

MESS 0002

MIMS 2.11.1 : EPEMC Management As Applied through the Project Power Curve

Sf. R. Careaga, BSEE, MSTOM
September 2022

ABSTRACT

In a first chance to apply the MESSy standard¹, the author takes a look at a [free forever] business MIMS, provided on the basis of a MIMS 1.0 *casually mentioned* hypothesis. As a first case use for the study, rather than apply the equation for Business and Project power to the more difficult and visionary SPACERS and AIM projects, the author directly examines projects which are directly/indirectly related to EPEMC itself. Not shown is the already completed Gateway 2.0, which was achieved (2019) but failed due to lack of community support. Its power value was $2.16E1 \text{ cares}^2$ ³ which compares rather high to the graphed values. Let this be a potential consideration (the effect of time) in constructing new projects and businesses in relation to the previous or other ancillary (existing) projects.

Keywords: MIMS - business - power - data analytics - TESLAB - Resilient Way

¹ https://www.academia.edu/87222389/MIMS_1_04_1_05_MESS0001

² \$ x (week-ohms)⁻¹

³ "Careaga... cares"

MIMS 2.11.1 - the Project Power Curve as an application


To quote, from MIMS 1.0:

“The word currency should be the main key. Money flows, and electricity is treated as flowing water. There is however, a difference in the power equations in physics and finance/business:

$$P = \frac{W}{dT} = V * I \text{ Equation for Power in physics, but } P = \frac{I}{R*t} \text{ in business or finance.}” (p.23)^4$$

In accordance with this equation, the author created the PPC⁵ tool within the www.startergrower.com extension/tool. The use of both is free, and the instructions are (as of this writing), a bit of a step. However, there is a definitive use of this system, now, as it is recursively applied to the EPEMC projects directly. Remember, these are as of the writing (9/24/22), and the curve itself will evolve over time. It will be interesting to mark which projects have “traction” regarding the EPEMC - aside from papers, which have no monetary involvement, save the cost of edit time. Reporting back is likely to be spotty, but at least there will be a *messy* look, and this will, hopefully, reduce the lossiness of the study into the Business Power Equation.

The items read:



- ❖ Starter Grower
 - MIMS 2.1.3
- ❖ AKHA Museum
- ❖ Monolith Project (a power project)
 - MIMS 2.1.5.X
- ❖ $TSLA\beta^{tm}$
 - MIMS 4.1.X
- ❖ STEMM Arena (A. Hardin^{6 7 8 9})
- ❖ QLEtm (Careaga & Hardin)
 - MIMS 2.1.4X
- ❖ RW-Store¹⁰ (an eCommerce endeavor)
 - AIM005
- ❖ Hidden KY Book & Merch
- ❖ Hidden KY Gallery
- ❖ Eol = end of line

Figure 1 - Power Curve Graph for PPC; credit: author¹¹

The Hidden KY work is not within the EPEMC or AIM references... yet... making this **mess** a bit messier. However, the interesting thing is that a great amount of power resides in these relatively cheap

4

https://www.academia.edu/50300514/On_the_Membranous_Interface_of_the_Material_and_the_Spiritual_from_an_EPEMC_perspective_and_Dual_Double_Layer_Economics_a_proposed_test_of_EPEMCs_metallic_properties_tensile_strength_malleability_durability

⁵ Not to be confused (but not to be ignored in similarity) with the PPPC: possibility-probability-potentiality-cloud

⁶ www.hardinscientific.com

⁷ www.eulium.org MIMS 2.5.2X

⁸ www.americanintegratedcircuit.com

⁹ https://www.ted.com/talks/aaron_j_hardin_the_superpower_of_ai

¹⁰ www.resilientway-stores.com

¹¹ www.startergrower.com

projects with little tension. Bear in mind this isn't the power given by the projects, but the power "in the moment" indicating which projects should be pursued, if one follows a form of queuing theory whereby one eliminates obstructions by following the paths of least resistance. Rather than merely utilizing impedance, the author proposes that the PPC indicate the best courses of action. In which case the study would indicate (bearing in mind a lack of foreknowledge and exact precision on certain values and vase assumptions) the following orders of priority.

1. [Resilient Way - Stores](#)
 - a. Store 1 - pilot
2. [Hidden KY](#) - both projects back to back
3. [Starter Grower](#)
4. Quantum Leap Engine - a web 2.0+ enterprise software (ERP) co-owned by Hardin & Careaga (primary inventor)
5. TESLAB
6. STEMM Arena
7. AKHA¹² Museum
8. Monolith Project

Note that this study does not include the SPACERS projects, which is a secret - unpublished - graph for now. The above priorities make some sense, in terms of chronological monetary progression, proof of concepts, and the roll forward. For example the SG engine feeds data one directionally into the QLE. TESLAB is important for mankind, and needs presearch and pre-engineering to take it forward, but the STEMM Arena needs, more or less, around \$28M to succeed. If it does, it will be much easier to do the museums, galleries, and prepare the projects.

Factors which will affect these impedances (but not the currencies) will be the successes of [Eulium](#)¹³ and [AIC](#), the company for which the author is providing the *Resilient Way* (acting as interim C.O.O.)¹⁴.

Summary

The author will make use of the MESSy standard to track these progresses, in comparison with the MIMS' goals (of improving human potential, energy, and momentum), and this includes comparing with the SPACERS¹⁵, AIM¹⁶, FREETH¹⁷ (score), and general EPEMC standards¹⁸

References

1. "MESS 0001: MIMS 1.04 & 1.05: the EPEMC test," Sf. R. Careaga, 2022
2. "On the Membranous Interface of the Material and Spiritual," Sf. R. Careaga, 2021

¹² <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/akha>

¹³ A. Hardin has engineered a new MIMS 2.5.2X standard called "Proof of Power" which combines the utility of Work and Stake

¹⁴ www.resilient-way.com

¹⁵ <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/epemc/spacers>

¹⁶  AIM - Advanced Idea Mechanics - Planning Document

¹⁷ www.freeth.us

¹⁸ <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/volunteer/standards>