

# ILLUMINATED BUDGET

- 1 BUDGETS Online
- 2 BILLS and LEGISLATION
- 3 CORPORATE AUTHORS in social media
- 4 CONSENSUS on FACTS
- 5 REPUTATION
- 6 ATTRIBUTION
- 7 INFORMATION DISPLAY
- 8 REACHING an AUDIENCE

## 2.1 COMMENTARY

- 2.1.1 Individual
- 2.1.2 Corporate
- 2.1.3 Identify DUPLICATES
  - 2.1.3.1 Merge
  - 2.1.3.2 Respond once
- 2.1.4 VALIDATE authority and facts
  - 2.1.4.1 Some organizations or individuals are more studious than others
  - 2.1.4.2 Some are WELL FUNDED with good research and references, easy to validate
  - 2.1.4.3 Some are NOT EXPERTS so need closer look at claims
  - 2.1.4.4 Some individuals are EXPERTS and will cite affiliations / experience making it easy to validate
  - 2.1.4.5 The CONCERNED PUBLIC will provide claims that are easier to validate, or not in need of validation.
  - 2.1.4.6 CRANKS can APPEAR to be experts but are not, and can be hard to disambiguate.
    - 2.1.4.6.1 Accumulated EXPERIENCE will uncover them
    - 2.1.4.6.2 EXPERTS tend to know each other by contact through conferences and mutual visibility and these folks can disambiguate
    - 2.1.4.6.3 The ACADEMIC network can help identify them.

- 2.1.4.7 No FORMAL LIST of experts to validate authority
  - 2.1.4.7.1 Can be politically difficult to have a list
  - 2.1.4.7.2 REVIEW process difficult...
    - 2.1.4.7.2.1 Still need list of experts to make list of experts...
    - 2.1.4.7.2.2 Slow down the overall process
  - 2.1.4.7.3 META commentary to on comments
    - 2.1.4.7.3.1 Meta comments outside expertise still need VALIDATION
      - 2.1.4.7.3.1.1 e.g chemistry; hard to validate authority of comments outside of local working knowledge.
    - 2.1.4.7.3.2 Meta-commentors can work out a consensus?
      - 2.1.4.7.3.2.1 Need credentials or reputation still to give weight to it
  - 2.1.4.7.4 Over time, with PERSISTENT IDENTITIES, people will learn from experience who is an authority
  - 2.1.4.7.5 MODERATION to keep it civil
    - 2.1.4.7.5.1 Official moderators
    - 2.1.4.7.5.2 Users self-moderating (community policing)

## 2.2 TOOLS to automate commentary

- 2.2.1 WHO is doing this kind of thing? Anyone? Bueller?
- 2.2.2 Is there a DESIRE/NEED for tools to make commentary easier?
  - 2.2.2.1 Not about legislators about REGULATORS
    - 2.2.2.1.1 Public Advisory committee
  - 2.2.2.2 Comments must be allowed and responded to
  - 2.2.2.3 Definite RULES about how comments
  - 2.2.2.4 On the state/city level there is in fact a need and desire (poor overworked staffers)
- 2.2.3 Need to understand HOW the tools can/will be used
  - 2.2.3.1 By overworked staff
  - 2.2.3.2 Lobbyist is there to help the staff; so their work the staff takes credit
    - 2.2.3.2.1 Biased advocates
    - 2.2.3.2.2 Not so much balanced commentary
  - 2.2.3.3 Staff is NOT becoming expert; getting it from outside
  - 2.2.3.4 Tools can allow the staffers do their own job
  - 2.2.3.5 Will also help lobbyists, same reason easy access to knowledge.
  - 2.2.3.6 Only reason to have tools is to CHANGE the process as we have it now.
- 2.2.4 A lot of debate occurs at the LAST SECOND
  - 2.2.4.1 Post-facto exposure but can it help realtime?
  - 2.2.4.2 Tools can expose the timing of the discussion.