



Cupertino Gazette

Issued 11 July 2022

183rd session

American Session

28 April 2022

Speaker: Carson Snyder

Agenda: [183rd Session Agenda](#)

Delegations in Attendance:

1. Northwood-Oregon
 2. West Sayville
 3. Saspearian
 4. USBI
 5. New Athens
 6. Aenopia
 7. Pibocip
 8. Desert District
-

Discussions and Proposals:

Third discussion: On the promotion of the Empire of Atiera to the status of full member.

Majority support

Third discussion: On the Cupertino External Cooperation Act, 2022.

Majority support

Third discussion: Discussion on Chris Miller's proposal for a committee-based parliament.

Majority against

Third discussion: On the Cupertino Workshop Act, 2022.

Majority against

Member reports:

N/A

Join the team!

Apply:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSewoAdbyHImiygDLkiYW-bjKiBewFv_n3x1CPG7_tQ7f_BDSSQ/viewform

Discord: <https://discord.gg/dE5MydTX6z>

Site: <https://cupertinoalliance.ca/>

Issued 11 July 2022 by the Ministry of Press and Promotion,
in cooperation with the Chair of the Cupertino Alliance.
Report any mistakes to Tyler Mullins (Darkstar1592#1047)

Session transcript:

[5:17 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: @Members @Provisional Members @Observers Session is beginning. Please state your attendance.

[5:17 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: West Sayville will only be intermittently present until the delegation informs otherwise.

[5:18 PM] Anthony I - Saspearian: Saspearian will be partially present.

[5:18 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: United Sea Bass Islands is present.

[5:18 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: New Athens will be intermittently present

[5:18 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Here is the agenda for today:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1z30ylBCRFQoByCOMzNKvXkNDTUhXqkz9/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111959425659213040079&rtpof=true&sd=true>

[5:19 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: First on the agenda, we have the third discussion on the promotion of the Empire of Atiera to the status of full member.

[5:20 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: I am in support.

[5:20 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: Fully support

[5:20 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I also support.

[5:21 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Seeing a fair concensus we will move on.

[5:22 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Next we have the third discussion on the Cupertino External Cooperation Act, which can be found here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jyO9O_1rwa2eCv5MWNl4jZ_qpsErVzHV/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111959425659213040079&rtpof=true&sd=true

[5:23 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: As the author of this act, I am in full support of it.

[5:24 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I support this, as think this is exactly what the Alliance needs.

[5:24 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: I support this act as well.

[5:26 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Next on the agenda, we have the third discussion on a proposal from Minister Chris Miller.

[5:26 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Here is the text of his original proposal.

[5:27 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: It sounds to me like the current ministers could each oversee a committee, and all delegates would be required to serve on at least one? Is this correct?

[5:28 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: I believe so.

[5:28 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: It could work.

[5:28 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Atleast thats a rendition that would make sense to me.

[5:28 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: I'm not convinced that all delegates would pull equal weight, but it might get some more delegates active in our programs.

[5:29 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I think it would be unneeded and would only make it more complicated.

[5:30 PM] Tyler Mullins - New Athens: A fair point as well.

[5:30 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Its something im willing to experiment with by creating a few standing committees with the job of creating legislation, but I also don't want to go full in on the idea as well.

[5:31 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: Also, I don't see any practical advantages to such a system.

[5:31 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: It would though, theoretically, ensure that we only got legislation that was well thought out and atleast approved by a portion of delegates.

[5:32 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: As well as provide a guide for what legislation individuals should focus on.

[5:32 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I completely reject this proposal

[5:33 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: Bureacracy is a major factor in the crippling of this alliance from. 2021 - 2022.

To increase to this level.. it would be akin to ratify an official execution writ in Parliament.

We need to be actively reducing this to increase our efficiency, especially now given that the projects are nearly dead. Increasing it would be incredibly foolish and naive.

[5:35 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Is there anything further?

[5:36 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I agree. Although I have not been the most active, I have seen this Alliance deteriorate even in the time the USBI is a member. Bureocracy can only harm this Alliance in this state.

[5:37 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Next we have the third discussion on the Cupertino Workshop Act, which can be found here:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ahf6aa7bANSraGvt2Twt73rFLky-C1f9/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111959425659213040079&rtpof=true&sd=true>

[5:38 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: Personally I believe this is redundant. I'm not really sure how this would benefit us.

[5:39 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: This allows us to experiment programs before rolling them out for parliamentary approval and to the rest of the alliance.

[5:39 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I think at such a scale it wouldn't help projects, only, again, create more confusion.

[5:39 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I think it is best that this is brought to parliament at a later date.

I believe it is silly to launch a system for running new projects, when we can't even run the ones we already have.

[5:39 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: Very true.

[5:39 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: This will also allow us to test new renditions of the current projects we have.

[5:40 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: The ministers already have standing orders to work on some of the current projects we have.

[5:40 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I believe the clause regarding sovereignty should be removed.

[5:40 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Why's that?

[5:41 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: By signing on to a project, you are essentially agreeing to it. If a nation does not like a project, they should simply not subscribe to it, rather than ruining it for other nations which are interested

[5:42 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: There needs to be some guarantee with open ended projects that the nation wont be unjustly violated of the sovereignty.

[5:42 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: What sort of instance would that be?

[5:43 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Lets say West Sayville signed up for the workshop, then I created a project that only allowed local citizens to be citizens of the nation, that would be a bit of an overreach.

[5:43 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: That isn't a project

[5:43 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: It could be.

[5:44 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: The local development project, starts with recruiting local citizens, then gradually fades out the rest.

[5:44 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: If such a scenario occurred, I would simply not engage in the project.

[5:44 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: Problem solved.

[5:45 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: But under your proposal you dont have a choice, you already signed up.

[5:45 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Theres no legal protection for you to not have to do it.

[5:45 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: Projects have never ever been mandatory in the alliance. This has been a principle for the past two years.

[5:46 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: I feel like you didnt read the proposal

[5:46 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: For those in the workshop, participation would be mandatory if we removed any clauses as to not violate sovereignty.

[5:46 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: How would it be mandatory?

[5:47 PM] Aenöpia: Aenopia is present.

[5:47 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Clause 3

[5:47 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Without the subclauses then it would just be open season.

[5:49 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: This act is to create a voluntary testing ground for new projects before they are opened up to the wider Cupertino Alliance. It will allow us to quickly create new projects, prove their worth, and get them passed saving us time and resources passing projects which would inevitably fail.

[5:51 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: Yes, but there is a high chance that the testing results will differ from what will happen when he project is completely started up.

[5:51 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: How?

[5:51 PM] Phillip - Pibocip: Pibocip is present

[5:52 PM] Nicholas Lokin – Humberlea: Sorry for being late, Humberlea is present.

[5:52 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: It is hard to imitate all the factors and variables at play when starting up a new project.

[5:52 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Its not really imitating them when we are just opening the project to more people.

[5:54 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: Yes, but when the project becomes open to the whole alliance, there are many things that can go wrong. For example, someone might interact with the project in a way that wasn't intended, etc. What I'm saying is that such a testing ground would not be very efficient at seeing how a project will actually work out.

[5:54 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Thats, the entire purpose of a testing ground?

[5:55 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Seeing how the project would see, how people would interact with it.

[5:56 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: While a larger sample size would always bring about new instances, not even having the initial sample would just remove that all together.

[5:58 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: I apologize, that was a bad example. I think that with the small sample size that would likely result, the testing results would not be worth the effort.

[5:59 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: How so?

[5:59 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: We will be able to test projects before going through the much greater effort of passing them and then being completely stuck with them.

[5:59 PM] James B. - Desert District: Desert District is present

[6:00 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I think the best course of action is to focus on running the preexisting projects which have essentially died of neglect, and to re-propose this to parliament at a future date when we are prepared to handle more projects than we already have

[6:01 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: I dont see any reason to delay something the rest of parliament has overly supported.

[6:01 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: We will still have to put in effort to test them, and I think the results we would get would barely help us decide whether the project is worth it, unless it proves to be obviously bad. I see your post too though, and I agree that as long as the project is voluntary and we don't put in too many resources, it can be beneficial.

[6:02 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: The effort to test them would be far less and with a dedicated team only to focus on them, I don't plan on taking away from other things to test the projects.

[6:03 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: The people participating in this project could theoretically be helping the other projects instead, no?

[6:03 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: That could literally be an argument against everything we pass in this parliament.

[6:04 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Plus, under the current system, no they really couldn't be.

[6:04 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Its up to the ministers to run the current projects.

[6:05 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: That's true. Right now especially though, many other projects have come to a near-standstill.

[6:05 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I Personally believe the majority of the non regional cabinet should be abolished, and managers assigned to individual projects should be appointed

Right now, we are essentially dumping everything on one man, and it's evidently not working. It's too much.

[6:05 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: That would be a pretty large and long change to make.

[6:06 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: To my knowledge, we only have two projects barely running. There needs to be change somewhere, or the organisation has failed.

[6:06 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: What projects would you say have failed?

[6:08 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I'd have to take a proper count, but the vast majority of projects still extant via legislation have not been active for a very long period of time. This includes the flagship projects dating from early 2020, and the several subsequent smaller ones brought in between 2020 - 2021

[6:08 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Like what, Windhoek?

[6:08 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Because thats one that im planning on testing and bringing back.

[6:09 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: That is one of them.

[6:09 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Then give me the chance to work on them.

[6:09 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I never sought to remove said chance.

[6:09 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: But you aren't enabling me.

[6:09 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: How is that

[6:10 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: The Cupertino Workshop Act is what I will be depending on to test these projects.

[6:10 PM] Sertor Valentinus - W. Sayville: I merely proposed appointing dedicated project managers

[6:10 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: I am going back on topic.

[6:10 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: I can add that discussion to the agenda though if you'd like.

[6:11 PM] Samuel S. - USBI: That might also help get accurate testing results.

[6:13 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Is there anything further?

[6:15 PM] Carson S. - Northwood-Oregon: Then with that this session is adjourned, I thank you all for your attendance.