

So, as has been said before, we plan to reform modifiers; or more specifically how modifiers are obtained. The system as it stands is too unbalanced in that, by requiring members to apply for modifiers, parties get modifiers for things such as performance at Minister's' Questions, whereas other parties who may not have applied for the modifier but may have done just as well do not get modifiers. Of course, for some things, the application method will remain in place as there are events in MHOC that occur but cannot be summarised into a uniform system - such as scandals or the realm of the press. Lastly, do not fear that these changes we propose are making the system in any way more 'gameable', just because we are simplifying many of the processes, the performance will still be based on triumvirate discretion - just we are applying more boundaries to it to allow us to more easily make and, more importantly, justify our decisions to the community.

The proposed system would satisfy posts written on /r/MHOC, /r/MHOCMP, /r/MHOCCmteVote, /r/MStormont and /r/MStormontVote. However, the modifiers where applicable will be separated between the /r/MHOC, /r/MHOCMP and /r/MHOCCmteVote subsection and the /r/MStormont and /r/MStormontVote subsection so as to not cause contradictions between the two. This means that all posts, regardless of content, on /r/MHOCPress, /r/MHOL and /r/MHOLVote are still subject to the application method. /r/MHOCStrangersBar is, as ever, not applicable for modifiers.

Legislation Modifiers

Firstly, we propose a standardised method of tracking legislation submission, attendance at legislation debates and lastly turnout for votes on legislation and amendments. It can be summarised below:

- After a piece of legislation is put to a vote in /r/MHOCMP, the triumvirate assign a score between 0 and 5 for a parties attendance and contribution to the debate across all readings, where 0 represents no contribution whatsoever and 5 represents lots of engaged contribution from many members of the party.
- A single bill or motion's score can be multiplied by a number of factors:
 - Base multiplier (+1 for all)
 - Legislation being written (+1 for author and their party).
 - Whether it's an 'important piece of legislation' (eg. significant legislation and/or manifesto commitments) as determined by the Triumvirate (+1 for legislation of minor importance, +2 for a minor manifesto commitment, +2 for legislation of medium importance, +3 for a medium manifesto commitment, +4 for legislation of major importance and +5 for a major manifesto commitment).
 - Whether it *breaks* any manifesto commitments (-1 for a minor manifesto break and -2 for a major manifesto break)
 - Note that for a minor manifesto break, a score of 4 or higher will cancel this multiplier and for a major manifesto break a score of 5 will cancel this multiplier. Therefore turning out your party in the debate, if it is something that goes against your manifesto, can still cancel the negative multiplier for doing so but at the risk of exposing internal divisions by having party members potentially arguing for something they disagree with.
 - How detailed the legislation text itself is (+1 for poor detail, +2 for adequate detail, +3 for excellent detail).
 - Whether an opening speech was provided and how detailed that was (+1 for poor detail, +2 for adequate detail, +3 for excellent detail).
 - Note that all multipliers will be applied at the discretion of the Triumvirate.
- Parties sponsoring legislation get a proportion of the modifier based on how many parties are sponsoring it; for example if two parties are sponsoring it in addition to the author and their party, the author and their party will get the full multiplier and the sponsoring parties will both get half of the total multiplier each. If three parties were sponsoring it in addition to the author and their party then the

author and their party would still get the full multiplier but the sponsoring parties would only get a third of the multiplier each.

- Note that if the author of a bill became an independent, they would receive the full modifier for a bill, alongside the party which they were a member of at the time receiving a full modifier.
-
- At the conclusion of the modifier term, the scores for legislation debates are averaged out and then applied as a percentage modifier. For example if you average a total score of 15 over the course of the term, you'll receive a +15% modifier at the general election for legislation.

This system specifically encourages the creation of high quality legislation that stimulates debate and fulfills commitments, rather than churning out small pieces of legislation. Likewise, it allows wiggle room within commitments, whereby if you turn out to defend the legislation enough you can cancel out the negative multiplier that you are given. Lastly, it makes it very simple to realise how the modifiers are given, since the multiplier section of it is based off of 'mathematical' stuff and the discretionary side is a simple 1-5 rating.

Examples:

- Party A writes a bill that is adequately detailed, that satisfies a minor manifesto commitment, as well as writing a poorly detailed opening speech alongside submission of the bill. They have a good showing at the debate, amassing a score of 3.
 - They would get a multiplier of 7, which when applied to their score of 3 gives them a total score of 21 for the bill.
- Party B debates well on a bill not written or sponsored by them, amassing a score of 4.
 - Due to the base multiplier being 1, their total score is therefore 4 for this bill.
- Parties C and D sponsor Party A's bill from above, meaning that they both get half of the multiplier that party A got (which was 7). Party C however fails to really turn out to debate the bill, getting a score of 1 while Party D passionately defends it, getting a score of 5.
 - Both parties get a multiplier of 3.5, which means Party C gets a total score of 3.5 while Party D gets a total score of 17.5 for that bill.
- Party E writes a motion that breaks a major manifesto commitment. It is a poorly detailed motion that is accompanied by a poorly detailed opening speech. They have good turnout, getting a score of 3.
 - They would amass a multiplier of 1 for this motion, rather than a multiplier of 3 if it had not broken a manifesto commitment - meaning they get a total score of 3 for the motion instead of a possible 9.
- Party E, alternatively, submits the same motion as above but vigorously defends it in debate, getting a score of 5. This counteracts the negative modifier meaning that their multiplier is now back to 3.
 - They now get their multiplier of 3 which with their new score of 5 makes a total of 15 for that motion.
- User A, the author of the motion from Party E, defects from the party. They would receive a score of 3, with a multiplier of 1 which would be applied to them if they were to stand in a by-election or general election that term.

Minister's Questions modifiers

This system is identical to the system for legislation, in that parties are rated between 0-5 after the session is finished based on the number and more importantly the quality of the questions they asked or answered at the session. Multipliers, in addition to the usual base of 1, are applied based on the type of Minister's Questions that it is:

- +3 for PMQs

- +2 for another great office
- +1 for other MQs

These multipliers are given in full to the party of government that holds the respective office, and the remaining parties in government get a proportion of the modifier subject to the size of the government. So for example, in a government of three parties, at PMQs the prime minister's party would get the full +3 multiplier whilst the remaining two parties get half of said modifier - +1.5 each. In a government of four parties however, the prime minister's party would still get the +3 modifier whilst the remaining three parties would only get a third of the modifier - +1 each.

Examples:

- Party A, the leading party of the Official Opposition, puts up a fantastic showing at Prime Minister's Questions, with multiple party members asking detailed questions around a variety of areas with references to local constituencies, promoting their interests whilst attacking the government.
 - They would get a score of 5 for the session with it being multiplied by 3 because it was at Prime Minister's Questions, giving them a total score of 15.
- Party B, who holds the office of Foreign Secretary, answers most of the questions asked to them in the session in good detail - earning them a score of 4.
 - Their score of 4 for the session is multiplied by 2 as it was a session for a great office, giving them a total score of 8 for the session.
- Party C, who is in a three party government with Party B, has a decent showing at the same Foreign Secretary questions, gaining a score of 3.
 - The party gets half of the multipliers of Party B (as it is a three party government), giving a multiplier of 1 which multiplied by their score of 3 gives them a total score of 3 for the session.

Executive Statements

Executive statements will use the same system as both legislation and minister's questions, with a score of 0-5 being applied to parties based on activity within the debates on the statements themselves. Multipliers will be gained similar to legislation as follows:

- Five days after the statement is read to the house, the triumvirate assign a score between 1 and 5 for a parties attendance and contribution to the debate, where 1 represents no contribution whatsoever and 5 represents lots of engaged contribution from many members of the party.
- These scores can be multiplied for a number of factors:
 - Base multiplier (+1 for all)
 - Statement being written (+1 for author and their party).
 - Whether it's an 'important statement' (eg. significant statement and/or satisfies manifesto commitments) as determined by the Triumvirate (+1 for a statement of minor importance, +2 for a minor manifesto commitment, +2 for a statement of medium importance, +3 for a medium manifesto commitment, +4 for a statement of major importance and +5 for a major manifesto commitment).
 - Whether it *breaks* any manifesto commitments (-1 for a minor manifesto break and -2 for a major manifesto break)
 - Note that for a minor manifesto break, a score of 4 or higher will cancel this multiplier and for a major manifesto break a score of 5 will cancel this multiplier. Therefore turning out your party in the debate, if it is something that goes against your manifesto, can still cancel the negative multiplier for doing so but at the risk of

exposing internal divisions by having party members potentially arguing for something they disagree with.

- How detailed the statement itself is (+1 for poor detail, +2 for adequate detail, +3 for excellent detail).
- Parties within a government issuing a statement get a proportion of the modifier based on how many parties are sponsoring it; for example if two parties are sponsoring it in addition to the author and their party, the author and their party will get the full multiplier and the sponsoring parties will both get half of the total multiplier each. If three parties were sponsoring it in addition to the author and their party then the author and their party would still get the full multiplier but the sponsoring parties would only get a third of the multiplier each.
- At the conclusion of the modifier term, the scores for statement debates are averaged out and then applied as a percentage modifier. For example if you average a total score of 15 over the course of the term, you'll receive a +15% modifier at the general election for statements.

Examples:

- Party A writes a statement that is adequately detailed and satisfies a minor manifesto commitment. They have a good showing at the debate, amassing a score of 3.
 - They would get a multiplier of 6 which alongside their score of 3 gives them a total score of 18 for the statement.
- Party B debates well on a statement not written or sponsored by them, amassing a score of 4.
 - Due to the base multiplier being 1, their total score is therefore 4 for this statement.
- Parties C and D are in government with Party A, who makes the statement in example 1, meaning that they both get half of the multiplier that party A got (which was 6). Party C however fails to really turn out to debate the statement, getting a score of 1 while Party D passionately defends it, getting a score of 5.
 - Both parties get a multiplier of 3, which means Party C gets a total score of 3 while Party D gets a total score of 18 for that statement.
- Party E writes a statement that breaks a minor manifesto commitment. It is a poorly detailed statement. They have good turnout, getting a score of 3.
 - They would amass a multiplier of 1 for this motion, rather than a multiplier of 2 if it had not broken a manifesto commitment - meaning they get a total score of 3 for the statement instead of a possible 6.
- Party E, alternatively, submits the same statement as above but vigorously defends it in debate, getting a score of 4. This counteracts the negative modifier meaning that their multiplier is now back to three.
 - They now get their multiplier of 3 which with their new score of 4 makes for a total score of 12 for that statement.

MP Turnout

The modifiers for MP turnout remain unchanged in this system, meaning that, for example, an aggregated party turnout of 92% will result in a -8% modifier being applied, whereas 96% will result in a -4% modifier being applied, et cetera.

Committee Representative Turnout

The modifiers for the committee representative are similar to the turnout system that is used to determine MP turnout modifiers. For example, if a committee representative had a total turnout of 92% it would result in a -0.8% modifier being applied whereas a 96% will result in a -0.4% modifier being applied, et cetera.