

Adapting Political Elections to Permanent Digital Feedback Mechanisms in the Context of a Digital Democracy (October 2026)



"Trusted WEB 4.0 is the Integration of all resources available via the Web into an overall system.

Machines, devices and people are globally accessible, organized in decentralized, anonymous structures.

Trusted WEB 4.0 maps pre-digital social structures.

*The value chains are being reorganised."
(Olaf Berberich, 2007)*

Adaptation of Political Elections and Parties to Permanent Digital Feedback Mechanisms in the Context of a Digital Democracy (particularly in the Trusted WEB 4.0)

- Real-time feedback systems for political decision-making processes are technically feasible and are already being tested in pilot projects.
- Category-based, staggered elections could break the dominance of individual interest groups and increase political diversity.
- Lobbying is being redefined by digital feedback mechanisms, with more transparency and citizen participation, but also new risks.
- Legal and ethical challenges require comprehensive regulation in order to address data protection, disinformation, and the digital divide.
- Practical examples from countries such as Estonia and India, and at the municipal level, show the opportunities and limits of digital democracy.
- The EU-D-S deliberately does not address all citizens, but a target group with an active interest in permanent political participation; those who want to participate actively can receive higher participation payments instead of social welfare.
- Since this target group sees meaning in permanent political participation, the risk that a permanent feedback will not work is significantly lower in the EU-D-S than in the comparison projects.

Introduction

The digital transformation of democracy is at the center of a promising but also challenging development. The idea of adapting political elections and parties through permanent digital feedback mechanisms promises to increase citizen participation, make political decision-making processes more transparent, and redefine the influence of interest groups. In the context of Trusted WEB 4.0 – a vision of a secure, transparent, and participatory digital space – the question arises of how such systems must be structured in order to enable intensive, permanent participation while at the same time guaranteeing the integrity of democratic processes. An essential insight in this context is that the EU-D-S does not target the entire population: not every citizen wants to or can participate permanently in political decisions. The EU-D-S therefore deliberately addresses a target group that brings an active interest in permanent political involvement. This work examines existing academic studies, pilot projects, and theoretical approaches that deal with real-time feedback systems, category-based elections, and the role of digital tools in political decision-making. Technical, legal, and ethical challenges are analyzed comprehensively.

Existing Research and Models

The academic literature of recent years shows a growing interest in digital feedback mechanisms for increasing citizen participation and improving democratic processes. Various studies analyze how digital tools can increase political participation by enabling real-time communication between citizens and decision-makers. For example, systematic analyses show that digital platforms improve inclusivity and deliberation by offering citizens diverse channels to voice their concerns and to take part in political decisions. However, a gap in the feedback loops is also identified, as there is often no continuous interaction between citizens and government, and the mechanisms of decision-making and implementation remain unclear. [1][2][3][4]

Some models propose dividing political elections into different categories and holding them at different times in order to prevent the dominance of individual interest groups. These approaches aim to increase political diversity and to minimize the influence of extremist or autocratic tendencies. Studies show that such systems can promote political stability and inclusivity by strengthening multi-party systems and consensus-building. However, implementation is also associated with challenges, in particular the complexity of organizing multiple elections and the danger of declining voter turnout. [5][6][7]

The role of lobbying is being rethought in the digital context. While lobbyists traditionally act through direct contacts and indirect influence, digital feedback mechanisms enable transparent and inclusive citizen participation that can offset the influence of lobbyists. Institutional solutions that rely on transparency and accountability could strengthen democracy and increase citizens' trust in political institutions. [8][9][10][11]

Technically, digital feedback systems are already implementable today. Blockchain-based solutions offer secure, transparent, and tamper-proof voting, as tested, for example, in Estonia or in pilot projects in India. These technologies enable the capture and analysis of citizen feedback in real time, thus promoting the transparency and traceability of political decisions. However, challenges also have to be mastered here, in particular the digital divide, data protection concerns, and the danger of disinformation. [4][12][13]

Legally, such systems require an adaptation of electoral laws and constitutions in order to enable digital feedback mechanisms while at the same time securing data protection and civil rights. The ethical implications include the danger of manipulating public opinion through data-driven persuasion and the necessity of overcoming the digital divide in order to guarantee representative citizen participation. [3][4]

Practical examples from various countries show that digital feedback mechanisms can be used successfully to increase citizen participation and to make political processes more transparent. For example, the Indian government reformed the distribution of subsidies through digital feedback systems with projects such as Lakshya and PaHaL, thereby increasing efficiency and transparency. In New Zealand, SmartStart created a platform that brings together parents and healthcare providers, thus improving the quality of services. In Kenya, mobile voting systems were tested that increase the political inclusion of marginalized groups. These examples show the potential of digital tools, but they also harbor challenges such as limited digital skills and infrastructure deficits. [12][14][15]

Comparison with the Proposed Model

The concept of getmySense in the European Digital System (EU-D-S) envisages a permanent digital feedback system that enables continuous citizen participation. In one crucial point, the EU-D-S differs from the comparison projects considered: it does not assume that all citizens are in the EU-D-S. Those who should participate are people who bring an active interest in long-term political engagement and, possibly, in freeing themselves from a poor social position. Citizens who, because of their upbringing, do not feel able to make their own decisions, or who are dependent on social media, will not participate in the EU-D-S and are not wanted there either. Without active interest, permanent participation makes no sense – the target group of the EU-D-S sees precisely this as its purpose and therefore participates on a permanent basis.

The idea of dividing political topics into different categories and putting them to the vote at different times finds support in studies that highlight the advantages of staggered elections for political diversity and stability. The role of active members as generators of value creation and passive members as representatives of democratic currents coincides with the findings on the importance of transparency and inclusion in digital democracies. The proposed redefinition of lobbying as transparent and inclusive citizen participation corresponds to the demands for more accountability and less influence by opaque interest groups.

For the social dimension, a realistic assessment is crucial: the state will not be able to roll back social welfare completely. However, for those who actively want it, it can alternatively assume slightly higher participation payments in the EU-D-S. This goes hand in hand with social recognition, because no social welfare is received any more, and with the chance to free oneself from one's own situation. This offer, too, follows the principle of active interest: it is not an automatic benefit for everyone, but an alternative for citizens who consciously choose the path into the EU-D-S.

Technical feasibility is supported by existing blockchain solutions and digital platforms that enable secure and transparent voting. However, legal and ethical challenges must not be underestimated and require comprehensive regulation in order to address data protection, disinformation, and the digital divide.

In the risk assessment, the clear target group leads to a fundamental difference: the challenges that arise in the comparison projects due to their orientation toward the entire population – limited digital skills, lack of interest, digital divide – affect the EU-D-S to a significantly lesser extent. Since only citizens who see meaning in permanent political participation take part in the EU-D-S, the risk that a permanent feedback will not work is much lower than in the comparison projects.

Challenges and Solution Approaches

Technical Feasibility

Digital feedback mechanisms are technically realizable, as examples from Estonia, India, and other countries show. Blockchain technologies offer tamper-proof voting and increase transparency. However, challenges such as the digital divide, data protection, and cybersecurity have to be mastered. The digital divide can exclude marginalized groups from participation, while cybersecurity risks endanger the integrity of digital voting. Solution approaches include the development of inclusive digital infrastructures and the implementation of strict security standards. [4][12][13] These risks relate to systems that want to include the entire population. The EU-D-S, by contrast, addresses a self-selected, motivated target group, so that the risk that the permanent feedback will not work is significantly lower.

Legal Framework Conditions

The introduction of permanent digital feedback mechanisms requires adjustments to electoral laws and constitutions in order to regulate data protection, data ownership, and civil rights. Comparative analyses of various countries show that different political and administrative framework conditions shape the use and consequences of digital feedback

mechanisms. Independent supervisory authorities are necessary in order to monitor digital opinion surveillance practices in hybrid regimes and to develop standards for data ethics and participatory illusion. [5]

Ethical and Social Implications

Ethical challenges include the manipulation of public opinion through data-driven persuasion and the danger of voter suppression or disinformation campaigns. The development of digital surveillance technologies raises questions about data protection and civil rights. Clear governance rules are needed in order to prevent the abuse of surveillance technologies for non-democratic purposes and to guarantee a balance between security and democratic freedom. [3][4] In terms of social policy: those who do not decide to participate in the EU-D-S remain in the existing social system. Social welfare is not rolled back across the board; only those who actively choose the path into the EU-D-S can receive higher participation payments there – with the chance of social recognition and of a way out of their own social situation.

Practical Implementation

Pilot projects such as Lakshya and PaHaL in India, SmartStart in New Zealand, and mobile voting systems in Kenya show that digital feedback mechanisms can be implemented successfully in order to improve services and increase political inclusion. These projects emphasize the importance of transparency, learning capability, accessibility, and protective measures for the success of feedback loops. However, challenges such as limited digital skills, infrastructure gaps, and institutional barriers have to be overcome in order to guarantee broad and equitable adoption. [12][14][15]

Conclusion and Outlook

The comprehensive research shows that adapting political elections and parties to permanent digital feedback mechanisms in the context of a digital democracy – particularly in the Trusted WEB 4.0 – holds both promising opportunities and considerable challenges. Existing studies and models demonstrate that real-time feedback systems can increase citizen participation, make political decision-making processes more transparent, and redefine the influence of lobbyists. The introduction of category-based, staggered elections could promote political diversity and curb autocratic tendencies.

Technically, such systems are already implementable today, but they require careful regulation in order to address data protection, disinformation, and the digital divide. Legal adjustments are necessary in order to integrate the new mechanisms into existing democratic structures. Ethical challenges require clear governance rules in order to guarantee the integrity and inclusivity of digital democracies.

Practical examples from various countries show that digital feedback mechanisms can be used successfully in order to improve political processes and increase citizen participation. These experiences offer valuable insights for the design of future digital democracies.

For the EU-D-S, a central distinction follows from this: it does not address all citizens, but a target group with an active interest in permanent political participation. Citizens without this active interest – for example because, due to their upbringing, they do not

feel able to make their own decisions, or because they are dependent on social media – remain in the existing social system; social welfare is not rolled back completely. However, those who want to participate actively can receive higher participation payments in the EU-D-S and use the opportunity to free themselves from their own situation. Since the target group of the EU-D-S sees meaning in participating permanently in politics, the risk that a permanent feedback will not work is significantly lower than in the comparison projects.

Overall, the research supports the idea that permanent digital feedback mechanisms and category-based elections have the potential to make political systems more democratic, more transparent, and more inclusive. However, implementation requires a comprehensive and critical examination of the technical, legal, and ethical challenges in order to fully exploit the benefits of digital democracy while at the same time minimizing its risks.

Comparison Table of Important Models/Projects

Name of the model/project	Objective	Feedback mechanism	Role of citizens	Technical basis	Legal framework	Challenges	Sources
Lakshya & PaHaL (India)	Reform of the distribution of subsidies	Real-time feedback via SMS/online portals	Active and passive citizens	Digital platform	Adaptation of existing laws	Digital divide, data protection, infrastructure	[12], [14]
SmartStart (New Zealand)	Improvement of parental and healthcare services	Feedback-based platform	Active citizens	Digital platform	Existing	Digital skills, data protection	[12], [15]
Mobile Voting System (Kenya)	Increasing political inclusion	Mobile voting	Active citizens	Mobile technology	Adaptation of electoral laws	Infrastructure, security, digital divide	[12], [15]
E-Voting in Estonia	Secure and transparent elections	Blockchain-based e-voting	Active citizens	Blockchain	Adaptation of electoral laws	Cybersecurity, data protection	[4], [13]
Digital intra-party democracy (Germany, Spain)	Digitalization of internal party decisions	Online platforms, social media	Party members	Digital platforms	Existing	Data protection, cybersecurity, digital divide	[1]
getmySense in the EU-D-S	Permanent, category-based political participation	Permanent digital feedback	Target group with an active interest in permanent political participation	EU-D-S platform, blockchain	Adaptation of electoral laws; participation payments for active participants	Significantly lower risk that the permanent feedback will not work; social welfare is not rolled back completely	

This analysis provides a well-founded basis for further research and development of digital feedback mechanisms in political elections and parties in the context of a digital democracy.

Sources

- [1] A systematic analysis of digital tools for citizen participation – ScienceDirect
- [2] Impact of Information and Communication Technologies on Democratic Processes and Citizen Participation
- [3] Frontiers | Public opinion monitoring technologies: how the state uses data to make political decisions
- [4] Full article: Artificial Intelligence and Data-Driven Technology in the Public Policy Cycle: Comparative Applications, Opportunities, and Risks
- [5] The Impact of Electoral Systems on Democratic Governance
- [6] Election Timing and the Electoral Influence of Interest Groups – Sarah F. Anzia
- [7] Reimagining the Ballot: A Comprehensive Look at Primary and General Election Systems – R Street Institute
- [8] Frontiers | Toward a new paradigm of convergence in lobby-state interactions: global challenges, communication, and transparency
- [9] Lobbying | OECD
- [10] How Lobbying Matters | Annual Reviews
- [11] Designing Deliberative Lobbying: Three Institutional Solutions for an Open Lobby Democracy – Bitonti (2026) – The Political Quarterly – Wiley Online Library
- [12] Towards Real-Time Governance: Using Digital Feedback to Improve Service, Voice, and Accountability | Center For Global Development
- [13] Full article: Reconstructing elections in a digital world
- [14] Government Feedback Mechanism: Unlocking Business Opportunities through Government Feedback Mechanisms – FasterCapital
- [15] Digital democracy in action: 5 lessons to support resilient democracies | Westminster Foundation for Democracy

Impressum / Legal Notice

DE

Global Institute for Structure relevance,
Anonymity and Decentralization i.G.

Initiator

Olaf Berberich

Breiten Dyk 14

47803 Krefeld

Telefon : 02151-3872601

Mail: infoh@finders.de

Web: www.gisad.eu

EU-Register Nr. **244298340978-40**

Complainant at the Federal Constitutional Court:

- 1 BvR 227/23 -, -1 BvR 1640/24-, -1 BvR 1641/24-,
-2 BvR 907/24 -, -1 BvR 1426/25 -, -2 BvR 1668/25-
-1 BvR 91/26 -

Datenschutz

Die Texte der Studien basieren auf automatischen Recherchen im Internet und werden mithilfe der KI Mistral.ai optimiert und übersetzt. Dabei werden Quellen automatisch ermittelt. Alle Angaben werden sorgfältig geprüft. Sollte sich im Einzelfall doch einmal ein Fehler einschleichen, wären wir für jeden Hinweis dankbar.

Bitte beachten Sie dass von facebook.de, WhatsUp und weiteren Portalen Accounts unter meinem Namen angelegt sind, welche ich nicht pflege, aber auch nicht löschen kann. Außer über E-Mail können Sie GISAD über XING oder LinkedIn erreichen!

GISAD für ein starkes digitales Europa!
Mit Hilfe der EU die vordigitalen
Errungenschaften erhalten!

