

Dharma direct

Dharma direct as well as its authors are funded by donations.

The *dāna* pool is distributed among the authors of the magazine, based on rules described below. Such *dāna* is far from allowing a luxurious lifestyle, it is nonetheless a critical support to practitioners dedicated to studying in depth, and sharing/transmitting, the *Dharma*.

The *dāna* pool is based on **donations received, reduced by hard costs.**

Hard costs include those related to the domain name, the hosting service, all transaction costs, some hardware amortization (for hardware directly related to providing/running this service)... At the launch (March 2019) of Dharma direct, this equates € 94 per month. This is expected to be constant over the next 2 years.

The resulting *dāna* pool is distributed to authors of the magazine, per issue, before the next issue comes out.

Assume, by the end of the current issue of the magazine, the *dāna* pool is € 611 (net of the transaction costs expected when paying the authors).

An author's share of the *dāna* pool is first and foremost based on **weighted readership.**

In due time, the 'weight' will be based on collected feedback... but the mechanism for feedback is not yet in place, therefore it's currently measured as the number of members (logged in) having accessed the article, by the end of the current issue of the magazine.

Assume there are 5 articles in a particular issue, and weights are measured as $\omega_1=[300, 200, 10, 1, 100]$.

A priori, the share of the *dāna* pool for one article is **proportional to the square root** of weighted readership.

Authors would *a priori* receive a share of € 611, proportional to $\omega_1'=\sqrt{\omega_1}=[17.32, 14.14, 3.16, 1, 10]$. Given $\Sigma\omega_1'=45.62$, this implies respective shares of $\omega_1''=[38.0\%, 31.0\%, 6.9\%, 2.2\%, 21.9\%]$ of the *dāna* pool, i.e. [€ 232.18, € 189.31, € 42.16, € 13.44, € 133.81].

However, this is **subject to a maximum**, initially (March 2019) at € 200 per article: any excess is redistributed among authors not having reached the maximum.

€ 232.18 is capped at € 200, and € 32.18 are thus to be redistributed based on $\omega_2'=[0, 14.14, 3.16, 1, 10]$, $\Sigma\omega_2'=28.30$... which would mean an extra of [€ 0, € 16.09, € 3.59, € 1.14, € 11.37], except that € 189.31+16.09 = € 205.40, which is above the maximum (€ 200), so the procedure iterates another time, based on € 5.40, $\omega_3'=[0, 0, 3.16, 1, 10]$ and $\Sigma\omega_3'=14.16$.

The final distribution is then [€ 200, € 200, € 46.86, € 14.96, € 148.99] —algorithmically, the rounding will only occur at end so the total would be € 611 (instead of € 610.81 for the above).

The two most popular articles (with 300 and 200 initial weights) have received the maximum (€ 200), the third most popular still has received a meaningful amount (€ 149). Yet, solidarity within the *saṅgha* implies that the *least* popular article received 1/13.37 of the *most* popular article (not a naïve, ridiculous 1/300 fraction).

If the *dāna* pool is **larger** than the maximum per article multiplied by the number of articles, then all authors will get the maximum per article, by construction... and the **leftover** will be kept as **provision** towards the costs, and the *dāna* pool, of the next issue of the magazine.

If there's a perpetual leftover, not only the maximum per article might be raised (to reflect the high value these articles seem to provide to the community at large) but also the funding of other projects might be proposed to members (subject to a vote, in due time).