful project in sustainable agriculture might raise their weight in the Agriculture domain. Conversely, if some claimed expertise is later discredited (say a piece of work is found plagiarized or incorrect), moderators can reduce the corresponding domain weight. This dynamic adjustment ensures **merit profiles remain current and earned**.
* **Peer Endorsements and Review:** The platform also supports a peer endorsement system where recognized experts can vouch for others’ skills (with safeguards to prevent collusion). For instance, a group of established software engineers might endorse a contributor’s programming expertise after reviewing their code contributions. Such endorsements, especially when coming from high-merit users, can increment the recipient’s weight in that domain (much like how academic citations increase a researcher’s credibility in that field). All such endorsements are transparent and require justification. In parallel, periodic reviews can be conducted – e.g., requiring users to update their KonnectED learning or demonstrate continued involvement in a field to retain their weight. This approach mirrors professional development, encouraging users to stay active in their domains.

Crucially, the system is designed so that **domain weights reflect genuine capability**. The use of an authoritative taxonomy (ISCED-F) means there is clarity about what falls under each domain, reducing misclassification. For example, *“Information Technology”* and *“Telecommunications”* are distinct detailed fields under the ICT broad field; a user’s contributions in one won’t mistakenly inflate their weight in another unrelated field. Additionally, **there is no manual or arbitrary assignment of weights** – everything is backed by evidence (certifications, documented accomplishments, peer-validated contributions). This not only makes the merit attributions fair, but also *auditable*: the provenance of each user’s weight can be traced (e.g. which certificates or contributions led to their current score in a domain). New evidence can always augment a user’s profile, allowing growth and learning to translate into greater influence over time. Conversely, inactivity or loss of relevance can be handled by weights naturally decaying or being overshadowed by others’ active contributions (though one’s past achievements remain part of the record).

Through this evolving, evidence-based model, Smart Vote ensures that **meritocracy within the system is justified and up-to-date**. Partners and collaborators can trust that a user flagged as an expert in *Renewable Energy* truly has the background to justify it (since that status might be backed by, say, an engineering degree, a published research paper, and 10 successful projects in the field). The weighted voting influence is therefore not a static privilege, but something continuously earned by **maintaining expertise and positive contributions**.

## **Fairness, Inclusivity, and Cross-Domain Limitations**

The Smart Vote weighted system is carefully structured to balance expert influence with broad inclusivity, ensuring **fairness** at every level. Key fairness and participation safeguards include:

* **No Exclusion of Non-Experts:** Everyone gets to vote on every issue. Even if you have zero expertise in a topic’s domains, your vote is counted with the baseline weight of 1. This baseline is the great equalizer – it embodies the principle that *every individual has a voice*. Smart Vote’s weighting elevates expert input but does not silence or remove the input of non-experts. This design choice preserves the democratic foundation of the platform while enhancing it with meritocratic features.
* **Proportional Influence, Not Absolute Control:** Domain experts gain *additional* weight in their field, but not to the extent that they can single-handedly dictate outcomes unless a broad consensus of experts agrees. The system may cap extreme weight ratios or ensure diminishing returns for exceedingly high merit, such that a small number of experts cannot completely override a large majority of regular voters on general issues. In practice, this means a highly specialized issue will naturally be guided by those who know it best (since most others won’t have weight there), whereas a general issue (with many people having at least some merit or interest) will still reflect collective sentiment. **Cross-domain influence is limited** by design – expertise in one area does not automatically translate to another. An eminent physicist does not get extra say in an economics debate, and vice versa, which prevents dominance by polyglots or fame across unrelated topics.
* **Fair Credit and No Penalty:** Users are only rewarded, never punished, in the weighting scheme. *Not having* expertise in a domain simply means you get the default vote weight, not that your vote is worth less than one. This is an important philosophical point: Smart Vote weights are about **recognition of merit**, not punishment for its absence. By the same token, having expertise outside a topic won’t give you undue influence on it. This keeps the playground fair — you can’t hoard influence in all areas, only in those where you’ve earned it. It also means newcomers or young participants can engage freely; as they build knowledge, they will see their influence grow in tandem.
* **Transparency and Explainability:** Fairness is reinforced by making the weighting logic open and understandable to users. At any time, a participant can inspect why a certain user or group has the weight they do: the components of weight (domain scores, ethics multiplier) are transparent. Consultations show which domains were considered and how much they mattered. This clarity helps prevent perceptions of bias. If someone has a higher vote weight, it is evident *where it comes from* (e.g. “User X has a 1.2× weight because of high merit in Environmental Science and an excellent ethics record”). There are no hidden “power users” – everything is out in the open for accountability.
* **Auditability:** Internally, the system keeps detailed logs of how weights are calculated and applied. All evidence linked to merit is recorded (with references to the source of each credential or contribution). Votes cast with weights can be audited after the fact by recalculating outcomes from stored profiles and tags. This means that not only is the process transparent in real-time, but one can also retroactively verify that a particular vote outcome was computed correctly and fairly from the inputs. This audit trail is crucial for partner institutions who might want to periodically review the system’s integrity. It allows independent verification that Smart Vote is operating as intended, with no hidden manipulation. The use of a standardized domain classification (UNICED-F) further eases auditing, as external observers can more easily map and understand the domain attributions.

In summary, the weighted voting model in Konnaxion’s Smart Vote is built to be **meritocratic yet inclusive, dynamic yet transparent**. It empowers those with the most relevant knowledge and ethical track records to have greater influence – leading to more informed and credible decisions – while still valuing the broader community’s input and values. Cross-domain checks ensure an even playing field across different topics, and continuous updates and audits ensure the system remains fair over time. The emphasis on transparency and evidence means users and partners can *trust* the system: it is clear how influence is earned and applied, and any stakeholder can scrutinize the process.

## **Transparency and Auditability**

Transparency is a cornerstone of Smart Vote’s design, critical for internal understanding and external collaboration. Every aspect of the weighted voting system is made **visible and explainable** to foster trust:

* **Visible Weights and Profiles:** Users can view their own merit profile and even (to an appropriate extent) aggregated statistics about the community’s expertise distribution. In a Smart Vote consultation, it can be made visible how the vote weights broke down by domain – for instance, an outcome page might show “Expert contributions (weighted) leaned 70% in favor, while general contributions (unweighted) were 60% in favor” along with an explanation of which domains influenced the result. This level of detail helps users understand *why* a decision went the way it did, reducing the “black box” feeling. Internally, maintainers can always trace the weight of a particular vote back to the user’s credentials and actions that produced it.
* **Open Methodology:** The algorithms for calculating merit and applying weights are documented and open for review. This white paper itself serves as part of that documentation, and further technical specifications (down to code level, if needed for partners) can be provided. By basing the approach on known standards (like UNESCO ISCED-F and well-defined formulae), we make it easier for external auditors or partners to follow the logic. If an institutional collaborator wants to know how much weight a certain certification carries or how ethics scores are computed, we have clear rules to share. Nothing relies on subjective judgment or ad-hoc decisions; it’s rule-based and data-driven.
* **Audit Logs:** Every voting session is logged in detail – including the list of participants, their raw votes, their computed weights, and the final tally. These logs can be audited by an independent party or a governance committee to ensure the computed outcome matches the recorded inputs. Similarly, changes to user merit profiles (e.g. when a new certification is added or an ethics multiplier is updated) are logged with timestamps and reasons (e.g. “User completed KonnectED Course X, +0.2 weight in domain Y”). This creates a verifiable history for each user’s influence. In the event of any dispute or analysis, one can reconstruct the state of the system at any point in time.
* **Periodic Reviews and Calibration:** Konnaxion plans regular reviews of the weighting system to ensure it remains fair and effective. For example, analyzing the correlation between weighted outcomes and successful implementations of decisions could feed back into tweaking the model. If certain domains are consistently undervalued or overvalued, adjustments can be proposed (in a transparent manner) to the weighting formula or evidence evaluation. Any such changes would be communicated clearly to all stakeholders. Importantly, because of the auditability, historical decisions can be re-run with new parameters if needed to simulate “what-if” scenarios, which helps in calibrating without affecting the actual past records.

In engaging with potential partners, this transparency is a strong selling point: **Smart Vote can be trusted because it can be verified**. The system holds itself to the same standards of accountability that it expects from users (who must back their expertise with evidence). All these measures combined (transparent criteria, open data, audit trails) create a **secure and trustworthy voting environment**. Decisions made via Smart Vote are not just weighted – they are *well-justified*, and any collaborator can see for themselves how the outcome was determined. This audit-friendly design is crucial for institutional adoption, where oversight and compliance may be required.

## **Conclusion**

The weighted voting system in Konnaxion’s Smart Vote module represents a novel fusion of domain-based meritocracy with broad democratic participation. By structuring influence around the UNESCO ISCED-F domains, it grounds the system in a **neutral, internationally recognized knowledge framework**. Each user’s multi-dimensional merit profile translates learning, experience, and contributions into tangible voting power, while the ethics multiplier ensures that this power is exercised responsibly. Consultations are explicitly linked to relevant domains, so that expertise is applied with surgical precision where it matters. The aggregation formula cleanly integrates these factors, distinguishing the raw voice of the people from the refined voice of experts in a transparent way.

Throughout the design, **fairness and transparency** have top priority – no one is disempowered for lacking expertise, and no weight is given without earned merit. General participants and top experts collaborate in each decision, with the system simply weighting inputs to favor knowledge and integrity. The entire process is open to scrutiny, giving both our internal teams and external partners confidence in the results. In essence, Smart Vote’s weighted voting model is an **internal governance tool and a potential collaborative solution** that harnesses the collective intelligence of a community, guided by those who know best, yet governed by principles of openness and fairness. It exemplifies Konnaxion’s mission to amplify the *quality* of decisions without compromising inclusivity or trust. By adhering to a structured and logical weighting system, Smart Vote delivers decisions that are not only democratic, but **democratically intelligent** – reflecting the best of all voices, proportionally to their knowledge and ethical contribution.

**Sources:** The design elements and principles described here reference the UNESCO Institute for Statistics’ ISCED-F 2013 classification for domain definitions, as well as Konnaxion’s internal concept notes and ethos as summarized in “Ekoh and Smart Vote” documentation, among other internal strategy papers. The focus remains on the structural model, with separate documents addressing simulation results and example case studies. All stakeholders are encouraged to review these materials and the audit logs for a thorough understanding of Smart Vote’s implementation.