

JANUARY 24, 2026



Agenda for Social Equity - Validation System - Foundational Charter



CREATED BY

EUSL AB

Care to Change the World



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 2 |
| Chapter 1 — Purpose and Mandate | 3 |
| Chapter 2 — Legal Status and Competence | 4 |
| Chapter 3 — Universality and Non-Discrimination | 5 |
| Chapter 4 — The 17 SGGs as Canonical Pillars | 7 |
| Chapter 5 — Institutional Interfaces and Roles | 9 |
| Chapter 6 — Validation Partner Ecosystem and Licensing Premises | 11 |
| Chapter 7 — Patient-Level Confidentiality and Autonomy | 13 |
| Chapter 8 — Independent Ethics and Compliance (GSIA) | 15 |
| Chapter 9 — Data, Privacy, and Integrity | 17 |
| Chapter 10 — Transparency, Public Interest, and Non-Retaliation | 20 |
| Chapter 11 — Financial Principles and Sustainability | 22 |
| Chapter 12 — Amendments, Versioning, and Supremacy Clause | 24 |
| Final Word | 26 |



Foundational Charter

Introduction

This Foundational Charter constitutes the constitutional instrument of the Agenda for Social Equity 2074 Validation System (A2074-SRS). It fixes the validation architecture under Agenda 2074, affirms the Social Global Goals (SGGs) as the universal canon, and embeds patient-level confidentiality and independent ethics and compliance jurisdiction under the Global Social Impact Alliance (GSIA). The Charter delineates the normative hierarchy, institutional interfaces, and licensing premises for Validation Partners who design and operate validation models across sectors and geographies. It preserves the standard-setting prerogatives of the Agenda 74 community while enabling an open, innovation-positive ecosystem in which enterprises of all sizes can demonstrate progress, learn by doing, and elect their disclosure posture without coercion or adverse treatment.

The instrument recognizes three principal imperatives. First, the universality of the 17 SGG pillars as a shared language for social equity, inclusion, and responsible enterprise. Second, a privacy-by-default and autonomy-anchored approach to validation that protects participants from reputational, commercial, or political harm absent explicit, informed, and revocable consent to disclose. Third, an independent ethics and compliance function vested in GSIA with guidance, audit, adjudication, and corrective authority that is procedurally fair, protective against retaliation, and interoperable with national and international legal orders.

The Charter is construed as a living instrument, subject to controlled amendments and canonical interpretations, with supremacy afforded to patient-level confidentiality and GSIA's ethics jurisdiction where conflicts arise. It applies globally, across sectors and institutional forms, through partner-operated models—including hospitality-style star systems, points/maturity indices, sector modules, and single-goal deep dives—licensed under Agenda 2074 and accredited under GSIA oversight. It is complemented by the remaining instruments in the A2074-SRS package, including the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, the Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars, the Operating Manual (Open Standard), the Multi-Model Validation Framework, and the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

For clarity and brevity, the following terms govern this Charter and its companion instruments:

| Term | Definition |
|--------------------|---|
| Agenda 2074 | The standard-setting authority and custodian of the 17 SGG pillars; not an audit or certification operator. |
| A2074-SRS | The Agenda 2074 Social Responsibility Standard; the collective validation architecture established by this Charter. |
| SGGs | The 17 Social Global Goals; the canonical pillars defining the universal normative structure of A2074-SRS. |
| GSIA | Independent ethics and compliance custodian with guidance, audit, adjudication, and corrective powers under this Charter. |



| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Validation Partner | An accredited organization licensed to design and operate validation models under A2074-SRS (e.g., EUSL in Europe). |
| Patient-Level Confidentiality | A privacy regime under which validation results are private by default and disclosable only with explicit, informed, revocable consent. |
| Open Standard | A governance posture whereby specifications, interfaces, and interpretive rules are publicly accessible, while protected data remain confidential. |
| Derivative Right | The limited, revocable license by which Validation Partners operate models aligned to the SGG canon under GSIA oversight. |

Chapter 1 — Purpose and Mandate

This Charter establishes the *raison d'être*, legal mandate, and universal scope of the A2074-SRS within the Agenda 74 community. Its purpose is to set forth a coherent, rights-preserving, and innovation-enabling validation architecture that advances the Social Global Goals as a shared and measurable framework for social equity. It affirms Agenda 2074's role as the standard-setter, codifies the SGGs as the universal canon to which all partner models must conform, and vests GSIA with independent ethics and compliance jurisdiction to preserve integrity, fairness, and protection against retaliation.

The mandate is anchored within the Global Social Equity Alliance (GSEA) governance family. Agenda 2074, acting through its Secretariat and Agency as applicable, promulgates the standard and its canonical interpretations; GSIA exercises independent ethics and compliance functions; GSDA ensures resource mobilization for common goods and public interest operations; GSCA and adjacent institutional families interface where cooperative, employer, labor, civil society, and public-private social economy structures engage the A2074-SRS; and DESA units, PCGG, and PCPP provide implementation linkages and sectoral or territorial pathways that are validated, rather than supplanted, by this system.

The Charter applies across sectors and geographies without preference or exclusion. It recognizes proportionality and non-comparative evaluation as systemic principles so that microenterprises, public bodies, cooperatives, and multinational corporations are assessed with fairness and contextual sensitivity, under the doctrine that "everyone can do something." It adopts patient-level confidentiality as a structural right, requiring explicit, informed, and revocable consent for any disclosure of validation results, and prohibits coercion, retaliation, or adverse treatment on the basis of non-disclosure.

The Charter further mandates a digital governance posture consistent with privacy-by-design, secure evidence handling, AI guardrails, and consent ledgering of all disclosures and revocations. It embeds a public-interest transparency framework at the aggregate level (standard evolution, anonymized benchmarks, interpretive updates), without compromising the confidentiality of individual results, except as expressly consented to by the subject party.

The Charter is operationalized through an open market of licensed Validation Partners, each designing and operating models—such as hospitality-style star systems, points or maturity indices, sector-specific modules, and single-goal deep dives—aligned to the SGG canon, accredited under the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, and supervised for ethics and compliance by GSIA. In Europe, the EUSL



hospitality-style star system is adopted as the flagship partner implementation, setting a reference pathway for regional adaptation while remaining under the canonical authority of Agenda 2074 and the independent oversight of GSIA.

Chapter 2 — Legal Status and Competence

Agenda 2074 is a standard-setting authority. It does not function as an audit firm, certification body, or commercial operator of validation models. Its competence lies in promulgating the A2074-SRS, defining canonical interpretations of the 17 SGG pillars, issuing interpretive notes and guidance, and granting derivative rights by license to accredited Validation Partners. All operational validation activities are executed by licensed Validation Partners, who bear responsibility for model design, evidence protocols, assessor competence, client engagement, and the secure handling of data, subject to GSIA ethics and compliance jurisdiction.

Competence allocation within the A2074-SRS is structured to preserve independence between standard-setting, validation operations, and oversight, as follows:

| Function | Competent Body | Core Powers and Limits |
|--|---|---|
| Standard-Setting | Agenda 2074 (Secretariat/Agency) | Issues and maintains the A2074-SRS, canonical interpretations, interpretive notes, and updates; cannot conduct commercial validations or certification activities. |
| Licensing & Accreditation | Agenda 2074 (Licensing) and GSIA (Accreditation Ethics) | Grants derivative rights to operate partner models; conditions licenses on compliance with ethics, confidentiality, and digital governance; GSIA advises or concurs on ethics conditions. |
| Validation Operations | Licensed Validation Partners | Design and operate models (stars, points, modules, deep dives); manage assessor competence; handle evidence and client relations; must implement privacy-by-design, consent ledgering, and AI guardrails. |
| Ethics & Compliance Oversight | GSIA | Issues ethics guidance; conducts audits and inquiries; adjudicates complaints; orders corrective actions and protective measures; may recommend suspension or revocation of licenses for cause. |
| Resource Mobilization | GSDA | Supports sustainability of the standard and public-interest functions; does not interfere with standard-setting independence or case adjudication. |
| Systemic Interfaces | GSCA, DESA units, PCGG/PCPP | Provide thematic and territorial interfaces for ecosystem uptake; do not alter canonical interpretations absent Agenda 2074 action. |



Derivative rights are time-bound, non-exclusive, and revocable for cause, including material breaches of confidentiality, ethics, or digital governance requirements. Licensed Validation Partners must adopt contractual clauses with their clients that entrench the patient-level confidentiality regime, define lawful bases for processing, enable explicit informed consent and revocation, and prohibit coercive disclosure practices. Partners must further implement proportional evidence standards and secure technical controls consistent with the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

Agenda 2074 retains supremacy in interpretive matters. Where disputes arise concerning the meaning, scope, or application of the SGG pillars or companion rules, canonical interpretations issued by Agenda 2074 prevail. GSIA's ethics and compliance adjudications are binding as to remedies, corrective actions, and protective measures within the A2074-SRS, subject to the appeal and review mechanisms defined in the Governance & Oversight Manual. Nothing in this Charter authorizes any party to claim ISO certification or equivalence; ISO 26000 may be referenced only as an optional self-declaration tool within the Communication & Public Disclosure Protocol, without implying certification under ISO.

The non-comparative and proportionality principles are legally embedded in all partner models. Partners shall refrain from league-table rankings or other comparative outputs that could undermine fairness across enterprise sizes or contexts, unless expressly permitted by Agenda 2074 under tightly controlled, anonymized, and ethically reviewed conditions. All disclosures of individual results require explicit, informed, and revocable consent by the subject party, recorded in a consent ledger. Retaliation or adverse treatment due to non-disclosure is prohibited and remediable under GSIA jurisdiction.

Chapter 3 — Universality and Non-Discrimination

This Charter affirms the universal applicability of the A2074-SRS across sectors, geographies, and institutional forms, including microenterprises, small and medium-sized enterprises, multinational corporations, public bodies, cooperatives, civil society organizations, academic institutions, and consortia. Access to the validation system shall not be denied on the basis of size, sector, domicile, ownership model, language, or lawful purpose, subject only to compliance with this Charter and to reasonable eligibility conditions designed to protect integrity, privacy, and public interest.

Universality is operationalized through a proportionality and non-comparative evaluation doctrine. Proportionality requires that the nature and extent of evidence, assessor sampling, and process burdens be calibrated to the capacity, risk profile, and contextual realities of each participant. Non-comparative evaluation prohibits league-table rankings or other cross-entity comparisons that would undermine fairness across heterogeneous contexts, save for anonymized, aggregate transparency authorized under this Charter and the Governance & Oversight Manual. Within-entity benchmarking over time is encouraged to support continuous improvement under the maxim that “everyone can do something.”

Non-discrimination extends to fee structures, accessibility, language accommodations, and procedural protections. Licensed Validation Partners shall implement tiered and transparent pricing models, hardship considerations for microenterprises and civil society organizations, and reasonable accommodations for language, disability, and technological accessibility. Partners shall refrain from preferential treatment, undue delay, or differential procedural handling based on commercial leverage or public profile. Conflicts of interest shall be identified, disclosed, and mitigated in accordance with the Ethics & Integrity Code and GSIA guidance. Retaliation, coercion, or adverse treatment for electing non-disclosure of results is prohibited and remediable under GSIA jurisdiction.



The universality principle does not dilute the integrity of the standard. Participants remain bound by the 17 SGG pillars and their canonical interpretations; however, the evidentiary path and improvement horizons may differ by archetype, sector, and jurisdiction. Validation outputs shall be constructed to preserve patient-level confidentiality and autonomy while enabling de-identified, aggregate insights that advance the public interest and the evolution of the standard. Exceptions to confidentiality shall not be implied or inferred; disclosure requires explicit, informed, and revocable consent recorded in the consent ledger, as prescribed in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

To guide implementation, the following proportionality matrix illustrates indicative expectations by enterprise archetype. It shall be read in conjunction with the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, the Multi-Model Validation Framework, and the Governance & Oversight Manual. Where tensions arise, GSIA's ethics guidance and adjudications prevail as to remedies and protective measures.

| Enterprise Archetype | Indicative Evidence Burden | Assessment Modality | Improvement Horizon | Fee Principles |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Microenterprise (≤ 10 FTE) | Narrative attestations, lightweight artefacts, limited sampling; focus on intent, minimum controls, and near-term actions proportionate to capacity | Remote assessment with targeted interviews; limited site verification where risk warrants | 12–24 months with staged milestones | Tiered fees with hardship provisions; cost-recovery orientation |
| SME (11–249 FTE) | Mixed documentary and transactional evidence; sampling across core processes; baseline risk assessment | Hybrid remote/on-site; competence-based sampling | 12–24 months with measurable control strengthening | Tiered fees; predictability and transparency |
| Large Corporate (≥ 250 FTE or high risk) | Comprehensive evidence across policy, process, and outcomes; internal audit interfaces; third-party artefacts where relevant | On-site and remote blended; multi-site sampling based on risk | 12–36 months with formal improvement programs | Full-cost fees with public-interest contributions where applicable |
| Public Body | Policy-to-practice tracing; statutory compliance mapping; citizen-impact evidence; procurement integrity | On-site where feasible; stakeholder hearings as appropriate | 12–36 months with public reporting options subject to consent | Public-sector terms; non-profit custodianship respected |



| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Cooperative/Civil Society | Governance practice evidence; member rights; community benefits; resource stewardship | Remote with selective site engagements; member consultations | 12–24 months; participatory improvement cycles | Tiered fees; facilitation of access and inclusion |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|

Discrimination complaints, access disputes, or allegations of coercion shall be received and adjudicated by GSIA under the Governance & Oversight Manual. Corrective actions may include injunctive relief, process redesign, fee remediation, license conditions, suspension, or revocation, as circumstances warrant.

Chapter 4 — The 17 SGGs as Canonical Pillars

The Social Global Goals (SGGs) constitute the canonical, non-derogable pillars of the A2074-SRS. They define the normative structure to which all Validation Partner models must conform. The SGGs, as promulgated and version-controlled by Agenda 2074, are incorporated herein by reference. Canonical one-sentence statements and interpretive notes for each SGG are authoritatively set forth in Document 3 (Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars) and its annexes. This Charter binds all partners to those statements and to subsequent canonical interpretations, with supremacy afforded to Agenda 2074 in the event of ambiguity or conflict.

All validation models shall maintain traceability to each of the 17 pillars. Partners may design hospitality-style star systems, points or maturity indices, sector modules, and single-goal deep dives, provided that no pillar is deleted, substituted, or materially obscured. Weighting, sequencing, sampling, and sector-specific elaborations are permitted where justified by documented risk and materiality determinations and where they preserve the intelligibility of pillar-level performance and improvement. Any aggregation across pillars for summary display shall be reversible, such that underlying pillar-level results remain available to the subject entity and to GSIA for ethics and compliance purposes, subject to patient-level confidentiality.

Minimum control objectives and evidence classes for each pillar shall be established in the Operating Manual (Open Standard) and the Multi-Model Validation Framework and shall be harmonized with the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual to ensure privacy-by-design, consent ledgering, secure evidence handling, and AI guardrails. Partners shall adopt assessor competence criteria that include demonstrated familiarity with the canonical interpretations and the ability to apply proportionality and non-comparative evaluation in practice. ISO 26000 may be used only as an optional self-declaration tool for communication; it does not constitute certification and shall not be presented as such within any A2074-SRS output.

For avoidance of doubt, the following table codifies the binding treatment of the SGG pillars within partner model design and operation. It is normative and shall be read together with Document 3 and the Licensing & Accreditation Framework.

| Canonical Element | Mandatory Treatment | Permitted Treatment (with justification) | Prohibited Treatment |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Pillar Integrity (SGG1–SGG17) | Full inclusion and clear traceability to each pillar | Sector-specific elaborations; | Deletion, substitution, or obscuring of any pillar |



| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | sequencing; justified weighting | |
| Canonical Definitions | Use of Agenda 2074's one-sentence canonical statements and interpretive notes | Supplemental sector notes aligned with canonical text | Rewording that alters meaning or scope |
| Evidence Classes | Adoption of minimum evidence per pillar (policy, process, outcome, grievance/feedback) | Enhanced evidence where risk warrants | Evidence demands that are punitive or disproportionate to archetype |
| Metrics and Indicators | Mapping to illustrative metrics that preserve pillar intent | Alternative metrics where justified and documented | Metrics that invert or dilute pillar intent |
| Aggregation & Display | Reversible aggregation; pillar-level results accessible to subject and GSIA | Composite indices for user experience | Irreversible aggregation that prevents pillar-level review |
| Confidentiality & Consent | Private by default; explicit, informed, revocable consent for any disclosure | Time-bound public summaries with renewal/expiry logic | Implied consent; coerced disclosure; retaliation for non-disclosure |
| AI & Digital Guardrails | Privacy-by-design; consent ledgering; secure storage; audit trails | Model-assisted scoring with human oversight | Fully automated adverse determinations without human review |
| Comparative Outputs | Within-entity time-series benchmarking | Anonymized, aggregate sector insights | Public league tables ranking named entities |
| Remediation & Improvement | Documented plans tied to pillars; fair timelines | Accelerated plans where risk or harm requires | Use of remediation as coercive publicity leverage |

The authoritative one-sentence statements of SGG1–SGG17 shall be published in Annex A to this Charter, which shall be kept in lockstep with Document 3 through version-controlled updates. Until Annex A is appended, the canonical statements as set forth in Document 3 and its most recent interpretive circulars govern.

Validation outputs—whether stars, points, maturity stages, sector badges, or deep-dive attestations—must render the connection to the pillars intelligible to the subject entity and auditable by GSIA. Where partner models introduce user-facing summaries or visual abstractions, they must not mislead as to pillar-level performance, must embed clear disclosures regarding patient-level confidentiality and consent posture, and must implement expiry or review intervals to prevent stale or miscontextualized signals.



Single-goal deep dives are expressly permitted to encourage focused progress on specific pillars. Such deep dives shall remain within the A2074-SRS by preserving canonical language, evidence classes, consent rules, and GSIA oversight, and by indicating the relationship of the deep-dive result to any broader model operated by the partner. Deep dives shall not be represented as comprehensive validation unless accompanied by a statement of scope and limitations, provided to the subject entity and retained for GSIA review.

Chapter 5 — Institutional Interfaces and Roles

This Charter defines the institutional interfaces and role allocations necessary to preserve independence between standard-setting, validation operations, and ethics and compliance oversight, while ensuring coherent interaction across the Agenda 2074 community and its implementing families. The objective is to maintain a clear separation of functions, prevent conflicts of interest, and guarantee that patient-level confidentiality, non-retaliation, and proportionality are embedded across all engagements.

Agenda 2074, acting through its Secretariat for policy stewardship and its Agency for implementation liaison, retains exclusive authority to promulgate the A2074-SRS, issue canonical interpretations of the 17 SGG pillars, and approve derivative licensing terms. The Secretariat maintains the normative corpus and version control, including interpretive circulars, errata, and superseding guidance. The Agency administers structured engagements with implementing families and external counterparts to facilitate uptake without diluting the supremacy of canonical texts. Where doubt arises, canonical interpretations issued by Agenda 2074 prevail, subject to amendment procedures established in Chapter 12.

The Global Social Impact Alliance (GSIA) serves as the independent ethics and compliance custodian. It is vested with authority to issue ethics guidance, conduct targeted or systemic audits, receive and adjudicate complaints, order corrective actions and protective measures, and recommend license conditions, suspensions, or revocations to Agenda 2074 where breaches of confidentiality, coercive disclosure practices, or proportionality failures occur. GSIA's adjudications are binding within the A2074-SRS, subject to appeal and review procedures defined in the Governance & Oversight Manual, and are designed to provide effective remedies without compromising the privacy of participants.

The Global Social Development Alliance (GSDA) functions as a resource mobilization and financial stewardship body for public-interest operations that sustain the standard, including affordability measures for microenterprises and civil society organizations. GSDA's role is fiduciary and supportive; it shall not interfere with standard-setting independence, validation determinations, or GSIA adjudications, and shall adopt ring-fencing practices to preclude financial leverage over ethics or interpretive outcomes.

The Global Social Cooperative Alliance (GSCA) and adjacent institutional families provide thematic and sectoral conduits for engagement with cooperative employers, workers, civil society, and public-private social economy structures. These interfaces remain advisory and facilitative; they cannot amend canonical interpretations or constrain GSIA ethics jurisdiction. The Pan-Continental Global Ground (PCGG) and the Pan-Continental Power Play (PCPP) operate as programmatic frameworks whose implementations may be assessed under A2074-SRS but are not exempt from its confidentiality or non-retaliation rules.

DESA units, including central and regional DESA structures, provide territorial and sectoral pathways for capacity building, digital integration, and institutional development aligned with the SGG pillars.



DESA implementations must incorporate the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, including consent ledging, privacy-by-design, AI guardrails, and secure evidence handling. DESA units may not conduct validations unless separately licensed as Validation Partners, and they remain fully subject to GSIA oversight where they act in any validation-adjacent capacity.

Validation Partners are licensed entities authorized to design and operate validation models consistent with the SGG canon, including hospitality-style star systems, points or maturity indices, sector modules, and single-goal deep dives. They bear operational responsibility for assessor competence, sampling logic, evidence sufficiency, client onboarding, contract terms entrenching patient-level confidentiality, consent management, and secure handling of data. EUSL is recognized as the flagship Validation Partner in Europe, operating a hospitality-style star system aligned to the 17 pillars and to the proportionality and non-comparative doctrines established by this Charter.

To promote clarity and prevent functional drift, the following matrix consolidates the principal interfaces:

| Institutional Actor | Primary Role | Powers and Constraints | Interface Duties |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Agenda 2074 (Secretariat) | Canonical standard-setting | Issues A2074-SRS, canonical interpretations, interpretive circulars; may not operate validations | Maintains version control; publishes amendments; coordinates with GSIA on ethics implications |
| Agenda 2074 (Agency) | Implementation liaison | Facilitates uptake; administers licensing processes; cannot alter canonical texts | Coordinates with GSDA on affordability measures; aligns DESA and programmatic interfaces |
| GSIA | Ethics and compliance custodian | Guidance, audits, adjudication, corrective orders, protective measures; recommends license actions | Operates complaints intake; ensures non-retaliation; supervises consent and privacy compliance |
| GSDA | Resource mobilization | Funds public-interest functions; cannot influence ethics or interpretations | Ensures transparent, ring-fenced financing consistent with non-profit custodianship |
| GSCA and Adjacent Families | Sectoral conduits | Advisory and facilitative; cannot amend canon or limit oversight | Channels sector insights; supports proportionality and access without comparative rankings |
| DESA Units | Capacity and digital integration | Implement platform governance; not validation operators unless licensed | Enforce consent ledging, AI guardrails, and secure evidence controls |



| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| PCGG/PCPP | Program frameworks | Subject to A2074-SRS when assessed; cannot claim exemptions | Align implementations with SGG pillars; respect patient-level confidentiality |
| Validation Partners (e.g., EUSL) | Model design and operation | Operate stars, points, modules, deep dives under license; subject to GSIA oversight | Ensure assessor competence, proportionality, secure evidence, and consent management |

Nothing in this allocation authorizes any actor to derogate from patient-level confidentiality, proportionality, or non-retaliation. Conflicts of competence are resolved by reference to this Charter, with interpretive supremacy vested in Agenda 2074 and ethics remedies vested in GSIA.

Chapter 6 — Validation Partner Ecosystem and Licensing Premises

This Charter establishes an open, innovation-positive market for Validation Partners who design and operate models that conform to the SGG canon and the systemic doctrines of proportionality, non-comparative evaluation, and patient-level confidentiality. The licensing regime confers derivative, non-exclusive, time-bound, and revocable rights to operate, subject to accreditation, ethics compliance, and digital governance obligations. The system is designed to ensure diversity of approaches—hospitality-style stars, points or maturity indices, sector modules, and single-goal deep dives—while preserving canonical integrity and GSIA oversight.

Licensing is administered by Agenda 2074 and conditioned on a demonstrable capacity to uphold this Charter. Applicants must submit model design documentation, pillar-level traceability, sampling and evidence protocols, assessor competence criteria, digital and AI governance controls, consent ledgering mechanisms, and contractual templates that entrench patient-level confidentiality and non-retaliation. GSIA shall review ethics-critical aspects and may impose conditions or require remedial redesign prior to license issuance. Licenses incorporate audit-readiness obligations and continuous improvement undertakings aligned to the Operating Manual (Open Standard) and the Multi-Model Validation Framework.

Accreditation is an ongoing status dependent on performance. GSIA conducts periodic and risk-based ethics and compliance reviews, including inspections of consent records, evidence handling, assessor assignments, conflict-of-interest controls, and client communications. Material breaches—such as coerced disclosure, retaliatory practices, disproportionate evidence demands, or irreversible aggregation that obscures pillar-level results—are remediable through corrective orders or may lead to suspension or revocation. Appeals are governed by the Governance & Oversight Manual, which ensures procedural fairness, confidentiality of sensitive records, and effective remedies for affected parties.

Pricing and access principles are integral to licensing. Partners shall adopt transparent, tiered fee structures, with affordability measures for microenterprises and civil society organizations, without cross-subsidy practices that could distort independence or induce coercion. Marketing and public communications must accurately describe the nature and scope of validations, disclaim any implication of ISO certification, and clearly state that disclosure of results is voluntary, consent-based, and revocable. Any use of ISO 26000 is limited to optional self-declarations within the Communication & Public Disclosure Protocol and does not constitute certification or equivalence.



Model diversity is encouraged within boundaries set by this Charter. Hospitality-style star systems must map each star threshold to explicit pillar-level control objectives. Points or maturity indices must provide reversible aggregation and make pillar-level performance intelligible to the subject and auditable by GSIA. Sector modules may incorporate sector-specific risk lenses and metrics, provided canonical language and evidence classes are preserved. Single-goal deep dives must state scope and limitations, adhere to consent and confidentiality rules, and avoid representing partial attestations as comprehensive validations.

For clarity, the following matrix enumerates the licensing premises and ongoing obligations:

| Premise or Obligation | Licensing Condition | Ongoing Duty | Breach Consequence |
|--|--|---|--|
| Canonical Conformity | Pillar-level traceability and use of canonical definitions | Maintain alignment with updates and interpretive circulars | Corrective order; suspension for persistent non-alignment |
| Proportionality & Non-Comparative Design | Documented sampling, evidence, and burden calibration by archetype | Periodic recalibration using GSIA guidance and risk data | Redesign mandate; potential suspension |
| Patient-Level Confidentiality | Contractual entrenchment; consent ledgering design | Obtain explicit, informed, revocable consent for any disclosure | Injunctive relief; protective measures; license action |
| Digital & AI Governance | Privacy-by-design, secure storage, audit trails, human-in-the-loop scoring | Security testing; AI change control; incident reporting | Remediation; penalties; suspension for material incidents |
| Assessor Competence & Independence | Competence criteria; COI controls; training on canonical texts | Continuing education; rotation to avoid bias | Case nullification; corrective staffing orders |
| Evidence Integrity | Proportional, lawful processing; chain-of-custody; reversible aggregation | Routine QC; retention limits; subject access | Data handling sanctions; corrective orders |
| Communications & Marketing | Accurate scope descriptions; ISO disclaimer; no coercive messaging | Monitoring of partner channels; corrective notices | Public correction; fines; suspension for repeated violations |
| Access & Affordability | Tiered fees; hardship provisions; transparent terms | Reporting on access metrics; GSDA-aligned affordability | Fee remediation; conditions on license renewal |



| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Ethics & Compliance Cooperation | Acceptance of GSIA jurisdiction; audit-readiness | Timely responses; implementation of corrective actions | Escalation to suspension or revocation |
| Recordkeeping & Auditability | Documentation of methods, decisions, and consent events | Retain and furnish records to GSIA upon request | Adverse inference; remedial audits at partner cost |

Nothing in this ecosystem authorizes comparative public rankings of named entities or any retaliation against participants who elect non-disclosure. Disclosure, when chosen, must be time-bound, accompanied by scoping statements, and subject to revocation with prospective effect, all recorded in the consent ledger administered under the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. EUSL, as the flagship Validation Partner in Europe, shall exemplify these premises and will be periodically reviewed by GSIA to ensure continued conformity and to generate learning for system-wide improvements.

Chapter 7 — Patient-Level Confidentiality and Autonomy

This Charter adopts a hospital-patient analogue to govern all validation engagements under the A2074-SRS. Validation results are private by default, held in confidence by the Validation Partner and accessible only to the subject entity and the independent ethics custodian, GSIA, for purposes of oversight and remedies. Any public disclosure of results, in whole or in part, shall occur solely upon explicit, informed, and revocable consent of the subject entity, recorded via consent ledging consistent with the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. No actor within the system may infer or imply consent from conduct, commercial necessity, or silence, nor may any actor condition services, pricing, or access on disclosure that exceeds what is necessary to perform the validation service under this Charter.

Consent is a discrete legal act with scope and duration. It must be specific to the content to be disclosed, the audience, the channel, the duration, and any secondary uses. Consent must be obtained in a form that is intelligible, language-appropriate, and free from coercion or undue influence. Consent is revocable with prospective effect; upon revocation, the Validation Partner shall cease further disclosure and shall update all downstream channels within its control, recording the revocation in the consent ledger and issuing notices to any relying parties identified in the consent record. Historic disclosures made under valid consent remain lawful as of the time made, without prejudice to remedies where consent was vitiated by misrepresentation, coercion, or material error.

Autonomy includes the right to select a disclosure posture ranging from full privacy to tightly scoped public attestations. It includes the right to withhold disclosure without retaliation, adverse treatment, or comparative penalties. It includes the right to access one's validation records, to request corrections of factual errors, and to obtain a record of consents given and revoked. It includes the right to elect single-goal deep dives without representation that such attestations are comprehensive. Nothing in this Charter authorizes comparative public rankings of named entities, nor may any party imply that non-disclosure signifies non-performance.

Evidence handling is governed by privacy-by-design, purpose limitation, data minimization, secure storage, and audit trails that are proportionate to the risks presented. Aggregated, anonymized insights may be produced for public-interest purposes to improve the standard and support learning, provided that re-identification risks are addressed and that no individual result is disclosed without consent.



Partners shall ensure that model designs, user interfaces, and communication materials clearly distinguish between private results and any optional public-facing summaries and shall present unambiguous notices explaining consent options, scope, duration, and revocation.

To ensure uniform implementation, the following table codifies minimum elements for consent and the permissible disclosure postures under this Charter.

| Consent Ledger — Minimum Elements | Required Content | |
|--|--|--|
| Subject Entity Identity | Legal name, unique identifier, jurisdiction | |
| Validation Scope | Model type (stars, points, module, deep dive), period covered, pillars implicated | |
| Disclosure Content | Specific items to be disclosed (e.g., overall star level; pillar-level summaries; narrative attestations) | |
| Intended Audience and Channels | Public website, registry listing, partner directory, press release, limited stakeholder group | |
| Duration and Expiry | Start date, expiry/review date, renewal conditions | |
| Secondary Use | Whether aggregated, anonymized use is authorized; prohibition on any other secondary use absent separate consent | |
| Revocation Mechanism | Method, effect as of revocation date, notice obligations to relying parties | |
| Contact and Accountability | Authorized signatory, contact point, dispute and complaint routes (including GSIA) | |
| Disclosure Posture Options (Illustrative) | Description | Conditions |
| Private by Default | No public disclosure of any result | Always available; no adverse treatment permitted |
| Scoped Badge | Publication of limited badge (e.g., "A2074-SRS Validated: Hospitality-Style ★★") | Requires explicit consent; must include scope statement and expiry |
| Pillar Summary | High-level pillar-level qualitative summaries without granular data | Requires explicit consent; reversible aggregation preserved for subject and GSIA |



| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Deep-Dive Attestation | Publication limited to a single SGG pillar deep-dive result | Requires explicit consent; must state scope and limitations; no implication of comprehensiveness |
| Time-Bound Case Note | Short narrative highlighting improvements with defined expiry | Requires explicit consent; renewal needed upon expiry; no open-ended publication |

Retaliation, coercion, or adverse treatment arising from a subject entity's decision to remain private is prohibited. Violations, including coerced consent, misrepresentation, or disclosure beyond the consented scope, are subject to GSIA adjudication and corrective orders, including injunctive relief, withdrawal or rectification of public statements, protective measures for affected parties, and license conditions, suspension, or revocation for the responsible Partner. Where Partners deploy AI-enabled tools in evidence review or scoring, human review and contestability must be guaranteed for any adverse determinations, and no automated action may override patient-level confidentiality or the consent ledger.

Retention periods shall be proportionate to the purposes of validation, oversight, and lawful recordkeeping under this Charter. Subject access to records, including the consent ledger and validation outputs, shall be provided upon request within reasonable timelines and without compromising the privacy rights of third parties. Where a subject exercises revocation, Partners shall implement prompt takedown or de-listing from channels under their control and shall document notifications issued to any known third-party mirrors or syndications.

The Communication & Public Disclosure Protocol supplements this Chapter with model notices and standardized language to ensure clarity and reduce cognitive burden on subjects. The Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual prescribes the technical controls for consent ledging, access control, audit trails, encryption, and incident response. The Governance & Oversight Manual prescribes the complaint intake, investigation, and remedy process for confidentiality and autonomy violations.

Chapter 8 — Independent Ethics and Compliance (GSIA)

Independent ethics and compliance within the A2074-SRS is vested in the Global Social Impact Alliance (GSIA). GSIA operates with institutional independence, ring-fenced financing, and conflict-of-interest protections that insulate its determinations from commercial, political, or reputational pressures. Its jurisdiction extends to all licensed Validation Partners, their assessors and subcontractors in validation-adjacent roles, and any entity acting within the A2074-SRS for which an ethics-relevant complaint arises. Its mandate is to uphold patient-level confidentiality, non-retaliation, proportionality, and canonical conformity to the 17 SGG pillars, to provide remedies for violations, and to promote learning through anonymized guidance without exposing confidential results.

GSIA exercises the following authorities: issuance of ethics guidance; risk-based and ad hoc audits; receipt and adjudication of complaints; orders for corrective actions and protective measures; recommendations for license conditioning, suspension, or revocation; approval of remedial action plans; monitoring and follow-up; and publication of anonymized case digests and systemic advisories. Its procedures guarantee due process, proportionality, and effective remedy while preserving the privacy of participants and whistleblowers.



The lifecycle of a GSIA matter proceeds through standardized stages designed for clarity, timeliness, and fairness. The remedies available are calibrated to address breaches without compromising the structural rights established by this Charter.

| GSIA Case Lifecycle | Content and Standards |
|-------------------------|--|
| Intake and Registration | Receipt of complaint or audit trigger; assignment of unique case ID; acknowledgment to complainant where contactable |
| Threshold Assessment | Jurisdictional check; plausibility and risk rating; interim protective measures where retaliation risk or ongoing disclosure is alleged |
| Investigation | Evidence request to Partner; interviews; secure review of records including consent ledger; preservation orders as needed |
| Determination | Findings of fact; application of Charter, canonical interpretations, and ethics guidance; standard of proof: preponderance for administrative remedies |
| Remedies and Orders | Corrective actions; protective measures; communications rectification; license conditions/suspension; timelines and verification steps |
| Monitoring and Closure | Verification of implementation; post-remediation audit where warranted; anonymized case digest preparation; formal closure notice |

| Remedies and Protective Measures Matrix | Description | Illustrative Triggers |
|---|--|--|
| Injunctive Relief | Immediate cessation of unauthorized disclosure or coercive practice | Publication beyond consented scope; coerced disclosure clauses |
| Corrective Publication | Public correction, takedown, or contextualization with subject's input | Misleading badges; stale or de-contextualized statements |
| Protective Measures | Non-retaliation orders; confidentiality shields; safe-channel communications | Whistleblower reports; fear of commercial reprisal |
| Process Redesign | Mandates to revise consent workflows, sampling burdens, or AI human-in-the-loop controls | Systemic proportionality failures; opaque scoring |
| Training and Competence Orders | Targeted training, assessor rotation, conflict-of-interest remediation | Repeated assessor bias; undisclosed conflicts |
| License Conditioning | Time-bound conditions with milestones; independent monitor appointments | Material breaches with credible remediation paths |



| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Suspension or Revocation | Temporary or permanent withdrawal of derivative rights | Egregious or repeated violations; refusal to cooperate |
| Restorative Actions | Fee remediation; courtesy re-validation under corrected process | Harm from disproportionate evidence demands |

GSIA's independence is preserved through structural safeguards, including separate governance from Agenda 2074's Secretariat and Agency, ring-fenced funding arrangements in coordination with GSDA that prevent financial leverage over ethics outcomes, and recusals where conflicts arise. While GSIA coordinates with Agenda 2074 on licensing implications and systemic advisories, interpretive supremacy concerning the SGG pillars rests with Agenda 2074; GSIA applies those interpretations and orders remedies accordingly.

Proceedings are confidential. Parties receive notice of material steps, an opportunity to be heard, and access to non-confidential portions of the record consistent with privacy and safety. Whistleblowers and complainants are protected against retaliation, with burden-shifting as appropriate where *prima facie* evidence indicates adverse treatment following a protected disclosure. Timelines are proportionate to risk, with expedited pathways for ongoing disclosure, coercion, or integrity threats. Appeals and reviews are conducted pursuant to the Governance & Oversight Manual and may result in affirmation, modification, or remand with guidance.

GSIA issues anonymized case digests and systemic advisories to support learning and prevention, ensuring that nothing in such publications reveals confidential results without consent. Partners must demonstrate responsiveness to advisories in their continuous improvement plans. GSIA may also conduct thematic or sectoral ethics reviews, focusing on common failure modes such as disproportionate burden on microenterprises, irreversible aggregation that obscures pillar-level results, or implied ISO equivalence in marketing.

Emergency powers may be exercised where immediate action is required to prevent ongoing harm, including temporary suspension of public-facing badges or listings and issuance of interim non-retaliation orders. Such actions are reviewable and time-limited. Coordination with national authorities or sectoral regulators may occur where legally mandated and consistent with the privacy commitments of this Charter, without disclosing individual results absent consent.

Nothing in this Chapter authorizes GSIA to disclose a subject entity's validation results without consent. The scope of GSIA's disclosures is confined to the minimum necessary to effect remedies, publish anonymized learning, and protect the integrity of the system.

Chapter 9 — Data, Privacy, and Integrity

This Charter commits the A2074-SRS to privacy by default, lawful and proportionate processing, and robust integrity controls across the full evidence lifecycle. Validation Partners shall collect, process, store, analyze, and disclose data strictly for the purposes of model operation, client service, and oversight under this Charter, with no secondary use absent explicit, informed, and revocable consent. Data minimization, purpose limitation, and storage limitation are structural requirements. All processing must remain traceable to a valid legal basis as specified in the Operating Manual (Open Standard) and the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, and shall be documented in records that permit independent review by GSIA without exposing confidential results beyond what is necessary for ethics and compliance functions.



Evidence is handled under a chain-of-custody regime that ensures completeness, authenticity, and non-repudiation, while remaining proportionate to the participant's archetype and risk profile. Cryptographic controls, secure transmission, encryption at rest, role-based access, multi-factor authentication, tamper-evident logging, and immutable consent ledging are mandatory controls, calibrated to risk and context. Partners shall deploy human-in-the-loop review for any AI-assisted processing that could materially affect scoring, sampling, or remedial expectations. No automated determination may override patient-level confidentiality, alter the consent ledger, or produce adverse actions without human review, contestability, and recorded rationale.

Cross-border transfers and data residency practices shall be transparent to the subject entity and limited to jurisdictions and vendors that uphold confidentiality, integrity, and availability obligations compatible with this Charter. Subprocessors must be contractually bound to equal or higher standards, including incident response, audit cooperation, and deletion assistance. Where applicable law compels disclosure to public authorities, Partners shall disclose the minimum necessary, document the legal compulsion, promptly notify the subject unless lawfully prohibited, and inform GSIA for oversight of remedial measures.

Retention periods shall be set to the minimum necessary to fulfill validation, oversight, and lawful recordkeeping purposes. Upon expiry or lawful revocation, personal or confidential business data shall be deleted or irreversibly anonymized, with deletion certificates or verifiable logs retained for audit. Subjects shall have accessible channels to request access, correction of factual errors, and records of consents given or revoked. Requests shall be fulfilled within reasonable timelines, subject to protection of third-party privacy and system security.

To ensure uniform application and reviewability, the following matrices constitute normative guidance under this Chapter and are binding unless superseded by canonical amendments.

| Data Lifecycle Phase | Partner Duty (Minimum) | GSIA Oversight Right | Technical Controls (Illustrative and Risk-Calibrated) |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Collection & Ingestion | Collect only necessary evidence tied to declared scope; present clear notices | Review notices, sampling logic, and necessity | TLS during upload; signed manifests; data minimization checks |
| Transmission | Use secure, authenticated channels; record transfer metadata | Inspect transfer logs where relevant | mTLS/VPN; integrity hashing; DLP on egress |
| Storage | Encrypt at rest; segregate by client; apply least-privilege access | Verify encryption, access models, and key management | AES-grade encryption; HSM-backed keys; MFA; RBAC/ABAC |
| Processing & Analysis | Apply proportional sampling; document model versions and human reviews | Examine sampling rationales; review human-in-the-loop | Versioned models; tamper-evident logs; model registry |



| Disclosure (if consented) | Disclose only consented content; record audience, channel, and duration | Validate consent scope; order corrective action if exceeded | Consent ledger checks; programmatic expiry; revocation hooks |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| Retention & Deletion | Apply defined retention; execute deletion or anonymization at expiry | Request deletion proof; verify anonymization sufficiency | Deletion certificates; irreversible hashing; keyed tokenization |
| Audit & Remedies | Maintain audit-ready records; cooperate with GSIA | Conduct risk-based and ad hoc audits | Immutable logs; time-stamped events; secure evidence vaults |
| Evidence Classification | | Description | Handling Rules |
| Confidential (Default) | Raw artefacts, working papers, internal metrics, identifiable narratives | | Private by default; access strictly need-to-know; encrypted at rest; no disclosure without explicit consent |
| Restricted | Derived analyses, partial summaries with potential re-identification risk | | Use within Partner and GSIA; no external disclosure; additional masking if shared with advisors |
| Anonymized Aggregate | Benchmarks, distributions, trend lines with controlled re-identification risk | | Public-interest publication permitted; k-anonymity or equivalent safeguards; no microdata release |
| Public-by-Consent | Scopes, badges, pillar summaries expressly authorized by subject | | Publication strictly per consent ledger: specified channel, audience, duration; programmatic expiry and renewal |
| Regulatory-Compelled | Minimum necessary disclosure under law | | Document legal basis; notify subject unless prohibited; inform GSIA; apply minimization and segregation |

AI guardrails shall ensure that training, tuning, and inference do not expose confidential data to unintended models or third parties. Partners shall maintain model cards, change-control records, and human decision logs for any AI-assisted activity materially affecting outcomes. Shadow processing for optimization is prohibited unless anonymized beyond re-identification risk and explicitly authorized. Adverse events—including unauthorized disclosure, consent-scope breach, data loss, tampering, or AI malfunction with material effect—must be recorded, promptly contained, and reported to GSIA with a remedial action plan. GSIA may order additional controls, mandate third-party testing, or condition licensing on demonstrable remediation.

Nothing in this Chapter permits comparative public rankings of named entities or any inference of non-performance from a decision not to disclose. Privacy, integrity, and autonomy are systemic rights. Where conflicts arise between model design convenience and these rights, the rights prevail, subject to limited and documented exceptions strictly required by law and overseen by GSIA.



Chapter 10 — Transparency, Public Interest, and Non-Retaliation

This Charter balances aggregated transparency in the public interest with patient-level confidentiality and subject autonomy. Transparency serves to improve the standard, inform policy debates, and foster learning without exposing individual results absent consent. Public outputs shall concern the canon, methodologies, anonymized benchmarks, and systemic advisories; they shall not identify or imply the identity or relative ranking of any participant unless consent has been granted for the specific disclosure, scope, channel, audience, and duration recorded in the consent ledger.

Non-retaliation is absolute. No participant shall be denied service, charged differential fees, subjected to delays, publicly disparaged, or otherwise disadvantaged for electing non-disclosure or for exercising rights under this Charter. Negative inference from non-disclosure is prohibited in all communications and user interfaces. Where a participant elects limited disclosure (for example, a scoped badge or a single-goal deep dive), communications shall accurately state the scope and limitations and shall not suggest comprehensiveness. Partners remain responsible for internal controls that prevent personnel, subcontractors, or marketing affiliates from coercive or misleading practices. Violations are subject to GSIA adjudication, corrective orders, and, where warranted, license conditions, suspension, or revocation.

The following catalogue delineates permissible and prohibited transparency practices to guide Partners and allied institutions.

| Transparency Item | Content | Conditions | Issuing Body |
|--|--|--|--|
| Canonical Texts & Interpretive Circulars | A2074-SRS, SGG canon, interpretive updates, errata | Public by default | Agenda 2074 (Secretariat) |
| Operating Specifications | Open Standard methods, evidence classes, competence criteria | Public by default; excludes sensitive implementation details | Agenda 2074 (Secretariat/Agency) |
| Licensing & Accreditation Registers | List of licensed Partners; license status (active/suspended/revoked) | Public by default; reasons summarized without confidential case data | Agenda 2074 (Agency) with GSIA input |
| Anonymized Benchmarks | Aggregated sectoral distributions, trends, learning | Public interest; robust de-identification; no microdata | Agenda 2074 / GSIA |
| Ethics Advisories & Case Digests | Systemic patterns, remedies, prevention guidance | Anonymized; no identifying details; rights-preserving | GSIA |
| Subject-Opted Disclosures | Badges, pillar summaries, deep-dive attestations | Explicit, informed, revocable consent; | Validation Partner (subject-specific), auditable by GSIA |



| | | scope, channel, duration | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Public Interest Statements | Time-bound notices on systemic risks or clarifications | No individual identification without consent; necessity shown | Agenda 2074 / GSIA |
| Prohibited Practice | | Rationale | GSIA Remedial Response (Illustrative) |
| Public league tables of named entities | | Violates non-comparative evaluation and risks coercion | Injunctive relief; corrective publication; license conditioning |
| Implied consent or negative inference from silence | | Contravenes autonomy and consent standards | Corrective notices; training orders; monitoring |
| Coercive pricing or service denial for non-disclosure | | Violates non-retaliation | Fee remediation; sanctions; suspension for repetition |
| Irreversible aggregation that hides pillar-level results | | Impairs auditability and remedies | Process redesign; re-validation; ethics audit |
| ISO equivalence claims | | Misleading representation of scope and authority | Public correction; marketing controls; license action |

Optional public registries operated by Agenda 2074 or licensed Partners may host consented disclosures. Registry entries must be time-bound, include scoping statements, display expiry dates, and provide a simple mechanism for revocation and delisting with prospective effect. Mirrors, syndications, or third-party embeddings under Partner control must update automatically upon expiry or revocation. For third-party channels outside Partner control, reasonable takedown requests shall be pursued and documented.

Communications shall be clear, accurate, and non-manipulative. Any badge, summary, or narrative published with consent must state the model type, scope and limitations, the validation period, and the review or expiry date. Where a disclosure aggregates pillar-level information, the Partner shall maintain reversible linkage for the subject and for GSIA audit. No disclosure shall be open-ended; all public statements expire unless expressly renewed. Historic statements shall not be republished as current.

Where law compels disclosure inconsistent with this Chapter, Partners shall apply the minimum necessary principle, document the lawful basis, notify the subject unless prohibited, and inform GSIA. GSIA may issue protective measures, systemic advisories, or remedial orders to mitigate risks and prevent recurrence. Nothing in this Chapter authorizes disclosure of a subject's results by GSIA or Agenda 2074 absent consent, save for de-identified systemic learning publications.

The Governance & Oversight Manual prescribes complaint intake for alleged retaliation, coercion, or misleading communications and establishes burden-shifting protections where a *prima facie* case indicates adverse treatment following a protected refusal to disclose. Remedies include injunctive



relief, public corrections, fee remediation, process redesign, and license action. The Communication & Public Disclosure Protocol supplies standardized language and user-interface cues to reduce interpretive risk and cognitive burden on subjects.

Chapter 11 — Financial Principles and Sustainability

This Charter establishes a fiduciary framework that sustains the A2074-SRS without compromising independence, fairness, or patient-level confidentiality. Financial stewardship is organized to uphold non-profit custodianship of the standard, ring-fence ethics and compliance functions, ensure affordability and access, and prevent commercial incentives from distorting validation outcomes or disclosure postures.

Agenda 2074, acting through its Secretariat for standard-setting and its Agency for licensing administration, operates on a non-profit basis. GSIA, as the independent ethics and compliance custodian, is financed through ring-fenced allocations and public-interest funding corridors managed with GSDA to prevent any financial leverage over adjudication or guidance. GSDA functions as a resource mobilization and financial stewardship entity, aggregating funds for affordability measures, open-standard maintenance, research, and anonymized transparency outputs. None of these bodies may conduct commercial validation, earn outcome-contingent revenues, or accept consideration that conditions interpretive or adjudicative outcomes. Validation Partners operate on a cost-recovery and reasonable-margin basis, with explicit prohibitions against fee arrangements that create incentives for over-collection of evidence, coercive disclosure, or implied guarantees of positive results.

Fee architecture is transparent and proportionate. Licensing fees are assessed to recover the cost of reviewing model designs, digital and AI governance controls, consent ledging architecture, and initial ethics diligence. Accreditation and surveillance fees cover periodic ethics and compliance reviews by GSIA. Validation service fees are set by Partners, subject to tiering, hardship accommodations for microenterprises and civil society organizations, and explicit disclosure that non-disclosure of results shall not attract penalties or surcharges. Performance-contingent fees, “pay-for-stars” constructs, or discounts contingent upon public disclosure are prohibited. Marketing affiliates may not receive commissions tied to the disclosure choices of subject entities.

All actors observe strict financial controls, including segregation of duties, documented procurements, conflict-of-interest disclosures, anti-corruption safeguards, and sanctions-compliant transactions. Donations or sponsorships to Agenda 2074, GSIA, or GSDA are accepted only on unconditional terms, with donor non-interference covenants and public listing by class without attribution to individual cases. Partners are required to maintain auditable ledgers, retain records in accordance with defined periods, and cooperate with GSIA financial-ethics inquiries. Surpluses within custodial bodies are reinvested in open standard maintenance, anonymized research, affordability measures, and capacity building; no surplus may be distributed to private owners or used to influence case outcomes.

To clarify roles, permissible flows, and constraints, the following matrix is normative under this Charter.

| Actor | Permissible Revenues | Permissible Expenditures | Structural Constraints |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Agenda 2074 (Secretariat/Agency) | Non-profit licensing fees; open standard | Canonical texts, interpretive circulars, licensing | No commercial validation; no outcome-contingent |



| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | maintenance grants; GSDA allocations | administration, public registries | income; ring-fenced budgeting |
| GSIA (Ethics & Compliance) | Ring-fenced allocations; ethics review fees; GSDA public-interest funding | Guidance, audits, adjudication, monitoring, anonymized case digests | Institutional independence; donor non-interference; recusals when conflicts arise |
| GSDA (Stewardship) | Grants, donations, earmarked public-interest contributions | Affordability funds, research, standard maintenance, capacity building | No leverage over interpretations or adjudications; transparent criteria for allocations |
| Validation Partners | Validation fees; training on open materials; non-contingent service agreements | Assessor competence, secure platforms, client service, incident response | No “pay-for-stars”; no coercive disclosure pricing; full cooperation with GSIA |
| DESA Units (when not Partners) | Capacity-building grants; platform support funding | Digital governance enablement consistent with this Charter | No validation revenues unless separately licensed; ethics oversight applies |

Affordability is a system objective. GSDA may operate an Accessibility Fund to subsidize validations for microenterprises, civil society organizations, and public bodies in resource-constrained settings. Eligibility criteria are published, non-discriminatory, and verifiable. Validation Partners participating in subsidized engagements shall adhere to the same confidentiality, proportionality, and non-retaliation requirements as in non-subsidized engagements. Subsidies may not be conditioned on any public disclosure, marketing participation, or timing that would compromise autonomy.

Financial transparency occurs at the aggregate level. Agenda 2074 and GSIA publish annual anonymized financial statements and stewardship reports that summarize aggregate revenues by class, expenditures by program, affordability deployments, and high-level audit outcomes without revealing confidential case details. Validation Partners disclose fee schedules, tiering criteria, and hardship provisions in plain language. Any proposed changes to licensing, accreditation, or registry fees are subject to notice periods, ethics review by GSIA for coercion risks, and publication of a rationale by Agenda 2074. Where fee changes materially affect access for protected archetypes, mitigation measures must accompany implementation.

The linkage to brand development, traffic, and Charity as a Business is permitted only through opt-in, consented disclosure pathways that respect scope, audience, channel, duration, and revocation. Partners and subject entities may derive reputational or commercial benefits from consented badges or narratives; such benefits must never become de facto conditions for access or fairness. Communications must avoid implying that disclosure is presumed or preferred by the standard, and must state, where relevant, that private participation is equally valid and protected.

Financial integrity violations—including undisclosed contingent compensation, coercive pricing for disclosure, donor interference in interpretive or adjudicative matters, or diversion of ring-fenced ethics



funds—constitute material breaches. GSIA may order fee remediation, impose license conditions, require independent monitors, or recommend suspension or revocation, alongside public aggregate reporting of the remedial theme without identifying the parties.

Chapter 12 — Amendments, Versioning, and Supremacy Clause

This Charter is a living instrument governed by controlled amendment procedures, explicit versioning, and a supremacy rule that prioritizes canonical interpretations and patient-level rights over conflicting texts or practices. Amendments are promulgated by Agenda 2074, with ethics impact review by GSIA, and are published with effective dates, transition provisions, and deprecation schedules. Nothing in any amendment may derogate from patient-level confidentiality, non-retaliation, or proportionality, save where required by law and then only to the minimum extent necessary, subject to GSIA oversight.

Amendments take one of four forms. Errata correct typographical or non-substantive defects and become effective upon publication. Interpretive circulars clarify the meaning and application of canonical texts and are effective upon the date specified, with immediate supremacy in interpretive disputes. Minor revisions adjust procedures or specifications without altering structural rights; these carry a standard notice and transition period. Major revisions change structural elements or duties and require extended notice, public comment on the Open Standard portal, and explicit transition and grandfathering provisions. Emergency advisories address imminent integrity or safety risks and take immediate, time-limited effect, subject to prompt review and conversion to an ordinary form or lapse.

Versioning follows a semantic schema (Major.Minor.Patch). Major versions introduce structural changes; Minor versions add or refine features without altering structural rights; Patch versions correct defects without functional change. Each instrument in the A2074-SRS package carries an independent version identifier and a consolidated release note referencing cross-impacts. Partner licenses incorporate the versions in force at issuance and include an update clause that binds Partners to Minor and Patch versions on publication and to Major versions after the transition period, unless specific hardship exemptions are granted with conditions protective of patient-level rights.

The following matrices are normative for amendment classes and documentary hierarchy.

| Amendment Class | Description | Notice and Transition | Supremacy and Review |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Errata (x.y.z+e) | Non-substantive corrections | None beyond publication | Immediate; no appeal required |
| Interpretive Circular (IC-YYYY-N) | Canon clarification consistent with existing text | Effective per circular; advisory prerelease optional | Supersedes prior conflicting guidance; GSIA applies immediately |
| Minor Revision (x.y+1.z) | Procedural refinement without altering structural rights | 30–90 days; Partners update processes | Prevails at end of transition; GSIA monitors readiness |
| Major Revision (x+1.y.z) | Structural change affecting duties or interfaces | 90–270 days; public comment; grandfathering plan | Prevails on effective date; appeals limited to implementation terms |



| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Emergency Advisory (EA-YYYY-N) | Time-critical integrity or safety measure | Immediate; 30–60 day sunset unless converted | Temporary supremacy; mandatory review and publication of rationale |
| Documentary Hierarchy (Highest to Lowest) | | Scope and Effect | |
| Foundational Charter (this instrument) | | Constitutes the system; fixes structural rights and duties; sets supremacy rule | |
| Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars (Doc 3) | | Canonical definitions and interpretive notes; binding on all models | |
| Governance & Oversight Manual (Doc 4) | | GSIA procedures, due process, remedies; binding on Partners | |
| Licensing & Accreditation Framework (Doc 2) | | Derivative rights, conditions, and revocation grounds | |
| Operating Manual — Open Standard (Doc 5) | | Methods, evidence classes, competence, sampling | |
| Multi-Model Validation Framework (Doc 10) | | Model-type specifications and reversible aggregation rules | |
| Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual (Doc 11) | | Consent ledgering, privacy-by-design, security, AI guardrails | |
| Communication & Public Disclosure Protocol (Doc 8) | | Notices, disclosures, language standards, registry logic | |
| ISO 26000 Self-Declaration Protocol (Doc 9) | | Optional, non-certification declarations for communication | |
| Legal Compliance & International Law Note (Doc 12) | | Conflict-of-laws guidance; lawful compulsion handling | |
| Validation Partner Licenses | | Derivative rights and obligations specific to Partner | |
| Partner–Client Contracts | | Service terms; must entrench patient-level rights and be consistent with higher instruments | |

Supremacy operates as follows. In any conflict between this Charter and subordinate instruments, this Charter prevails. In any interpretive conflict concerning the 17 SGG pillars, the Rules for Interpretation and current interpretive circulars prevail. In any process conflict involving ethics or remedies, the Governance & Oversight Manual prevails. Partner licenses and Partner–client contracts must conform to higher instruments; any term that narrows patient-level confidentiality, authorizes retaliation, enables coercive disclosure, claims ISO certification or equivalence, or prevents GSIA oversight is void within the A2074-SRS and remediable by GSIA order. Where applicable law compels deviation, the



Partner shall adopt the minimum-necessary approach, document the lawful basis, notify the subject unless prohibited, and inform GSIA to determine protective measures.

Transitional arrangements ensure orderly adoption. Major revisions include a risk-based grandfathering schedule by archetype and sector, with interim safeguards for confidentiality and non-retaliation. During transitions, Partners may operate under the prior version for the duration specified, provided they implement any immediate ethics safeguards specified in the revision notice. At the close of the transition, validations must conform to the current version, and legacy disclosures must be re-evaluated for expiry, accuracy, and consent scope.

Severability applies to this Charter. If any provision is held invalid in a jurisdiction, the remaining provisions continue in effect, and the invalid provision shall be applied to the maximum extent permissible. The authentic text is maintained in the Agenda 2074 registry. Translations are provided for accessibility and do not supersede the authentic text; in case of discrepancy, the authentic text prevails unless Agenda 2074 designates a localized authentic version.

Nothing in this Chapter permits comparative public rankings of named entities or derogation from patient-level rights. Supremacy expressly prioritizes confidentiality, non-retaliation, and proportionality across all instruments and engagements.

Final Word

This Foundational Charter constitutes the A2074-SRS as a rights-preserving, ethics-anchored, and innovation-positive validation architecture. It recognizes the universality of the 17 SGG pillars, safeguards patient-level confidentiality and autonomy as structural rights, and vests GSIA with independent jurisdiction to uphold integrity and provide effective remedies. Through an open licensing ecosystem and disciplined digital governance, it enables diverse partner models while maintaining canonical traceability, proportionality, and non-comparative fairness across geographies and sectors. The Charter is designed as a living instrument with controlled amendments and clear supremacy rules, ensuring that as the standard evolves, the primacy of confidentiality, non-retaliation, and public-interest transparency—aggregated and anonymized—remains intact. It invites responsible actors to participate, innovate, and learn within a system that treats every participant with dignity and proportional fairness, under the enduring doctrine that everyone can do something.