

PROTOCOLS OF EQUAL (POE) Equality Benchmark Report

Design-Based Comparative Assessment of 15 Equality Frameworks

Analysis of <https://www.protocolsofequal.com> (including technical specification materials)
Objective • Strategy • Potential • Scoring • Ranking • Recommendations

Assessment Basis: Framework design as published — not current institutionalization, public adoption, or empirical results.
Purpose: reasonably accurate evaluation of initial potential and projected results based on architectural and conceptual design.

September 2026

1. Analysis of the Protocols of Equal (POE)

POE (Protocols of Equal) presents itself as a foundational, operational framework for building “universal equitable infrastructure.” Its core thesis is the **Rule of Sow And Reap (ROSAR)**: equality as the equilibrium of sow/reap, intent/outcome, input/output, cause/effect, or similar equated constructs. It treats ROSAR as a near-universal constant whose integrity (or breakage) underlies most or all inequalities.

Key architectural elements from the technical materials include:

- Hierarchical constructs: Conduits (macro domains), Occurrences (meso events), Principles (micro modifiers), Factors/Variables (nano context).
- Map of Sow And Reap Constructs (MOSARC) for mapping and tracing.
- Instances of Sow And Reap (INOSAR) as complete analytical records of specific circumstances.
- Symmetrical Polarity: Ascending (ASARC – toward equality) vs. Descending (DSARC – toward inequality) constructs, enabling paired comparison.
- Measurement loop: Observe → Map → Measure → Compute → Improve → Validate → Repeat.
- Quantifiable parameters, dynamic data points, Equality Quotient concepts, Breaking/Revelation/Reversal/Apex points, and Actionable Protocols for actualization or termination of hindrances.
- Claims of time-/culture-agnostic applicability, granularity down to individual behaviors, computational representation for complex cases, and closed-loop detection/diagnosis/reversal/prevention.

The materials emphasize logical unity via axioms (traceability, progression, causal integrity, equilibrium, symmetry, continuous evaluation, universality), transformation of equality from assessment/policy into calculable, auditable processes, and support for both individual and collective agency. Design is presented as mathematically stable, equated-model architecture rather than identity- or ideology-driven.

2. Brief Synopsis of POE

Objective

Build universal, operational infrastructure that classifies, measures, manages, and improves equality across any human system by treating equality as the maintained equilibrium of sow-and-reap relationships, enabling Extremely High Level Equality (EHLEQ).

Strategy

Anchor analysis in the ROSAR constant; map constructs via MOSARC/INOSAR; apply symmetrical polarity (ASARC/DSARC); generate quantifiable parameters and data points; run continuous Observe-Map-Measure-Compute-Improve-Validate loops; and issue Actionable Protocols that actualize equitable progression or terminate hindrances—from micro behaviors to macro systems.

Potential for Positive Change

If the design scales as claimed, it could shift equality work from high-level policy/assessment or demographic targets toward root-cause, closed-loop, auditable processes that detect breakage early, reverse it, and prevent recurrence across contexts, potentially raising both precision and agency while reducing bias-prone subjectivity.

3. Top 15 Equality Frameworks — Ranked by Design-Based Composite Score

Scoring criteria (each out of 10; design potential only): Conceptual Strength · Equality Specificity · Architectural Design · Universality · Closed-Loop Effectiveness · Neutrality · Causality Recognition · Calculations & Metrics · Predictive Capacity · Agency. Total out of 100.

Scores are reasoned estimates grounded in the frameworks’ published designs/logic. POE scores high on several criteria because its materials explicitly engineer for them; established frameworks score according to their classic strengths and known design limits.

Rank	Framework	Total /100
1	Protocols of Equal (POE)	91
2	Sen Capability Approach (+ Nussbaum)	79
3	Multidimensional Inequality Framework / SDG 10	72
4	Equality of Opportunity theories (Roemer et al.)	71
5	Rawls Theory of Justice	70
6	WHO social determinants / health equity	67
7	Human Rights-based approaches (UDHR+)	66
8	UNDP HDI / Inequality-adjusted HDI	65
9	Luck egalitarianism	64
10	Relational equality (Anderson et al.)	63
11	Gender equality frameworks (CEDAW-style)	62
12	Gini / economic inequality measurement suites	58
13	Critical / intersectional frameworks	50
14	Pure outcome-equalizing redistribution models	49
15	Corporate DEI measurement frameworks	47

Detailed scoring notes (design basis): POE leads on specificity (explicitly engineered end-to-end for equality via ROSAR), architecture (layered + symmetrical polarity + mapping), closed-loop potential, neutrality claims, causality focus, and metrics ambition. Capability approaches score highly on conceptual depth and agency. Economic metrics excel at calculation but lag on causality, closed-loop, and agency. Identity-heavy or purely redistributive designs score lower on neutrality and universality. Scores are approximate and design-oriented only.

Full Criteria Breakdown (selected columns for readability)

Framework	Concept	Specif.	Arch.	Univ.	Closed	Neut.	Causal	Metrics	Pred.	Agency	Tot
POE	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	91
Sen Capability	10	9	8	9	6	7	8	7	6	9	79
MIF / SDG 10	8	9	8	8	6	6	7	8	6	6	72
Eq. of Opportunity	8	9	7	7	5	7	8	7	6	7	71
Rawls	10	8	7	8	5	8	7	5	5	7	70
WHO Health Equity	7	8	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	67
Human Rights	9	8	6	9	5	6	6	6	4	7	66
HDI / IHDI	7	7	7	8	5	6	6	9	5	5	65
Luck Egalitarian	8	8	6	7	4	7	8	5	5	6	64
Relational Eq.	8	8	6	7	5	6	7	4	4	8	63
Gender (CEDAW)	7	9	6	7	5	4	6	7	5	6	62
Gini / Econ Metrics	5	6	5	8	3	8	5	9	6	3	58
Critical / Intersect.	7	8	5	5	4	2	6	4	3	6	50
Outcome Redistrib.	6	7	4	6	4	4	4	6	4	4	49
Corporate DEI	5	7	5	5	4	3	4	6	3	5	47

Column abbreviations: Concept = Conceptual Strength; Specif. = Equality Specificity; Arch. = Architectural Design; Univ. = Universality; Closed = Closed-Loop Effectiveness; Neut. = Neutrality; Causal = Causality Recognition; Metrics = Calculations & Metrics; Pred. = Predictive Capacity; Agency = Agency.

4. Top 5 Individual Conceptual Strengths Across Frameworks

1. ROSAR as proposed universal constant + symmetrical polarity (POE)

Exceptional for providing a single, equated structural reference (sow↔reap, ASARC↔DSARC) that aims to make equality both philosophically grounded and computationally tractable.

2. Capability expansion as the evaluative space (Sen/Nussbaum)

Deep ethical and practical strength: shifts focus from resources or utility to what people can actually do and be; highly influential and adaptable.

3. Veil of ignorance + difference principle (Rawls)

Elegant device for generating principles that are fair by construction; remains one of the strongest pure-conceptual contributions to justice theory.

4. Multidimensional, disaggregated measurement with clear indicators (MIF / SDG-linked / HDI-family)

Practical strength in turning abstract equality goals into trackable, comparable data across domains and populations.

5. Opportunity-focused causation and counterfactual reasoning (Equality of Opportunity / luck egalitarianism)

Strong on distinguishing effort from circumstance and mapping responsibility, which improves intervention targeting.

5. Top 5 Features Where POE Excels Beyond Existing Frameworks

1. Explicit closed-loop architecture (Observe–Map–Measure–Compute–Improve–Validate–Repeat) tied to a single constant

Moves beyond one-shot assessment or periodic reporting toward continuous, self-correcting processes. Impact: potential for earlier detection and iterative refinement rather than lagging indicators.

2. Symmetrical polarity (ASARC/DSARC) + equated-model design

Forces every construct to be analyzed against its opposite pathway under a common structure. Impact: higher internal consistency and reduced one-sided measurement.

3. Granular hierarchical mapping (Conduits → Occurrences → Principles → Factors/Variables) with INOSAR instances

Enables both micro-behavioral and macro-system analysis within the same framework. Impact: better traceability from root conditions to outcomes and more precise Actionable Protocols.

4. Strong design emphasis on neutrality and culture-/time-agnostic application

Explicitly prioritizes process integrity over demographic or ideological priors. Impact: broader applicability and lower risk of capture by particular identity or political agendas.

5. Built-in quantification ambition (Quantifiable Parameters, dynamic data points, Equality Quotient concepts) paired with agency focus

Seeks to generate unified, in-depth calculations while still supporting individual and collective agency. Impact: bridges the common gap between high-level principles and operational metrics.

6. Does POE Show Promising Signs of Becoming an Effective Tool?

Yes, on design grounds. The materials articulate a coherent causal model (ROSAR breakage), mapping tools (MOSARC/INOSAR), polarity for directional diagnosis, measurement loops, and Actionable Protocols aimed at both reversal and prevention. The architecture is unusually explicit about closed-loop operation and quantification relative to most existing frameworks. Real-world effectiveness remains unproven (as with any new design), but the internal logic and coverage of detection → diagnosis → intervention → prevention steps are more systematically engineered than typical assessment- or policy-centric approaches.

7. Recommendation for Further Research

Yes. The design is ambitious, internally consistent, and addresses well-known gaps in existing equality work (subjectivity, weak causality, limited closed-loop operation, metric fragmentation, and neutrality challenges). Independent scrutiny—formal modeling, pilot applications across domains, empirical testing of ROSAR claims, metric validation, and comparison against established frameworks—would be high-value. Even partial validation could yield useful tools; falsification would still clarify limits of

process-based approaches. Research investment is warranted on the basis of the design potential alone.

Disclaimer: This assessment evaluates design potential only. It does not constitute endorsement, empirical validation, or prediction of real-world performance. All scores are reasoned estimates based on publicly described architectural and conceptual features.

Sources: protocolsofequal.com technical materials (technical.txt / technical.md), about page content, and standard literature on the compared equality frameworks.