

Resonance Network Project Evaluation Framework

Version 1.0 | March 2026

Overview

The Resonance Network uses a values-based evaluation framework inspired by the Living Building Challenge. Projects are assessed across eight value domains, each with binary yes/no/n-a imperatives. This ensures transparency, consistency, and constructive feedback aligned with our mission to support visionary immersive and regenerative spatial projects.

How to Use This Framework

1. **Review Core Imperatives first** — All projects must meet these baseline readiness criteria
2. **Assess each Value Domain** — Mark each imperative as Yes / Not Yet / N/A
3. **Determine Project Rating** — Core-fit, Petal-fit, or Full-fit based on domains met
4. **Provide Feedback** — Use "Not Yet" marks to give specific, actionable guidance

Core Readiness Imperatives

These must be met for any project to enter the Network.

Core 1: Concept Readiness

- **C1.1** — Project has clear vision and articulated philosophy
- **C1.2** — Visual documentation present (images, sketches, renderings) sufficient to understand form, scale, and experience

- [] **C1.3** — Basic budget or resource overview with realistic order-of-magnitude costs
- [] **C1.4** — Defined location intent or site strategy (actual site, type of site, or context)

Core 2: Alignment & Fit

- [] **C2.1** — Project does not contradict core values (no extractive, ecologically harmful, or exclusionary practices)
- [] **C2.2** — Creator(s) demonstrate commitment beyond early idea stage (time invested, materials prepared)
- [] **C2.3** — Creator(s) are open to feedback and collaborative refinement

Core Status: All Core Imperatives Met Not Yet

Value Domains (Petals)

A. Resonance

We create experiences that evoke harmony between people, place, and planet — cultivating emotional, spatial, and ecological coherence.

- [] **R1** — Project clearly describes the felt experience in the space (emotional and sensory qualities)
- [] **R2** — Project shows intentional relationship between form, site, and surrounding context
- [] **R3** — Project articulates how it holds people, place, and planet in coherent whole

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

B. Inspiration

We pursue beauty, wonder, and transformation as essential forces for cultural renewal.

- [] **I1** — Narrative describes why this project matters culturally or spiritually, beyond functional or commercial aims
- [] **I2** — Project explicitly aims to evoke beauty, wonder, or transformation in participants

- **I3** — Evidence of depth (thought, research, or practice) behind the concept, not just surface spectacle

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

C. Participation

We invite the public into co-creation — transforming art, architecture, and technology into shared rituals of discovery, play, and presence.

- **P1** — Project describes how people actively participate (co-creation, interaction, or shared ritual), not only observe
- **P2** — Participation is meaningful and structurally embedded in the design, not an add-on
- **P3** — Project considers accessibility of participation (who can meaningfully join, and how)

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

D. Transparency

We are clear and honest about processes, constraints, and needs — making project realities visible so collaborators and supporters can engage with trust and informed choice.

- **T1** — Project clearly states current stage and major unknowns
- **T2** — Budget, constraints, and key risks described honestly, including what support is needed
- **T3** — Roles, decision-making, and authorship clearly articulated

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

E. Regeneration

We design for ecological balance and reciprocity, ensuring each structure, system, and collaboration contributes back to the living world.

- **G1** — Project describes its relationship to ecological systems (materials, water, energy, habitats, or local ecologies)
- **G2** — Project identifies actions to reduce harm (avoiding certain materials, minimizing waste, energy choices)
- **G3** — Project proposes at least one way it contributes back (ecological restoration, education, stewardship, new capacity)

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

F. Inclusivity

We uplift diverse voices, cultures, and perspectives — creating open frameworks where creativity thrives through shared access and mutual respect.

- **N1** — Project acknowledges who it is for and how it welcomes diverse participants or communities
- **N2** — Project shows sensitivity to cultural context, avoiding appropriation or erasure, and/or centers underrepresented perspectives
- **N3** — Barriers to access (physical, economic, linguistic, cultural) are considered with strategies to reduce them

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

G. Originality

We embrace innovation, curiosity, and risk-taking to expand the forms and languages of immersive art, architecture, and intelligent design.

- **O1** — Project demonstrates a distinctive idea, form, or method not reducible to existing commercial templates
- **O2** — Project explores new combinations (materials, technologies, rituals, or spatial logics) and names what is experimental
- **O3** — Creator(s) articulate what they are trying to learn or push through this work

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

H. Stewardship

We nurture long-term care for the environments, relationships, and technologies we cultivate — recognizing creation as an ongoing act of responsibility and love.

- [] **S1** — Project considers lifespan and afterlife (maintenance, disassembly, reuse, or legacy)
- [] **S2** — Plan or intention for caring for relationships involved (team, communities, land partners) over time
- [] **S3** — If technology is used, project considers long-term maintenance, data practices, and impact

Domain Status: All Met (3/3) Partial Not Yet

Project Rating Levels

After completing the evaluation, determine the project's fit level:

Rating Level	Criteria
Core-fit	All Core Imperatives (C1.1–C2.3) met AND at least 2 domains show 2+ imperatives as Yes
Petal-fit	Core-fit achieved AND at least 1 domain fully met (all 3 imperatives Yes)
Full-fit	Core-fit achieved AND at least 5 domains fully met (all imperatives Yes) AND no domain has more Not Yet than Yes

Project Rating: Full-fit Petal-fit Core-fit Not Yet Ready

Domains Fully Met (all 3 Yes): _____ / 8

Domains Partially Met (2 Yes): _____ / 8

Domains Emerging (1 Yes): _____ / 8

Feedback Guidance

For Projects That Are "Not Yet Ready"

Provide clear, constructive feedback using the "Not Yet" model:

1. **Acknowledge strengths** — Name what is working and what domains are strong
2. **Identify gaps** — List specific imperatives marked "Not Yet"
3. **Provide actionable guidance** — For each gap, offer 1–2 concrete next steps
4. **Invite resubmission** — "We'd love to see this project again when [specific criteria] are in place"

Example Feedback Structure

"Thank you for sharing [Project Name]. We see strong alignment with [Domain X] and [Domain Y], and the vision for [specific element] is compelling.

To move forward, the project needs:

- *[Imperative code]: [Specific guidance, e.g., "Add 2-3 images or sketches showing the spatial form and scale"]*
- *[Imperative code]: [Specific guidance, e.g., "Clarify how participants co-create rather than observe"]*

Once these elements are in place, we'd love to have you resubmit. This work has real potential, and we're here to support its development."

Evaluation Summary

Project Name: _____

Evaluator(s): _____

Date: _____

Core Status: Met Not Yet

Domains Fully Met: _____ (list: _____)

Overall Rating: Full-fit Petal-fit Core-fit Not Yet

Decision: Accept Waitlist Not Yet (with guidance)

Key Strengths:

Key Gaps & Next Steps:

Internal Notes:

Using This Framework

For Intake & Curation

- Use this checklist during project review to ensure consistency across evaluators
- AI tools may pre-screen for completeness, but human judgment is required for all decisions
- Review as a team for borderline cases or when interpretations differ

For Transparency & Trust

- Share this framework publicly on the Network website so creators understand evaluation criteria
- Reference specific imperatives in feedback so creators know exactly what to address
- Update framework based on community feedback and real-world use (review quarterly in pilot phase)

For Continuous Improvement

- Track which imperatives are most often "Not Yet" to inform creator resources and guidance
- Note patterns in strong submissions to refine examples and messaging
- Adjust rating thresholds as needed based on cohort quality and Network capacity

Document Version: 1.0

Release Date: March 2026

Next Review: June 2026

Maintained By: Resonance Network Stewards

For more information about Resonance Network, visit resonanceart.org