

(11) Users, use cases

Content

| | |
|--|---|
| WHY IT IS NEEDED — WHAT PROBLEMS DOES IT SOLVE?..... | 2 |
| TYPICAL MOTIVATIONS OF POTENTIAL USERS | 3 |
| Protection (e.g. individual citizens)..... | 3 |
| Direct economic benefits (e.g. individual citizens) | 3 |
| Organizations (state-related organizations or even HOAs)..... | 3 |
| TARGET GROUPS..... | 4 |
| Primary Users (individual Owners, primary target group) | 4 |
| Secondary Users (Organizations, secondary target group) | 4 |
| TYPICAL USE CASES..... | 5 |
| Direct usage by citizens (e.g. citizen ↔ home-country relationship): | 5 |
| Indirect usage by Organizations (e.g., political parties):..... | 6 |
| WHY IS IT A LASTING SOLUTION? WHICH MISTAKES DOES IT AVOID?..... | 7 |
| BENEFITS FOR ORGANIZATIONS..... | 9 |

This document explains why the solution is needed, who should use it, and where it applies in practice.

WHY IT IS NEEDED — WHAT PROBLEMS DOES IT SOLVE?

Many Organizations require Owners to delegate part of their rights so that the Organization can function. Examples include a country or state and its authorities; police and intelligence services; communities and HOAs; and GDPR-relevant operators such as social media or public surveillance systems.

In practice, recurring problems appear:

- Elected or appointed leaders (employees) take unauthorized actions not covered by the election program or not authorized by Owners.
- Decisions are justified by position or law rather than by Owner authorization.
- Management avoids the effort to get proper authorization in advance.
- In extreme cases, basic rights of Owners (e.g., citizens) are denied.

It is often easier for those in power to claim that their actions are legal by position.

Yet an Organization can be 'law-conform' and still violate Owners' core rights. This solution gives individual Owners a fast, peaceful way to stop such violations.

TYPICAL MOTIVATIONS OF POTENTIAL USERS

Protection (e.g. individual citizens)

- Individual owners who want to protect themselves against the organization they co-own
- Individual owners who want to stop unauthorized actions by the management

Direct economic benefits (e.g. individual citizens)

- Saving money by paying less tax (potentially several thousand dollars per year):
 - a transparent and efficient management can lead to lower spending, which can result in lower taxes
 - a transparent and efficient management can lead to lower debt and interest payments, which can also result in lower taxes
- Individual owners who want to protect the value of their ownership (their stake in the organization)
- the owner (in this example, the citizen) does not have to use the solution personally; they can benefit from others using it

Organizations (state-related organizations or even HOAs)

- Achieving higher satisfaction among their owners/members
- Enabling a common platform for national and international cooperation between different, and even opposing, organizations

TARGET GROUPS

Primary Users (individual Owners, primary target group)

Individuals who own or hold significant membership in an entity—countries, states, communities, authorities, state-owned companies, associations. Beyond formal citizenship, “Owner” covers cases where a person has a direct stake in governance or resources—e.g., shareholders in public companies, HOA (Homeowners Association), or members of religious institutions with an ownership-like role. Membership counts only when it represents governance participation (e.g., a gym subscription is transactional and not ownership, the customer has no governance participation).

Secondary Users (Organizations, secondary target group)

Organizations that Owners co-own—countries, states, counties, authorities, towns, cities, villages, communities, HOAs, associations, churches, political parties, companies, and third parties. They can be passive (responding when Owners exercise their rights) or active: the framework doubles as a compliance model that Organizations can self-assess against and improve over time.

TYPICAL USE CASES

Direct usage by citizens (e.g. citizen ↔ home-country relationship):

Generally to be applied in situation where the individual Citizen or Owner is threatened, is affected directly or his or her ownership rights are threatened or targeted. In the examples below the Citizen uses the framework not because he or she has different ideas how the society should look like in his or her country.

He or she just simply exercises his or her basic core ownership rights, e.g.:

- **Life or freedom of the Owner(=Citizens') is endangered** because of nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, etc.
- **Restoring control when immigration has directly a huge negative impact on the Owners (=Citizens') life.**
- **Safeguarding the right to articulate political values or opinions** of the Owners (=Citizens') without any kind of retaliation.
- **Preventing governments from acting outside the election program or without transparency.** (direct violation of ownership rights)
- **Requiring separate authorization for constitutional changes.** (otherwise direct violation of ownership rights)
- **Enforcing environmental protections and reliable monitoring** (e.g., biodiversity, deforestation).
- **Demanding full transparency on public spending** (contracts and deals available in full, up to date).
- **Opposing unauthorized mass surveillance**
- **Opposing seizing and nationalization of private assets**
- **Requiring climate-relevant monitoring**
- **Requiring insurance for high-risk industries** (e.g., nuclear).

Indirect usage by Organizations (e.g., political parties):

- **Commitment to transparency:** adopt the framework to signal accountability and win trust.
- **Building a common platform** across parties with differing ideologies by setting a shared minimum standard.
- **Renewal and rebranding:** center the movement on core rights protected by the framework.
- **Strategic focus:** pick 2–6 priority points and drive measurable progress.
- **Enabling national and international cooperation** on a common language of compliance.

WHY IS IT A LASTING SOLUTION? WHICH MISTAKES DOES IT AVOID?

Many controlling systems are also a rewarding system, but poorly designed controlling systems unwished incentives. Two examples:

- Banking: high commissions plus weak risk management \Rightarrow crisis.
- Politics: rewarding fear-mongering and empty promises \Rightarrow chaos, corruption, division.

This framework separates control from rewards and minimizes incentives for abuse. It provides clear Owner rights, simple procedures, strict timeframes (SLA-like), and predictable consequences.

The framework is durable because it:

- **Focuses on a minimal core.** It covers only specific, fundamental Owner rights so that a system or Organization (e.g., a country) remains manageable—provided it does not violate those rights.
- **Drives better processes.** Its very existence and use encourage cleaner procedures and more efficient use of resources, both short-term and long-term.
- **Creates common ground.** It offers a neutral platform where groups with different interests can cooperate, raising overall Owner satisfaction.

Why are courts alone not enough?

Court proceedings are often too slow to protect an Owner when threats are immediate. A country can enact or amend laws—including constitutional changes—that endanger an Owner's existence (e.g., life, liberty, free movement) based on nationality, ethnicity, or for

expressing non-violent, non-hateful opinions. History shows how “uncomfortable” citizens (i.e., Owners) have been punished through new laws and administrative measures for their peaceful political views or identity—infamously in Nazi Germany against Jews and Communists. For this reason, the rights, criteria, and measures in this framework are deliberately and carefully selected.

Priority of Owner rights over employee discretion.

In any co-owned Organization (state, community, authority, HOA, etc.), protecting an Owner’s core rights outweighs the discretion of employees at any level. Just as company employees must not hijack the company from its Owners, public employees must not hijack an Organization from its citizens.

What the solution provides?

This solution places a practical tool in Owners’ hands (e.g., citizens) to **deny quickly and effectively** any attempted hijacking of power by employees within a co-owned Organization, restoring the proper Owner↔Organization relationship without delay.

BENEFITS FOR ORGANIZATIONS

- A ready-made compliance baseline and self-assessment tool.
- Faster cooperation nationally and internationally through shared minimum standards.
- Clear service-level expectations and processes improve:
 - efficiency (quicker, faster, cheaper, more transparent)
 - trust and owner satisfaction (similar to customer satisfaction).
- Even opposing parties can cooperate by choosing different improvement areas within the same baseline.