

JANUARY 26, 2026

# Agenda for Social Equity 2074



**Rules for Interpretation  
of the 17 SGG Pillars**



CREATED BY

EUSL AB

*Care to Change the World*



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>Chapter 1 — Purpose, Scope, and Authority</b> .....	3
<b>Chapter 2 — Doctrinal Principles for Interpretation</b> .....	4
<b>Chapter 3 — Taxonomy and Definitions</b> .....	5
<b>Chapter 4 — Materiality and Contextualisation Rules</b> .....	7
<b>Chapter 6 — Evidence Standards and Evidentiary Hierarchy</b> .....	11
<b>Chapter 7 — Indicator Design Principles</b> .....	13
<b>Chapter 8 — Scoring, Levels, and Conversions</b> .....	16
<b>Chapter 9 — Aggregation and Trade-Off Rules</b> .....	18
<b>Chapter 10 — Non-Comparative Benchmarking Protocol</b> .....	19
<b>Chapter 11 — Proportionality by Enterprise Size and Capacity</b> .....	20
<b>Chapter 12 — Sectoral Context Notes (General)</b> .....	22
<b>Chapter 13 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 1 to SGG 5</b> .....	23
<b>SGG 1 — Universal Access to Essential Services</b> .....	24
<b>SGG 2 — Eradicating Poverty through Social Support</b> .....	25
<b>SGG 3 — Gender Equality and Empowerment</b> .....	25
<b>SGG 4 — Educational Equity and Lifelong Learning</b> .....	26
<b>SGG 5 — Mental Health and Well-being for All</b> .....	27
<b>Chapter 14 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 6 to SGG 10</b> .....	27
<b>SGG 6 — Community Resilience and Disaster Preparedness</b> .....	27
<b>SGG 7 — Inclusive and Equitable Urban Development</b> .....	28
<b>SGG 8 — Social Justice and Fair Governance</b> .....	28
<b>SGG 9 — Eradication of Social Inequality</b> .....	29
<b>SGG 10 — Decent Work for Social Empowerment</b> .....	29
<b>Chapter 15 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 11 to SGG 13</b> .....	30
<b>SGG 11 — Support for Youth and Children’s Development</b> .....	30
<b>SGG 12 — Fostering Social Cohesion and Inclusivity</b> .....	31
<b>SGG 13 — Protection of Vulnerable Populations</b> .....	32
<b>Chapter 16 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 14 to SGG 17</b> .....	32
<b>SGG 14 — Cultural and Community Identity Preservation</b> .....	33
<b>SGG 15 — Support for Family and Community Structures</b> .....	33
<b>SGG 16 — Promoting Civic Engagement and Participation</b> .....	34
<b>SGG 17 — Ethical Use of Technology for Social Benefit</b> .....	34
<b>Chapter 17 — Single Goal (Deep Dive) Validation Method</b> .....	35



<b>Chapter 18 — Multi-Model Equivalency and Cross-Recognition .....</b>	39
<b>Chapter 19 — Localisation and Translation Protocol.....</b>	42
<b>Chapter 20 — Human Review and AI-Assisted Interpretation .....</b>	44
<b>Chapter 21 — Confidentiality and Sensitive Evidence.....</b>	46
<b>Chapter 22 — Publication Independence .....</b>	48
<b>Chapter 23 — Revision, Versioning, and Sunset Protocol .....</b>	49
<b>Chapter 24 — Public Consultation and Participatory Governance .....</b>	52
<b>Chapter 25 — Investigations, Enforcement, and Appeals .....</b>	53
<b>Chapter 26 — Registry, Archives, and Evidence Lifecycle Management.....</b>	56
<b>Chapter 27 — Cross-Border Operations and Jurisdictional Harmonisation.....</b>	58
<b>Final Word .....</b>	60



# Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillar

## Introduction

This document establishes the authoritative interpretive framework for the Agenda 2074 Social Responsibility Standard, ensuring that all validation models developed and operated by authorized Validation Partners reflect the canonical intent of the 17 Social Global Goals (SGGs) and the institutional safeguards of the A2074-SRS. It provides doctrinal rules, definitional controls, materiality tests, evidence standards, scoring parameters, proportionality mechanisms, and publication safeguards designed to maintain fidelity across heterogeneous partner methodologies and multi-model validation outputs. Its provisions are to be read in continuous harmony with the Foundational Charter, the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, the Governance & Oversight Manual (GSIA ethics chambers), the Operating Manual (Open Standard), the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, and the Ethics & Integrity Code. Confidentiality, proportionality, and non-comparative evaluation are preserved throughout. GSIA retains adjudicatory authority over interpretive disputes, safeguards, and appeals.

## Chapter 1 — Purpose, Scope, and Authority

This instrument codifies the binding rules of interpretation for the 17 SGG pillars under the A2074-SRS. Its purpose is to secure uniform meaning, prevent methodological drift, and preserve the normative architecture of the standard across diverse validation models, including stars, points, badges, maturity ladders, sector modules, and pillar-specific deep dives.

The scope of this document extends to all Validation Partners, their subcontracted assessors, technology providers integrating decision support, and any entity developing or deploying indicators, evidence requirements, scoring tools, dashboards, or public disclosures under a license, accreditation, or other authorization recognized by Agenda 2074 and subject to GSIA oversight. It governs the full validation lifecycle: indicator design, materiality screening, contextualization, evidence collection, analysis, scoring, aggregation, publication, revision, and appeals. It further binds the management of confidentiality, consent, and digital governance, including consent ledging, privacy-by-design, AI guardrails, and secure evidence handling.

The authority of this document is derived from the Foundational Charter and the Licensing & Accreditation Framework. Its interpretive clauses are mandatory and prevail over any partner methodology, tool, rubric, contractual instrument, or market convention to the extent of any inconsistency. GSIA is the custodian of these rules and exercises adjudication, investigative powers, and corrective directions under the Governance & Oversight Manual. Validation Partners must incorporate these rules by reference into their operational manuals, training curricula, and digital systems, and must be able to demonstrate procedural and technical conformance upon request. Where this document is silent, the Operating Manual and the Ethics & Integrity Code apply. Any derogation requires prior written authorization from GSIA and is time-bound, specific, and published in the revision notes pursuant to Chapter 23.

No provision herein shall be construed to permit claims of ISO certification. References to ISO 26000 are strictly limited to optional self-declaration alignment as further governed by the ISO 26000 Self-Declaration Protocol. Publication independence is preserved; disclosure is voluntary, revocable,



and must never be a condition of validation price or outcome. Patient-level confidentiality governs all results by default; access, processing, and disclosure are strictly consent-based and proportional to purpose.

## Chapter 2 — Doctrinal Principles for Interpretation

All interpretation under the A2074-SRS is guided by five core canons that are cumulative and non-waivable. Each canon operates as a controlling principle for indicator design, evidence appraisal, scoring, aggregation, publication, and review.

**Proportionality.** Obligations and assessments must be proportionate to enterprise size, capacity, and operational context. Proportionality does not reduce the normative content of the SGGs; it calibrates the means and evidentiary burden. The same pillar meaning applies to a microenterprise and a multinational, while the scale, complexity, and intrusiveness of indicators and evidence are adapted to avoid undue burden. Proportionality is operationalized through algorithmic tiers and qualitative overrides, with GSIA retaining audit authority over both.

**Progress-based evaluation.** Validation focuses on demonstrable progress over time against a defined baseline and trajectory, privileging credible improvement pathways, interim milestones, and corrective action effectiveness. Static compliance is insufficient where material risks persist; conversely, partial conformity accompanied by robust, time-bound remediation may meet maturity thresholds when proportionate and verified. Longitudinal benchmarking is the default; cross-entity comparisons are generally prohibited under the non-comparative canon.

**Non-comparative assessment.** The standard forbids direct ranking or competitive comparison of entities against one another in public outputs. Results are expressed against the canon of the 17 SGG pillars and an entity's own progress trajectory. Composite outputs may only be published where minimum presence thresholds across pillars are met and trade-off controls are applied, ensuring that overperformance cannot conceal underperformance in material areas.

**Subsidiarity.** Decisions are taken at the most local competent level, provided canonical meaning and safeguards are preserved. Sectoral annexes, local context notes, and translation protocols may tailor materiality screens, indicators, and evidence practices to geography, sector, and lifecycle stage. Such tailoring must follow the approval pathway set in this document and its annexes and remains subject to GSIA oversight.

**Capacity sensitivity.** The design and interpretation of indicators and evidence must reflect realistic capabilities and resource constraints, especially for micro and small enterprises, early-stage organizations, and entities in fragile or resource-constrained contexts. Capacity sensitivity prioritizes least intrusive verification consistent with reliability, encourages high-leverage practices, and permits staged adoption and modular validation without fragmenting the canon. Where capacity barriers impede compliance, tailored technical assistance pathways may be recognized as valid progress measures under defined conditions.

These canons have binding effect, inform the drafting of sectoral annexes, regulate single-goal deep dives, and govern the conversion across points, stars, badges, and maturity ladders. In the event of interpretive ambiguity, the canon most protective of confidentiality, fairness, and pillar fidelity prevails. GSIA adjudication resolves conflicts, and its written determinations form persuasive precedent incorporated into the next version cycle under Chapter 23.



## Chapter 3 — Taxonomy and Definitions

This chapter establishes a controlled vocabulary for the interpretation and operation of the A2074-SRS. It governs the meaning and use of terms related to the pillars, indicators, evidence, materiality, and contextualisation. The taxonomy is binding on Validation Partners, assessors, subcontractors, and technology providers, and it must be embedded within partner manuals, data models, schemas, and user interfaces. Where a term is not defined herein, its ordinary meaning shall be inferred in light of the Foundational Charter, the Operating Manual, and the Ethics & Integrity Code, subject to GSIA adjudicatory oversight. In the event of conflict, the definitions in this chapter prevail over partner glossaries and sectoral usage unless a duly approved sector annex expressly specifies otherwise.

For clarity and implementation discipline, the following canonical taxonomy applies.

Term	Canonical Definition	Notes on Use	Binding Status
<b>Agenda 2074</b>	The standard-setter and custodian of the 17 Social Global Goals (SGGs), including the interpretive canon and institutional safeguards.	Source of normative content and final interpretive authority through GSIA.	Binding.
<b>SGG Pillar</b>	One of the 17 Social Global Goals forming the universal canon of the A2074-SRS.	Pillars carry uniform meaning across sectors and sizes; only indicators and evidentiary burdens are contextualised.	Binding.
<b>Pillar Interpretation</b>	The authoritative narrative and doctrinal explanation of an SGG pillar contained in Chapters 13–16 of this document.	Controls indicator design, materiality screens, and evidence expectations.	Binding.
<b>Indicator</b>	A discrete, observable representation of practice, performance, or outcome relevant to a pillar.	Indicators may be qualitative or quantitative; they must be clear, measurable, verifiable, and proportionate.	Binding design rules; catalogues are living.
<b>Materiality</b>	The threshold by which an issue, risk, or opportunity is deemed relevant to an entity's pillar performance and stakeholder welfare.	Determined by sector, geography, size, lifecycle, and exposure; governed by Chapter 4.	Binding method; context-sensitive.



<b>Contextualisation</b>	The approved process of tailoring indicators and evidentiary burdens to material context without altering pillar meaning.	Requires adherence to subsidiarity, proportionality, and capacity sensitivity.	Binding process; outputs monitored.
<b>Evidence</b>	Information used to substantiate indicator claims, ranked by an evidentiary hierarchy.	Includes policy, process, output, and outcome evidence with defined documentation norms.	Binding hierarchy and norms.
<b>Outcome</b>	Demonstrable changes in conditions attributable, in whole or in part, to an entity's actions under a pillar.	Preferred where feasible; attribution tests apply; may require proxy measures for micro-entities.	Preferred; proportionate burden.
<b>Output</b>	Immediate deliverables or activities produced (e.g., trainings conducted, services delivered).	Acceptable where outcomes are not yet observable; must align with a time-bound trajectory.	Acceptable with guardrails.
<b>Process Evidence</b>	Proof of operating procedures, controls, and routines (e.g., SOPs, logs, system trails).	Supports reliability of outputs and outcomes; subject to privacy-by-design.	Binding documentation norms.
<b>Policy Evidence</b>	Formal statements of intent approved by competent authority (e.g., board policy, charter, code).	Insufficient alone; must be corroborated by process and performance evidence.	Supportive only.
<b>Confidentiality (Patient-level)</b>	Default rule that all validation data are private, accessed and disclosed only by explicit, informed, revocable consent, with no coercion or retaliation.	Applies to all entities and individuals; encompasses consent ledgering and least-intrusive methods.	Binding and paramount.
<b>Validation Model</b>	A scoring and presentation schema (e.g., stars, points, badges, maturity ladders, single-goal deep dives) aligned with this interpretive canon.	Diversity permitted; fidelity and conversion constraints apply.	Binding constraints.



<b>Composite Output</b>	Any aggregated presentation of results across pillars.	Requires minimum presence thresholds and anti-masking controls.	Binding safeguards.
<b>Non-comparative Benchmarking</b>	Longitudinal and self-trajectory benchmarking precluding cross-entity rankings in public outputs.	Internal peer reference may be used for learning, not publicity.	Binding prohibition on public rankings.
<b>Localisation</b>	Linguistic and cultural adaptation preserving canonical meaning.	Governed by Chapter 19; translations must be certified for semantic fidelity.	Binding protocol.
<b>AI Decision Support</b>	Algorithmic tools assisting interpretation, scoring, or evidence review under human oversight.	Subject to bias testing, explainability, and privacy-by-design; human primacy preserved.	Binding governance.
<b>GSIA</b>	Independent ethics and compliance custodian with adjudication powers.	Oversees investigations, appeals, and corrective measures.	Binding jurisdiction.
<b>Validation Partner</b>	Licensed operator designing and running validation models under A2074-SRS.	Must embed this taxonomy in systems and training.	Binding license terms.

The foregoing taxonomy is complemented by controlled data elements defined in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, including enumerations for evidence types, sensitivity tiers, consent statuses, and materiality determinations. Terminology drift is prohibited. Any proposed addition, retirement, or definitional amendment must follow the revision and versioning protocol in Chapter 23, with public notice and a reasonable transition period commensurate with the impact on partner operations.

Where sectoral or jurisdictional laws prescribe specific terms, such usage must be mapped to this taxonomy in the relevant annex through a cross-reference key, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of confidentiality, proportionality, and pillar fidelity.

## Chapter 4 — Materiality and Contextualisation Rules

Materiality and contextualisation ensure that the evaluation of pillar performance reflects the real risks, opportunities, and capacities of the entity under review while preserving the uniform meaning of the SGG pillars. The purpose of this chapter is to define the decision framework, required documentation, and guardrails for tailoring indicators and evidentiary burdens to sector, geography, size, and lifecycle stage. Materiality determines *what* matters; contextualisation determines *how* it is assessed. Neither may be used to dilute or postpone engagement with core pillar duties where feasible means exist, proportionate to capacity.



Materiality determinations must be structured, documented, and reviewable. At minimum, partners shall: identify the universe of potential issues for each pillar; assess exposure, significance to affected stakeholders, and potential severity; consider legal and normative baselines; apply sector and geographic context notes; and record the rationale, data sources, and stakeholder inputs. Determinations are subject to GSIA audit and must be revisited at defined intervals or upon a material change in operations or context. Where uncertainty exists, the presumption favors inclusion with proportionate evidentiary burden rather than exclusion.

Contextualisation translates materiality into indicator selection, weighting, and evidence expectations. It operates under the canons of proportionality, subsidiarity, progress-based evaluation, non-comparative assessment, and capacity sensitivity. Tailoring is permitted within the conversion and aggregation constraints set forth in Chapters 7–11 and 18, and it must not permit overperformance in one material area to mask underperformance in another.

The relationship between context dimensions and their interpretive effects is set out below for operational clarity.

Context Dimension	Typical Influence on Indicator Selection	Typical Influence on Weighting	Typical Influence on Evidence Burden	Guardrails and Notes
<b>Sector</b>	Adds or prioritises sector-specific indicators reflecting inherent risks/opportunities (e.g., supply-chain due diligence in manufacturing; duty of care in healthcare).	Elevates weight of inherently material risks for the sector; caps weight of peripheral issues.	May require higher-quality evidence where sectoral risk is acute (e.g., third-party attestations).	Sector annexes must be approved; no derogation from pillar meaning.
<b>Geography</b>	Incorporates jurisdictional legal baselines and local risk profiles (e.g., labor law, conflict exposure).	Adjusts weight for location-specific severity and stakeholder impact.	Permits redaction and least-intrusive methods in fragile settings; may require geo-specific proofs.	Must respect local law and international norms; confidentiality paramount.
<b>Enterprise Size</b>	Scales indicator complexity; micro-entities may use simplified indicators aligned to the same pillar meaning.	Adjusts relative weight to avoid bias toward scale; ensures “everyone can do something.”	Calibrates documentation depth; allows credible proxies where direct measurement is infeasible.	No exemption from core duties; staged adoption allowed with time-bound plans.
<b>Lifecycle Stage</b>	Emphasises planning and policy in early stage; shifts to process, output, and outcome with maturity.	Temporarily rebalances weights to reflect feasible	Allows progressive evidence ramp-up tied to milestones.	Progress plans must be specific, time-bound, and verified.



		attainment at stage.		
<b>Value Chain Position</b>	Highlights upstream/downstream leverage and responsibility (e.g., procurement vs. distribution).	Reweights toward leverage-aligned indicators.	Evidence may include supplier or partner attestations with sampling protocols.	Responsibility follows leverage and causation; anti-masking rules apply.
<b>Stakeholder Salience</b>	Prioritises indicators addressing rights, welfare, and legitimate expectations of affected stakeholders.	Increases weight where severity and vulnerability are high.	Requires participatory evidence and safe feedback channels.	No coercion; retaliation protections mandatory.
<b>Technology Footprint</b>	Introduces indicators on data protection, AI governance, and cybersecurity.	Reweights in data-intensive or automated operations.	Requires technical evidence (e.g., audit logs, DPIAs) with privacy-by-design.	AI guardrails and human oversight mandatory.

Materiality screening must adopt a dual-lens approach: normative baselines derived from the SGG canon and contextual risk-based analysis. Normative baselines establish a floor; context analysis may raise, but not lower, the standard where risks or opportunities are heightened. Where sector or geography introduce heightened human rights or environmental risks, partners shall require enhanced due diligence indicators and evidence consistent with least-intrusive verification and redaction protocols under Chapter 21.

Indicator weighting must be transparent and justified. Weightings may vary across contexts but must remain within parameter ranges approved in the Multi-Model Validation Framework to preserve cross-model equivalency. Any deviation outside approved ranges requires prior GSIA authorization and explicit notation in the validation record and revision notes. Conversion rules in Chapter 18 bind the translation of weights and scores across stars, points, badges, and maturity ladders to ensure substantive comparability without public rankings.

Evidence burdens must be proportionate to capacity and risk. For micro and small enterprises, credible proxies, sampling, and attestations may be used where direct measurement would be unduly intrusive or costly, provided that reliability is maintained and improvement trajectories are verified over time. For high-risk contexts or sectors, stronger forms of evidence (e.g., independent assessments, system-generated logs, or outcome studies) may be required. All evidence handling must follow privacy-by-design, consent ledgering, and secure storage rules set in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, with sensitivity classifications and access controls per Chapter 21.

Stakeholder engagement is integral to materiality and must be safe, inclusive, and non-retaliatory. Anonymous channels, informed consent, and culturally appropriate methods are required where power asymmetries or safety concerns exist. Raw testimonies and qualitative inputs are evidence, subject to protection measures and triangulation where feasible. Publication independence remains intact; materiality outcomes do not predetermine disclosure obligations, which are always voluntary and revocable.



Context notes and sector annexes are living instruments maintained in the Annexes to this document. Drafting must follow the metarules in Chapter 12, including authorship competence, conflict-of-interest declarations, public comment, and GSIA approval. Upon approval, annexes attain binding interpretive status for their scope and are incorporated by reference into partner methodologies, with sunset and replacement managed under Chapter 23.

## Chapter 5 — Cross Walk Methodology

This chapter establishes the binding methodology for mapping the 17 SGG pillars to external frameworks, including ISO 26000, ILO instruments, OECD standards, sector-specific codes, and national regulatory frameworks. The purpose of the cross-walk is not to harmonise or dilute the A2074-SRS canon but to facilitate interoperability, reduce administrative burden, and allow Validation Partners to integrate externally recognised practices into their indicator catalogues, provided that all such integrations preserve pillar fidelity, confidentiality safeguards, and non-comparative evaluation.

Cross-walks serve as interpretive bridges. They do not confer certification under any external framework, nor may the existence of a cross-walk be used to imply equivalence of standards or interchangeable compliance. ISO 26000 may be referenced solely for self-declaration alignment, as governed by the ISO 26000 Self-Declaration Protocol, and must never be portrayed as certification or accreditation. All cross-walks are subject to GSIA review, approval, and potential withdrawal.

The methodology requires a structured, evidence-supported mapping exercise. Each pillar must be examined against external instruments to determine substantive alignment, partial alignment, or divergence. Where divergence exists, A2074-SRS prevails. Cross-walks may inform indicator selection or weighting but shall never modify canonical definitions or undermine minimum expectations under any pillar.

For operational clarity, the following table sets out the approved interpretive functions of cross-walks and their associated safeguards.

Function of Cross-Walk	Permitted Scope	Prohibited Scope	Required Safeguards
Interpretive Alignment	Identifying areas where external guidance coincides with pillar meaning.	Presenting external frameworks as normative authorities over SGGs.	GSIA approval; notation in annex; no dilution of canonical meaning.
Indicator Integration	Using aligned external indicators as optional references.	Replacing core indicators where material risks exist.	Documented justification; proportionality test; privacy-by-design.
Risk Identification	Identifying sector or geography-specific risks recognised externally.	Elevating external risk scopes above SGG risk model.	Harmonised risk matrix; internal consistency checks.
Evidence Reinforcement	Accepting certain external compliance evidence as supporting documentation.	Accepting external certification as conclusive evidence.	Triangulation; sensitivity classification; redaction protocols.



<b>Burden Reduction</b>	Avoiding double reporting by aligning documentation requirements.	Reducing evidentiary burden below proportionate risk threshold.	Verification that minimum pillar expectations remain intact.
<b>Technical Consistency</b>	Incorporating externally recognised definitions for limited technical concepts.	Using external definitions to reinterpret pillar meaning.	Explicit mapping table; GSIA sign-off; restricted applicability.

Every cross-walk must be documented using a standard structure, including identification of the external source, mapping rationale, interpretive notes, risk implications, evidence requirements, and any conflicts. Conflicts must be categorised and resolved explicitly, either through canonical override, contextualisation, or explicit rejection of the external linkage.

All cross-walks must appear in the Annexes of this document as living references. Validation Partners may not create proprietary cross-walks without GSIA authorisation. Any such addition must undergo public consultation pursuant to Chapter 24 and must be version-controlled in accordance with Chapter 23. In case of interpretive dispute, the decision of GSIA is final and binding, forming precedent for future updates.

## Chapter 6 — Evidence Standards and Evidentiary Hierarchy

This chapter establishes the official evidentiary hierarchy and the standards applicable to documentation, verification, collection, storage, and review of evidence under the A2074-SRS. Its purpose is to ensure that validation results are reliable, proportionate, fair across enterprise types, and fully compliant with patient-level confidentiality, least-intrusive methods, and digital governance requirements.

Evidence shall be considered valid only where it is obtained lawfully, handled in accordance with privacy-by-design principles, and retained under secure, access-controlled environments. Explicit, informed, revocable consent is required where evidence contains personal or sensitive data. Retaliation risks must be mitigated through anonymisation, redaction, or alternative verification pathways.

The following evidentiary hierarchy governs all indicators and scoring systems. Higher-tier evidence carries greater probative weight but may also impose greater intrusiveness; thus, proportionality and capacity sensitivity must guide its use.

Evidentiary Tier	Definition	Typical Examples	Probative Weight	Intrusiveness Level	Notes and Constraints
<b>Tier 1 — Outcome Evidence</b>	Demonstrable, attributable change in conditions resulting from the entity's actions.	Impact data, longitudinal studies, stakeholder welfare improvements, verifiable environmental or social outcomes.	Highest	Medium-High	Attribution tests required; proxies permitted for micro-entities; consent mandatory.



<b>Tier 2 — Output Evidence</b>	Immediate deliverables or activities showing implementation of practices.	Trainings delivered, services provided, audits conducted, activity logs.	High	Medium	Must align with time-bound progress trajectory; supports but does not replace outcomes.
<b>Tier 3 — Process Evidence</b>	Documentation of systems, routines, and controls supporting consistent action.	SOPs, governance protocols, system logs, risk registers, compliance routines.	Moderate	Low—Medium	Must be current, operational, and verifiable; digital trails preferred.
<b>Tier 4 — Policy Evidence</b>	Formal, approved statements of intent.	Policies, charters, commitments, codes.	Supportive Only	Low	Insufficient on its own; must be corroborated by higher tiers.

The hierarchy applies to all indicators unless a sector annex or GSIA ruling provides otherwise. Validation Partners must always seek the least intrusive form of evidence sufficient to establish reliability. For micro-enterprises, early-stage entities, and actors in fragile contexts, credible proxies, attestations, stakeholder interviews, and simplified logs may be used, provided they remain reliable and safe. For high-risk sectors, stronger evidence may be required even for smaller entities, subject to redaction and secure handling under Chapter 21.

Evidence must be evaluated using the following standards:

1. **Relevance** — Directly related to the indicator and pillar interpretation.
2. **Reliability** — Credible, consistent, and verifiable through independent means where feasible.
3. **Temporal Validity** — Current or demonstrating a trajectory consistent with progress-based evaluation.
4. **Triangulation** — Corroborated by at least one additional source where material risks exist.
5. **Least-Intrusive Sufficiency** — No more intrusive than necessary to establish the claim.
6. **Confidentiality and Sensitivity Compliance** — Data classified and handled according to sensitivity tier.
7. **Integrity and Authenticity** — Free from manipulation; verifiable digital signatures or logs preferred.
8. **Accessibility Under Consent** — Accessible only to authorised reviewers with documented consent trail.

To ensure uniformity, the following operational table defines the minimum evidence expectations for different enterprise sizes, subject always to contextualisation.



Enterprise Category	Minimum Evidence Standard	Capacity Adjustments	GSIA Review Threshold
Micro-enterprises	Tier 3 and Tier 4 mandatory; Tier 2 encouraged; Tier 1 where feasible.	Proxies and attestations allowed; simplified documentation accepted.	Standard audit; enhanced only in high-risk sectors.
Small Enterprises	Tier 2 mandatory; Tier 3 and Tier 4 required; Tier 1 expected over time.	Outcome proxies permitted; phased achievement plans required.	Standard audit with random sampling.
Medium Enterprises	Tier 2 and Tier 3 mandatory; Tier 1 for material indicators.	Limited use of proxies; digital records preferred.	Enhanced audit every 3–5 years.
Large Enterprises / Multinationals	Tiers 1, 2, and 3 mandatory; Tier 4 foundational.	No proxies except in justified contexts; robust data trails required.	Full GSIA oversight cycle; external review required for high-risk areas.

No evidence may be used if it risks retaliation, breaches confidentiality, or exceeds permissible intrusiveness. In such cases, alternative verification pathways must be applied, including anonymised interviews, independent attestations, aggregated data, or structured stakeholder panels. Evidence that cannot be safely collected must not be penalised; instead, it must be addressed through documented risk-mitigation commitments consistent with progress-based evaluation.

All evidence records must be securely stored, encrypted, and linked to the consent ledger defined in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. Access logs must be maintained and auditable. Any breach must be reported to GSIA within the statutory timeframe established in the Governance & Oversight Manual.

## Chapter 7 — Indicator Design Principles

This chapter sets binding principles for the design, selection, calibration, and maintenance of indicators under the A2074-SRS. Indicators operationalise the uniform meaning of the 17 SGG pillars while respecting proportionality, progress-based evaluation, non-comparative assessment, subsidiarity, and capacity sensitivity. Indicators shall be constructed so that microenterprises and large corporates are assessed against the same canonical meaning, with evidentiary burden and complexity tailored to capacity and risk. No indicator may be adopted that, by structure or application, undermines patient-level confidentiality, publication independence, or the authority of GSIA oversight.

Indicators must be clear, measurable, verifiable, proportionate, and auditable. Clarity requires unambiguous scope and defined terms aligned to the taxonomy in Chapter 3. Measurability requires a defined scale, unit, or categorical logic enabling consistent observation. Verifiability requires that evidence from the hierarchy in Chapter 6 can reliably substantiate the indicator without undue intrusiveness. Proportionality requires scaling of the method and burden to enterprise capacity and contextual risk while maintaining pillar fidelity. Auditability requires a transparent trail from the



indicator's definition to its data source, transformation rules, and scoring logic, maintained within the digital governance architecture defined in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

For operational precision, the following table establishes the canonical quality criteria for indicator design and the tests required at adoption and review.

Indicator Quality Criterion	Binding Rule	Operational Test for Adoption and Review
<b>Clarity</b>	Indicators must have a single, unambiguous meaning aligned to the pillar interpretation.	Plain-language definition, scope note, and exclusions recorded; conflicting readings resolved through GSIA notation.
<b>Measurability</b>	Indicators must specify a scale (nominal, ordinal, interval, ratio) and unit or category logic.	Scale and unit documented; measurement method reproducible across partner tools and assessors.
<b>Verifiability</b>	Indicators must be substantiated by evidence within the hierarchy, preferably Tier 2–1 for material risks.	Evidentiary pathway documented with least-intrusive sufficiency analysis and consent handling.
<b>Equitable Proportionality</b>	Burden and method must scale with capacity and risk without diluting pillar meaning.	Size-tier templates and risk triggers published; micro-entity proxies justified and time-bound.
<b>Temporal Validity</b>	Indicators must admit longitudinal assessment and progress trajectories.	Baseline, interval, and target logic defined; stale data cut-offs declared.
<b>Sensitivity &amp; Privacy</b>	Indicators must avoid unnecessary capture of personal or sensitive data.	Data minimisation documented; redaction and anonymisation pathways configured.
<b>Context Compatibility</b>	Indicators must accept contextualisation without altering canonical meaning.	Materiality decision tree and sector/geography notes linked; weighting ranges pre-approved.
<b>Auditability</b>	Indicators must be traceable through data lineage, transformation, and scoring.	Data dictionary entries complete; algorithmic steps documented with version tags.
<b>Bias &amp; Accessibility</b>	Indicators must be tested for scale bias and accessibility across enterprise types.	Pre-deployment bias testing; readability and support materials verified for SMEs.

Indicators may be quantitative or qualitative. Qualitative indicators must use structured rubrics with defined anchors to avoid discretion drift. Where indicators use proxy measures, the causal or contributory logic must be explicit, and the proxy shall be periodically re-validated against emerging outcome evidence. Indicators relying on self-attestation require corroboration through Tier 3 or higher



evidence, except where GSIA authorises temporary reliance in fragile contexts under Chapter 21 safeguards.

To support consistency, measurement scales must be explicitly declared. The following table governs permissible scales and their interpretive use.

Scale Type	Description	Permissible Uses	Constraints
<b>Nominal</b>	Categorical without inherent order.	Eligibility checks; presence/absence of a control.	Not to be used for magnitude claims or aggregation without transformation.
<b>Ordinal</b>	Ordered categories without equal intervals.	Maturity ladders; rubric-anchored practices.	Aggregation requires monotonic transformation with documented anchors.
<b>Interval</b>	Numeric scale with equal intervals, no true zero.	Indices combining multiple sub-measures.	Zero point arbitrary; ratio claims prohibited.
<b>Ratio</b>	Numeric scale with equal intervals and true zero.	Rates, intensities, outcome measures.	Allows proportionate aggregation; outlier handling required.

“Not applicable” (N/A) designations must be narrowly construed and justified by materiality, not convenience. Missing data and deferrals are distinct from N/A and shall be treated as follows.

Status	Definition	Permissible Treatment	Guardrail
<b>N/A</b>	Indicator is genuinely not material to the entity’s context.	Exclude from denominator; document rationale and context note reference.	N/A share capped by pillar-level rules; excess requires GSIA authorisation.
<b>Missing</b>	Data required exists but is not provided.	Penalise per approved parameter; initiate corrective action timeline.	Persistent missing data escalates to GSIA review.
<b>Deferred</b>	Indicator applicable but evidence not yet feasible due to lifecycle constraints.	Time-bound plan with milestones; temporary weighting shift allowed.	Automatic recheck within the next cycle; failure reverts to missing.

All new indicators, material amendments, and retirements must pass public comment and GSIA approval under Chapter 24 and be versioned in accordance with Chapter 23. Partner-specific indicators are permitted only where they meet these principles and are registered in the annexed indicator catalogue with cross-walk notes where relevant. Any indicator that risks coercive disclosure or retaliation is prohibited unless an alternative, less intrusive pathway has been established.



## Chapter 8 — Scoring, Levels, and Conversions

This chapter establishes the binding parameters for scoring methodologies, recognition levels, and conversion rules across models, including points systems, hospitality-style stars, badges, and maturity ladders. Diversity of models is permitted to meet sector and market needs; however, all models must preserve pillar fidelity, non-comparative assessment, publication independence, confidentiality, and proportionality. Composite outputs are subject to anti-masking controls and minimum presence thresholds across pillars.

All scoring must originate from pillar-level determinations. Indicators are scored, weighted within a pillar pursuant to approved ranges, and aggregated to a normalised pillar score on a declared scale. Composite representations may be produced only where each pillar meets a minimum presence threshold, and no single pillar falls below a floor specified for the model family in the Multi-Model Validation Framework. Where thresholds are not met, publication must revert to disaggregated pillar narratives or single-goal outputs; no composite is permitted.

For uniformity, model families and their binding properties are defined as follows.

Model Family	Canonical Purpose	Required Properties	Publication Rules
Points	Fine-grained scoring for internal management and longitudinal tracking.	Normalisation to a common pillar scale; transparent weighting; audit trail.	Public points only if accompanied by pillar narratives; no cross-entity rankings.
Stars (Hospitality-Style)	Simple, recognisable recognition aligned to lay understanding.	Discrete levels mapped to pillar floors and minimum presence thresholds.	Stars published only with per-pillar status; no comparative league tables.
Badges	Pillar-specific or thematic attestations.	Single-goal integrity; explicit scope and evidence class.	Badges must never be presented as composite performance.
Maturity Ladders	Capability development and staged adoption.	Ordinal levels with rubric anchors; time-bound progression expectations.	Public display must include anchor definitions and last-verified date.

Conversions between models must be monotonic, transparent, and reversible within the calibration domain. Reversibility means that, given the conversion artefact and underlying pillar scores, one can reconstruct the original model's representation without material loss of meaning. Conversions must never inflate apparent performance nor reduce the visibility of underperformance in material areas. The conversion artefacts and their parameter ranges form part of the annexed technical documentation and are subject to GSIA approval and periodic recalibration.



The following table sets the required elements for cross-model conversions.

From → To	Required Input	Conversion Method Constraint	Safeguard
<b>Points → Stars</b>	Normalised pillar scores and minimum presence checks.	Map composite only where all pillar floors are met; else no star conversion.	Anti-masking: low pillars trigger cap on achievable stars.
<b>Points → Maturity</b>	Pillar scores and rubric anchors.	Ordinal mapping must respect anchor definitions and avoid pseudo-precision.	Human review for boundary cases; publish anchor text.
<b>Stars → Points</b>	Star level and underlying pillar states.	Back-calculation uses parameter bands; wide bands must be disclosed as ranges.	No use for benchmarking across entities.
<b>Badges → Points/Stars</b>	Badge scope and evidence class.	No composite conversion; badges remain non-composite.	Cross-reference only; do not aggregate.

To preserve fairness and fidelity, the following rules apply to scoring and aggregation:

First, all indicators contributing to a pillar must declare their weights and scales, with weights constrained to approved ranges to prevent dominance by convenience measures. Second, missing or deferred indicators must be treated in accordance with Chapter 7; imputation is prohibited unless explicitly authorised and documented with uncertainty bounds. Third, outliers must be addressed through robust methods (e.g., winsorisation or capped ratios) recorded in the model notes; methods must not erase genuine adverse outcomes. Fourth, any cross-pillar aggregation must implement anti-masking controls, including caps on the extent to which overperformance in one pillar can offset underperformance elsewhere. Fifth, “not applicable” treatments may adjust denominators but are capped at defined shares per pillar, subject to GSIA approval where exceeded.

Parameter transparency is mandatory. Each model must publish its normalisation scheme, weighting ranges, thresholds for levels, treatment of N/A, missing, and deferred statuses, and rules for composite eligibility. Partners must maintain a versioned “model card” describing intended use, limitations, bias testing outcomes, and calibration datasets, all lodged in the annex and accessible to GSIA. Where AI is used in scoring or conversion, Chapter 20 applies; human primacy and explainability are required.

Publication independence remains controlling law. Prices, outcomes, and any form of recognition shall not be conditioned on disclosure. Where entities choose to disclose, they must be offered a privacy-preserving option emphasising pillar narratives and progress trajectories without cross-entity comparison. Any public display must include the last validation date, version of the model, and a statement clarifying that results are non-comparative and subject to confidentiality and consent rules.

Finally, equivalency across models is governed by Chapter 18. No partner may claim or imply that a given star level, point range, or maturity rank is “equal to” another model’s level without an approved equivalency statement and a live conversion artefact registered in the annex. GSIA may suspend or revoke equivalency where drift, bias, or material inconsistency is detected.



## Chapter 9 — Aggregation and Trade-Off Rules

This chapter governs the aggregation of indicators into pillar-level determinations and, where permitted, the formation of composite outputs. Its purpose is to prevent methodological distortion, protect the integrity of each SGG pillar, and ensure that overperformance in one area cannot obscure underperformance in another. These rules apply to all Validation Partners and all licensed scoring models, including points-based systems, stars, badges, and maturity ladders. Any aggregation conducted outside these rules constitutes a methodological breach subject to GSIA oversight.

Aggregation shall occur first at the indicator level, then at the pillar level, and only thereafter, where permitted, into composite results. No model may reverse this sequence. Each aggregation stage must respect weighting parameters, apply anti-masking controls, and satisfy minimum presence thresholds before advancing to the next stage. “Presence” refers to verified engagement with all material indicators within a pillar, as determined under Chapters 4 and 7.

At the indicator-to-pillar level, all indicators must be normalised to a common scale appropriate to the model family. Weighting adjustments must remain within the approved ranges set in the Multi-Model Validation Framework. Where indicators are deferred or missing, their treatment must follow Chapter 7; no imputation of scores is permitted unless explicitly authorised and disclosed, with uncertainty ranges documented. Indicators marked as not applicable may be excluded from weighting, but their share within a pillar is capped; exceeding the cap requires GSIA authorisation after review of the contextual findings.

At the pillar-to-composite level, aggregation is permitted only where each pillar meets a defined performance floor and where at least a minimum share of indicators within each pillar is present and verified. Performance floors are set per model family and reflect the minimum necessary engagement with each pillar to claim composite representation. Where a pillar falls below the floor, composite outputs are prohibited and must revert to disaggregated narratives or single-goal attestations.

To ensure operational clarity, the following table sets out allowable aggregation structures, their constraints, and required safeguards.

Aggregation Stage	Permitted Method	Binding Constraint	Safeguards
Indicator → Pillar	Weighted aggregation within approved ranges.	No indicator weight may exceed caps; “process-only” clusters must not dominate.	Declared weights; treatment of missing/deferred documented; sensitivity and privacy checks.
Pillar → Composite	Normalised aggregation where floors are met.	All pillars must meet minimum presence thresholds; no pillar may fall below the floor.	Anti-masking rules; publication fallback to disaggregated reporting.
Composite → Public Output	Optional composite visualisation (stars, indices).	Disclosure voluntary; no cross-entity comparisons.	Publication independence statement; versioning; opt-out mechanisms.

Anti-masking rules are central to this chapter. Overperformance in one pillar may not compensate for underperformance in another, particularly where stakeholder harm, severity of risk, or rights-based



obligations are implicated. Each model must implement a cap on permissible cross-pillar compensation, expressed as a maximum allowable offset. Caps vary by model family but must ensure that “high” performance in one pillar cannot raise an overall score where another pillar falls below the required floor.

Aggregation must also respect the non-comparative canon. Internal normalisation may establish a consistent scale, but at no time may relative performance between different entities be made visible in public outputs. Even where aggregated scores are published, they must be contextualised as non-comparative and must not enable inference of rank or competitive standing.

Partners must maintain a complete audit trail of all aggregation rules, parameters, transformations, and version histories. Any amendment to aggregation logic must follow the revision protocol in Chapter 23, including public notice, GSIA approval, and a transitional period appropriate to the change’s operational impact.

No aggregation rule may override confidentiality or consent. Where evidence required for aggregation cannot be safely disclosed or collected, the aggregation must exclude such indicators and rely instead on alternative verification pathways consistent with least-intrusive sufficiency. GSIA may suspend or modify aggregation permissions for any partner whose methodology threatens confidentiality or fairness.

## Chapter 10 — Non-Comparative Benchmarking Protocol

This chapter codifies the binding protocol for non-comparative benchmarking. The A2074-SRS forbids all forms of public ranking, league tables, comparative grading, or competitive positioning of entities against one another. Benchmarking under the standard shall be exclusively longitudinal (tracking an entity’s own trajectory over time) and internal (tracking progress relative to an entity-defined baseline). Any attempt to infer or display inter-entity comparisons constitutes a breach subject to GSIA enforcement.

The protocol rests on three pillars: temporal benchmarking, self-trajectory benchmarking, and contextual progress interpretation. Temporal benchmarking assesses change across validation cycles, measuring outcomes, outputs, processes, and policy implementation against prior states. Self-trajectory benchmarking evaluates whether an entity’s progress aligns with defined targets and improvement pathways established during earlier validations. Contextual progress interpretation integrates the materiality and contextualisation assessments in Chapter 4 to ensure that progress is interpreted within realistic constraints arising from sector, geography, size, lifecycle stage, and value-chain role.

Under this protocol, all public or private benchmarking outputs must take the form of narratives, calibrated scales, or charts that reflect only the entity’s internal trajectory. No formatting or graphical element may imply peer comparison, percentile placement, quartiles, market position, or competitive rank. Benchmarking insights may inform internal strategic decisions, resource allocation, and stakeholder dialogue, but must not be used to generate external reputational pressure or to influence pricing, validation outcomes, or access to services.

For operational clarity, the following table delineates permitted and prohibited benchmarking practices.



Benchmarking Form	Permitted Use	Prohibited Use	Required Safeguards
<b>Longitudinal Charts</b>	Visualising progress over time for a single entity.	Comparing two or more entities on the same axis.	Clear statement that trends are non-comparative.
<b>Trajectory Scales</b>	Showing movement along an entity-specific maturity path.	Using scales calibrated to market averages or peer groups.	Anchors defined; last-validated date included.
<b>Narrative Benchmarking</b>	Describing improvements or regressions in relation to the entity's prior state.	Describing performance relative to competitors or sector peers.	Confidentiality and consent applied; neutral language.
<b>Indicator Baseline Tracking</b>	Measuring change against a historical baseline.	Publishing baselines of multiple entities in a comparative format.	Access controlled; anonymisation where needed.
<b>Internal Peer Learning</b>	Aggregating anonymised data for internal learning sessions.	Publishing any anonymised dataset likely to enable re-identification or ranking.	Risk assessment; GSIA review for high-risk contexts.

Entities may request comparative insights solely for internal capacity-building, but these must be anonymised, aggregated, and subjected to re-identification risk testing. Where re-identification risks cannot be mitigated, the information may not be shared. Validation Partners must document all internal comparative analyses, ensuring that the materials contain no entity identifiers and that the risk-mitigation protocols meet the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual's requirements for differential privacy and secure handling.

Benchmarking must also respect publication independence. Entities may not be pressured, incentivised, or penalised for agreeing or refusing to publish benchmarking narratives. Disclosed benchmarking must explicitly note that the results reflect only the entity's internal progress and do not imply any competitive or cross-entity standing.

All benchmarking tools, interfaces, dashboards, and outputs must be reviewed for compliance prior to deployment. Partners using AI-driven analytics must apply the safeguards in Chapter 20, including bias testing, explainability, human oversight, and explicit exclusion of training data that might embed cross-entity comparators. Any breach—intentional or incidental—triggers GSIA review, corrective measures, and potential suspension of partner accreditation.

Finally, all non-comparative benchmarking materials must specify the validation cycle, the version of the scoring model, the version of the indicator catalogue, and any contextual factors affecting interpretation. They must be version-controlled and accessible only to authorised parties consistent with consent records.

## Chapter 11 — Proportionality by Enterprise Size and Capacity

This chapter operationalises the principle of proportionality as it applies to enterprises of different sizes, capacities, resources, and developmental stages. Its purpose is to ensure that the A2074-SRS is



uniformly interpretable while fairly applied to microenterprises, SMEs, large corporations, and multinational groups operating under varying institutional, geographic, and financial constraints. Proportionality shall never dilute the meaning of any SGG pillar. Instead, it calibrates the evidentiary burden, indicator complexity, verification method, and validation cycle to ensure fairness, feasibility, and fidelity to the standard.

Proportionality applies across five domains: (i) indicator design and selection, (ii) evidentiary burden and hierarchy, (iii) scoring and aggregation, (iv) validation cadence, and (v) corrective action expectations. Each domain must be applied in a manner that respects the entity's operational reality, while maintaining consistency with Chapters 7–10, the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, and the Operating Manual. GSIA retains full oversight authority and may require enhanced safeguards where proportionality risks concealment of material issues.

Indicators must scale in complexity according to capacity. Microenterprises may satisfy certain indicators through simplified proxies or attestations, whereas large enterprises must provide more detailed evidence—including system-generated logs, outcome data, and risk-based analyses. Indicator presence thresholds remain consistent across all entities; however, documentation depth varies proportionately. Similarly, the validation cadence—i.e., the frequency of reassessment—shall adjust according to risk profile, size, and sector without relieving the entity of continuous-improvement obligations.

To maintain consistency, the following table summarises minimum proportionality expectations for each enterprise category.

Enterprise Category	Indicator Complexity	Evidence Requirements	Validation Cadence	Corrective Action Expectations
Micro-enterprises	Simplified indicators; limited sub-indicators; focus on core practices.	Tier 3–4 required; Tier 2 encouraged; Tier 1 where feasible; proxies allowed.	Extended cycle with progress check-ins; cadence adapted to capacity.	Milestones reasonable and time-bound; emphasis on achievable practices.
Small Enterprises	Moderately complex indicators; sector-specific tailoring where risks exist.	Tier 2–3 required; Tier 1 expected over time; limited use of proxies.	Standard cycle with sector risk adjustments.	Clear remediation plans with periodic verification.
Medium Enterprises	Full indicator set; sector and geography adjustments applied.	Tier 2–1 required for material issues; digital logs preferred.	Standard cycle; enhanced review every 3–5 years.	Structured corrective actions with evidence of implementation.
Large & Multinational Enterprises	Full complexity indicators; full	Tier 1–2 mandatory; proxies prohibited	Standard cycle plus targeted	Comprehensive remediation plans with



	sector/geography coverage.	except by GSIA authorisation.	high-risk reviews.	outcome-based verification.
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

Proportionality does not authorise reduction of minimum standards where high risk or high impact contexts apply. A microenterprise engaged in a high-risk activity remains responsible for demonstrating proportionate risk mitigation through Tier 2 or Tier 1 evidence where necessary. Conversely, a large enterprise operating in a low-risk context may align evidence to the context while maintaining the obligatory minimum presence in all applicable pillars.

Where proportionality interacts with contextualisation, proportionality governs the *method* and *burden*, while contextualisation governs *relevance* and *materiality*. Neither may override canonical pillar meaning. Where doubt exists, the rule most protective of stakeholder welfare, confidentiality, and pillar fidelity shall prevail. GSIA determinations on proportionality disputes form precedential notes to be incorporated into the next revision cycle under Chapter 23.

## Chapter 12 — Sectoral Context Notes (General)

This chapter establishes the general metarules for drafting, adopting, revising, and applying sectoral context notes and sector annexes under the A2074-SRS. These instruments provide tailored guidance addressing the distinct risk profiles, operational characteristics, regulatory frameworks, and leverage patterns associated with specific economic sectors. Sector annexes do not alter the canonical meaning of any SGG pillar; rather, they refine materiality tests, indicator selection, weighting ranges, and evidence expectations to align the standard with sector realities while preserving its universality.

Sectoral context notes are mandatory where a sector displays inherent or emergent risks affecting human rights, environmental stewardship, labor conditions, responsible governance, or community welfare. Examples include manufacturing, extractives, agriculture, healthcare, logistics, financial services, digital platforms, and public administration. The presence of a sector annex does not diminish the applicability of the 17-pillar canon; instead, it specifies how that canon interfaces with sector-specific risk, opportunity, and leverage structures.

To ensure uniformity, every sector annex must contain the following elements: a sector definition and scope; a risk and opportunity matrix; materiality guidance for each pillar; indicator augmentation or prioritisation notes; evidence escalation requirements for high-risk areas; contextual weighting parameters; and confidentiality and sensitivity considerations inherent to the sector. All annexes must comply with the privacy-by-design, consent, and security rules of the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

For clarity, the following table sets out required components for each sector annex.

Component of Sector Annex	Mandatory Content	Binding Effect
<b>Sector Definition &amp; Scope</b>	Definition; sub-sectors; core activities; boundary conditions.	Binding for materiality determinations.
<b>Risk &amp; Opportunity Matrix</b>	Sector-specific risks and opportunities mapped to each pillar.	Guides prioritisation; does not modify canonical meaning.



<b>Materiality Guidance</b>	Approved relevance tests; sector baselines; contextual determinants.	Binding for indicator selection and weighting ranges.
<b>Indicator Augmentation</b>	Additional indicators for sector risks; clarifications on applicability.	Binding for high-risk sub-sectors; optional in low-risk zones.
<b>Evidence Escalation Rules</b>	Requirements for enhanced evidence (e.g., independent audits, logs).	Binding for severe or systemic risk areas.
<b>Confidentiality Considerations</b>	Sector-specific sensitivity classifications and safe handling.	Fully binding under Chapter 21.
<b>Public Communication Notes</b>	Sector expectations for voluntary disclosure.	Non-binding; preserves publication independence.

Drafting of sector annexes follows a structured pathway. First, a technical drafting group must be established, including subject-matter experts, SMEs, large-enterprise representatives, civil society stakeholders, and independent specialists with no conflicts of interest. Second, the draft annex must undergo risk screening for potential harm, disproportionate burden, or unintended bias. Third, the annex must enter a public consultation period consistent with Chapter 24. Fourth, a final draft must be submitted to GSIA for approval, amendment, or rejection. Upon approval, the annex becomes binding for all Validation Partners operating in the relevant sector.

Sector annexes are living documents and must be reviewed at least every three years or earlier where material shifts occur in technology, regulation, or sectoral practice. All amendments are subject to the revision protocol in Chapter 23. Where a sector annex conflicts with any other interpretive rule, the hierarchical resolution rule applies: canonical pillar meaning prevails; followed by this document; followed by the Operating Manual; followed by the sector annex; followed by partner-specific implementations.

Sector annexes must never be used to justify reduced engagement with a pillar. Their function is to increase specificity, not to limit applicability. Where a sector-specific risk elevates the relevance of a pillar, the annex may require stronger indicators or higher evidence tiers. Where a sector has inherently low exposure on a pillar, the annex may clarify reduced weighting within approved ranges, but the pillar remains fully applicable.

## Chapter 13 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 1 to SGG 5

This chapter provides the authoritative interpretations for SGG 1 through SGG 5. Each interpretation preserves the uniform meaning of the pillar across sectors and jurisdictions while enabling proportionate, context-sensitive application consistent with Chapters 3, 4, and 7–10. Pillar meaning is canonical and may not be re-defined by partner models; indicator selection, evidentiary burden, and weighting are tailored through materiality and contextualisation rules without diluting the canon. GSIA retains adjudicatory powers over all disputes and approvals.

### Canonical Pillar Titles (Reference Recital).

SGG 1: Universal Access to Essential Services; SGG 2: Eradicating Poverty through Social Support; SGG 3: Gender Equality and Empowerment; SGG 4: Educational Equity and Lifelong Learning; SGG 5: Mental Health and Well-being for All. [\[Agenda for...Merged.pdf | PDF\]](#)



### **Numbering Clarification.**

Where the AfSE 2074 Annex A matrix and related tables illustrate outcome domains and indicators, certain entries correspond to sectoral delivery areas that may not mirror the canonical numbering used in the Agenda 2074 Summary Table. For the avoidance of doubt, the present chapter follows the Agenda 2074 canon as listed above; cross-reference to AfSE tables is for indicator illustration only.

## **SGG 1 — Universal Access to Essential Services**

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 1 requires that health care, clean water and sanitation, education, energy, adequate housing, and digital connectivity be available, reachable, affordable in practice, quality-assured, and delivered without discrimination. “Universal” denotes inclusion across all population groups with reasonable accommodation for disability, age, language, and legal status barriers. Access includes rights-based governance, intelligible user information, safe grievance, and non-retaliatory redress.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Health & Primary Care	Clinic coverage; essential medicines; maternal/child services; facility uptime SLAs	Tier 2–1: facility uptime logs, HMIS extracts, outcome trends	Micro-providers may evidence via simplified service logs; patient-level data must be consented and redacted.
Water & Sanitation (WASH)	Household access rates; service continuity; contamination monitoring; public water-quality disclosure	Tier 2–3: utility MIS, audit reports; Tier 1 where outcomes measured	Least-intrusive sampling; community feedback anonymised; publication independence preserved.
Education Access	Enrollment and completion; TVET placement within 6–12 months; gender parity index	Tier 2–1: administrative records, tracer studies	In fragile contexts, proxies and cohort samples acceptable with time-bound improvements.
Energy for Households	Outage duration; safe connections; service restoration times	Tier 2: NOC/SCADA logs; Tier 3: SOPs	Personal address data treated as sensitive; publish aggregated continuity metrics.
Adequate Housing	Units meeting habitability standards; eviction safeguards; access to utilities	Tier 2–3: registries, inspection reports	Beneficiary identities protected; grievance data aggregated.



Digital Connectivity & E-Government	Broadband penetration; e-government uptime; service request resolution time	Tier 2: uptime dashboards, SLA attestations; Tier 1 where outcomes measured	Privacy-by-design and AI guardrails mandatory; logs disclosed only in aggregate.
-------------------------------------	---	---	--

The above indicators are illustrative. Sectoral annexes may add or prioritise indicators where risk and opportunity warrant, provided they remain within the evidentiary hierarchy (Chapter 6) and design principles (Chapter 7). AfSE matrices and sector playbooks may be used as optional references for indicator articulation and verification pathways.

## SGG 2 — Eradicating Poverty through Social Support

### Authoritative Interpretation.

SGG 2 mandates rights-based social protection systems that prevent, reduce, and eliminate poverty by stabilising income, removing practical barriers to essential services, enabling capability pathways (education, skills, employability), and guaranteeing safe access to grievance and appeal. Design and delivery are non-discriminatory, privacy-preserving, and proportionate to context.

### Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Enrollment & Targeting	Time to onboarding; eligibility fairness; exclusion error rate	Tier 2–3: administrative case files; Tier 1 where outcome effects evidenced	Personal data minimised; consented access; publish error rates in aggregate only.
Service Linkage	Share of beneficiaries linked to SGG 1 services (health, WASH, education, digital)	Tier 2: linkage logs; Tier 1: utilisation outcomes	N/A designations must be materiality-justified; linkage quality audited.
Capability Pathways	Recognition of prior learning (RPL); job placement rates; apprenticeship uptake	Tier 2–1: programme records; tracer studies	Micro-schemes may use sampled attestations with improvement plans.
Safeguards & Appeals	% grievances resolved within time limits; non-retaliation evidence	Tier 2–3: grievance registries; independent attestations	Anonymous channels mandatory; qualitative testimonies protected and triangulated.

## SGG 3 — Gender Equality and Empowerment

### Authoritative Interpretation.

SGG 3 requires elimination of discrimination and violence based on gender, equal participation and leadership, pay equity, bodily autonomy, equitable access to property, finance, technology, and data rights, and the embedding of gender-responsive design across all institutions and services.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Participation & Leadership	Share of women and non-binary persons in leadership; board parity	Tier 2: HR/payroll audits; Tier 3: governance records	Privacy safeguards applied; publish ratios, not identities.
Pay Equity	Gender pay gap indices; promotion parity over time	Tier 2: payroll audits; Tier 1 where outcomes verified	SMEs may use simplified equity audits with staged remediation.
Safety & GBV Mitigation	Workplace/sectoral GBV prevalence reduction; policy enforcement	Tier 2–3: grievance logs; independent investigations	Sensitive data tiered; least-intrusive verification; redaction mandatory.
Digital/Data Equity	Gender parity in digital access, training, and safe use	Tier 2: usage logs (aggregated); Tier 3: SOPs	AI bias tests and explainability disclosures required.

**SGG 4 — Educational Equity and Lifelong Learning****Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 4 establishes a rights-based entitlement to inclusive, quality education and continuous skills development across the life course, including early childhood, primary, secondary, TVET, tertiary, and adult learning. Delivery is inclusive by design, with safe environments and inter-operability to WASH, energy, and digital connectivity under SGG 1.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Access & Completion	Enrollment, completion, re-entry pathways; parity indices	Tier 2–1: administrative records; cohort tracking	Micro providers may report simplified cohorts; protect learner identities.
Learning Outcomes	Literacy, numeracy, and digital proficiency	Tier 1–2: assessment results; independent sampling	Sampling designs accepted for SMEs; publish aggregated proficiency bands.
Lifelong Learning	Adult/continuing education participation; RPL utilisation	Tier 2: programme records; Tier 3: SOPs	Accessibility accommodations documented; low-burden proxies permitted.
Safe & Inclusive Environments	WASH in schools; safeguarding protocols; grievance safety	Tier 2–3: inspection reports; grievance logs	Anonymised reporting; child protection standards enforced.



## SGG 5 — Mental Health and Well-being for All

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 5 integrates mental health promotion, prevention, and care into public health and community systems, ensures non-discriminatory, stigma-free access, and mandates privacy-preserving support across workplaces, schools, and services.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Service Coverage	Access to community and primary-care mental health services	Tier 2: service utilisation logs; Tier 1: outcome studies	Sensitive health data always consent-ledgered; redaction by default.
Treatment Gap & Outcomes	Reduction in treatment gaps; relapse/readmission trends	Tier 1: longitudinal outcomes; Tier 2: programme data	Where Tier 1 infeasible, use credible proxies with staged plan.
Stigma Reduction & Safety	Workplace/school programmes; grievance safety	Tier 2–3: policy/process evidence; independent attestations	Anonymous surveys permitted; retaliation protections mandatory.

## Chapter 14 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 6 to SGG 10

This chapter continues the authoritative interpretations for SGG 6 through SGG 10. The same rules of canonical meaning, proportionality, evidentiary hierarchy, and publication independence apply. Cross-references to AfSE matrices are for indicator illustration and shall not be construed as altering canonical numbering under Agenda 2074.

### **Canonical Pillar Titles (Reference Recital).**

SGG 6: Community Resilience and Disaster Preparedness; SGG 7: Inclusive and Equitable Urban Development; SGG 8: Social Justice and Fair Governance; SGG 9: Eradication of Social Inequality; SGG 10: Decent Work for Social Empowerment.

### **Technical Note on Cross-References.**

AfSE 2074 Annex A includes detailed indicator examples for domains such as climate & resilience, water and sanitation, housing & urban equity, and governance & integrity. These may be used to operationalise SGG 6–10 provided the Agenda 2074 canonical titles and meanings control and any cross-walks are recorded under Chapter 5.

## SGG 6 — Community Resilience and Disaster Preparedness

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 6 requires that essential services, institutions, and communities maintain continuity and recoverability under shocks through risk-informed planning, contingency protocols, and equitable crisis response that protects vulnerable groups.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Risk & Continuity Planning	Published continuity targets; tested contingency plans	Tier 2–3: plans, incident logs; Tier 1 where outcome continuity verified	Public summaries are non-identifying; drill results anonymised.
Resilience Outcomes	Resilience index movement; service restoration times	Tier 1–2: MRV protocols; service dashboards	Use least-intrusive MRV; protect critical-infrastructure data.
Inclusive Response	Equitable access to aid; grievance and remedy under crisis	Tier 2–3: case registries; community attestations	Heightened retaliation safeguards; safe channels mandatory.

**SGG 7 — Inclusive and Equitable Urban Development****Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 7 mandates urban development that is inclusive, affordable, safe, and participatory, preventing spatial inequality and enabling equitable access to housing, transport, basic services, and digital infrastructure.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Housing & Urban Equity	Affordable units delivered; energy-efficiency ratings	Tier 2: registries, audits; Tier 1 where outcome effects evidenced	Tenant data anonymised; eviction protections monitored.
Urban Services & Transport	Coverage and accessibility of WASH, mobility, connectivity	Tier 2: utility/MIS logs; Tier 3: SOPs	Aggregate route/service data; accessibility audits published.
Participatory Planning	Documented community inputs; inclusion of marginalised groups	Tier 3: minutes, representation logs; Tier 2: implementation evidence	Non-retaliatory participation protocols required.

**SGG 8 — Social Justice and Fair Governance****Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 8 requires transparent, accountable, participatory governance, rule-of-law safeguards, integrity in public administration, open and fair procurement, access to justice, and non-discriminatory redress mechanisms.



#### Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Transparency & Procurement Integrity	Open procurement rate; timely audit closures	Tier 2: e-procurement logs; audit reports	Sensitive vendor data minimised; publication independence preserved.
Access to Justice	Case resolution times; legal aid coverage; safe grievance	Tier 2–1: court/ombuds records; surveys	Protect complainant identities; publish aggregated outcomes.
Civic Participation	Inclusion of vulnerable groups in public decision forums	Tier 3–2: representation records; verified minutes	Non-retaliation guarantees; culturally appropriate methods.

#### SGG 9 — Eradication of Social Inequality

##### Authoritative Interpretation.

SGG 9 targets structural disparities in access, opportunity, and outcomes across income, gender, age, disability, origin, and other protected characteristics, requiring coherent policies and institutional practices that measurably reduce horizontal and vertical inequalities.

#### Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Equality of Access	Reduction in documented access gaps to SGG 1 services	Tier 1–2: disaggregated utilisation data	Data minimisation and anonymisation mandatory.
Institutional Reform	Adoption of anti-discrimination codes; enforcement actions	Tier 3–2: policy/process evidence; enforcement logs	SMEs may stage adoption under time-bound plans.
Representation & Mobility	Diversity in leadership; mobility indices for marginalised groups	Tier 2: HR/governance audits; surveys	Publish percentage bands, not identities.

#### SGG 10 — Decent Work for Social Empowerment

##### Authoritative Interpretation.

SGG 10 requires fair, safe, and meaningful employment; compliance with labour rights; pathways to employability and advancement; social protection; and inclusive workplaces that remove discrimination and support mobility from informal to formal work.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Job Creation & Formalisation	MSMEs financed; jobs created; formalisation rates	Tier 2–1: business registries; tax filings; tracer studies	Micro-enterprises may use attested proxies with verification.
Fair Standards & Safety	Living-wage compliance; OSH adherence; grievance redress	Tier 2–3: payroll/OSH audits; grievance logs	Worker identities protected; non-retaliation policed.
Skills & Employability	Apprenticeships; RPL and upskilling participation	Tier 2: programme records; Tier 1 where outcomes verified	Publish aggregated placement outcomes; protect personal data.

**Cross-Walk Caution.**

When operationalising these pillars within AfSE 2074 instruments and playbooks (e.g., climate/resilience, WASH, housing/urban, governance/integrity), partners shall use Chapter 5 cross-walk rules to ensure that any sector-specific domain drawn from AfSE tables is correctly mapped to the Agenda 2074 canonical pillar and that no dilution or re-labelling of pillar meaning occurs. All such mappings and any deviations must be recorded, justified by materiality, and approved as required.

## Chapter 15 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 11 to SGG 13

This chapter advances the authoritative interpretations for SGG 11 through SGG 13. The canonical meanings are uniform and non-derogable; tailoring occurs only through materiality and contextualisation under Chapters 4 and 7, with evidence governed by Chapter 6 and anti-masking and non-comparative rules under Chapters 9 and 10. GSIA remains the final arbiter of interpretive disputes.

**Canonical Pillar Titles (Reference Recital).**

SGG 11: Support for Youth and Children’s Development; SGG 12: Fostering Social Cohesion and Inclusivity; SGG 13: Protection of Vulnerable Populations. These titles and their high-level descriptions are set forth in the Agenda 2074 Goals package and are cross-referenced across AfSE 2074 annexes and tables for operational illustration, without altering the canon.

### SGG 11 — Support for Youth and Children’s Development

**Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 11 requires institutions to guarantee equitable access for children and youth to safe development pathways encompassing early childhood care, basic and upper-secondary education, TVET and apprenticeships, health and psychosocial support, civic participation, and protection from abuse, exploitation, and neglect. Delivery must be rights-based, non-discriminatory, age-appropriate, and privacy-preserving, with structured participation mechanisms enabling young people to be heard without retaliation.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Access to Education & Skills	Youth enrollment/completion; apprenticeship and internship slots; transition to work or further study	Tier 2–1: school/TVET records; tracer studies	Identities of minors protected; publish only aggregates and disaggregated rates.
Health & Psychosocial Support	Coverage of youth-friendly services; school mental-health programme uptake	Tier 2–1: utilisation logs; outcome snapshots	Sensitive health data consent-ledgered; least intrusive verification used.
Safe Participation	Youth councils; documented inputs to local decisions; safe grievance routes	Tier 3–2: minutes; case logs; attestations	Non-retaliatory protocols mandatory; anonymised narrative evidence acceptable.

**SGG 12 — Fostering Social Cohesion and Inclusivity****Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 12 requires the design of institutions, services, and public spaces that reduce social fragmentation and enable inclusion across lines of identity, belief, disability, age, migration status, income, and geography. It mandates accessible information, equal service standards, grievance safety, and mechanisms for constructive dialogue, with particular attention to communities historically excluded from decision-making or service access.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Inclusive Access & Design	Removal of language, disability, and documentation barriers; service co-design evidence	Tier 3–2: SOPs, accessibility audits; Tier 1 where outcome shifts verified	SMEs may rely on low-burden access audits with time-bound remediation plans.
Dialogue & Mediation	Documented community dialogues; mediation case resolution without retaliation	Tier 2–3: registers, anonymised case notes	Parties' identities protected; aggregated publication only.
Representation & Equity	Participation of marginalised groups in councils/boards; parity improvements	Tier 2: representation logs; HR/governance audits	Publish percentage bands; no personal data disclosed.



## SGG 13 — Protection of Vulnerable Populations

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 13 mandates targeted safeguards for persons and groups at heightened risk of harm or exclusion, including but not limited to children, women and girls at risk of gender-based violence, persons with disabilities, older persons, migrants and displaced populations, people experiencing homelessness, and those facing intersecting vulnerabilities. Institutions must ensure safe access to services, due process, non-discrimination, tailored accommodations, secure complaint pathways, and effective remedies, governed by least-intrusive, privacy-preserving verification.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Targeted Access & Safety	Safe-access protocols; emergency accommodation or service fast-track	Tier 3–2: SOPs; intake logs; independent attestations	Sensitive location and identity data never published; redaction by default.
Remedies & Redress	Time-bound grievance handling; remedy effectiveness	Tier 2–1: grievance registries; remedy confirmation	Anonymous channels; survivor-centred standards where GBV implicated.
Non-Discrimination & Accommodation	Documented reasonable accommodation; observed reduction in exclusionary incidents	Tier 3–2: policy/process; audits; Tier 1 for outcome movement	Micro-entities may use proxy logs with periodic external attestation.

### **Cross-Pillar Note.**

SGG 11–13 are frequently co-material with SGG 1 (essential services), SGG 3 (gender equality), SGG 8 (justice and fair governance), and SGG 10 (decent work). Where aggregation is presented, anti-masking rules in Chapter 9 apply; overperformance in a non-safeguard area cannot offset underperformance in protection duties.

## Chapter 16 — Pillar Interpretations: SGG 14 to SGG 17

This chapter completes the canonical interpretations for SGG 14 through SGG 17. As before, the interpretive canon prevails across all partner methodologies; any sectoral or financial-instrument mapping shall use Chapter 5 cross-walk rules, recorded in annexed artefacts, and remain subject to GSIA oversight.

### **Canonical Pillar Titles (Reference Recital).**

SGG 14: Cultural and Community Identity Preservation; SGG 15: Support for Family and Community Structures; SGG 16: Promoting Civic Engagement and Participation; SGG 17: Ethical Use of Technology for Social Benefit. These titles and their descriptions are set in the Agenda 2074 package and reinforced by AfSE matrices and playbooks for operational use.



## SGG 14 — Cultural and Community Identity Preservation

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 14 requires recognition, protection, and promotion of cultural heritage, languages, traditions, and community identities, including minority and indigenous cultures, in ways that respect rights, enhance inclusion, and avoid commodification or misappropriation. Institutions must ensure access to cultural life, support cultural transmission and education, and protect against erasure or discriminatory suppression.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Access & Transmission	Availability of cultural education/space; language support and revitalisation	Tier 2–3: programme records; curricula; participation logs	Community consent required for sensitive cultural materials; publication independence applies.
Protection & Non-Misappropriation	Policies and remedies against cultural appropriation and erasure	Tier 3–2: policies; complaint outcomes	Identities safeguarded; redacted case summaries permissible.
Inclusion & Visibility	Participation of cultural groups in institutional decisions	Tier 2: representation logs; minutes	Non-retaliation guarantees for minority and indigenous representatives.

## SGG 15 — Support for Family and Community Structures

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 15 mandates the enabling of stable, safe, and nurturing family and community environments through access to essential services, social protection, care systems, inclusive housing, and community infrastructure, with special attention to caregivers, single-parent and multigenerational households, and informal support networks. It requires proportionate safeguards against family separation due to poverty and protects the right to community life.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Care & Support Systems	Availability and uptake of childcare, eldercare, disability support	Tier 2: service records; Tier 1: outcome effects on participation	Household-level data treated as sensitive; publish aggregate access rates.



Community Infrastructure	Safe communal spaces; social services continuity; housing suitability for families	Tier 2–3: inspection reports; service dashboards	Affordability and suitability assessed using low-intrusion proxies where needed.
Prevention of Harmful Separation	Policies preventing poverty-driven removals; family reunification outcomes	Tier 2–1: case logs; outcome tracking	Survivors' and children's identities never disclosed; redaction mandatory.

## SGG 16 — Promoting Civic Engagement and Participation

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 16 requires credible, safe, and accessible channels for civic participation, including transparent public information, participatory budgeting and planning, youth and community councils, petition and hearing rights, and non-retaliatory grievance systems. It mandates proactive inclusion of under-represented groups and publication practices that enable informed engagement without cross-entity ranking.

### **Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Access to Participation	Number and diversity of accessible participation forums; barrier-removal measures	Tier 3–2: notices, minutes, accessibility audits	SMEs may deploy simplified participation protocols with time-bound scaling.
Quality of Engagement	Documented uptake of inputs into decisions; feedback loops and publication	Tier 2: decision memos; implementation logs	Non-comparative narratives only; no public ranking of entities.
Safety & Non-Retaliation	Whistleblower and complainant protections; incident handling	Tier 2–3: case registries; sanctions evidence	Anonymous channels required; sanctions tracked and summarised.

## SGG 17 — Ethical Use of Technology for Social Benefit

### **Authoritative Interpretation.**

SGG 17 mandates that technology—including data systems and AI—be designed and governed to enhance social benefit while protecting rights, dignity, and equity. It requires privacy-by-design, explicit and revocable consent, bias testing, explainability, secure evidence handling, human oversight, and grievance/redress for algorithmic harm. It forbids coercive disclosure and prohibits using technology to entrench discrimination or to enable cross-entity public comparisons in contravention of Chapter 10.

**Material Indicator Domains, Evidence, and Proportionality (Illustrative).**

Pillar Domain	Material Indicators (Illustrative)	Typical Evidence (Tier)	Proportionality & Confidentiality Notes
Privacy & Consent	Consent ledgering; data minimisation; revocation handling	Tier 3–2: system logs; policy/process evidence	Personal data access strictly role-based; consent trails audit-ready.
AI Governance & Safety	Bias testing, explainability, human-in-the-loop controls	Tier 2: model cards, test reports; Tier 3: SOPs	Publish non-sensitive artefacts; redact model specifics where security risks exist.
Security & Incident Response	Encryption at rest/in transit; uptime SLAs; incident response within defined windows	Tier 2: NOC/security logs; incident RCA	Incident summaries published without sensitive technical exploit details.

**Equivalency and Cross-Walk Note.**

Where AfSE 2074 sector playbooks or instrument annexes articulate technical indicators—for example, MRV protocols (resilience), uptime/SLA attestations (digital services), or integrity controls (governance)—their use under A2074-SRS must follow the cross-walk methodology in Chapter 5 and remain consistent with evidence tiers, anti-masking rules, and non-comparative publication. All deviations require notation and, where material, GSIA approval.

## Chapter 17 — Single Goal (Deep Dive) Validation Method

This chapter constitutes the binding method for pillar-specific validation and recognition under the A2074-SRS. Its objective is to enable rigorous, proportionate certification of performance against one Social Global Goal (SGG) at a time without fragmenting the canon, distorting pillar meaning, or creating misleading public impressions about multi-pillar performance. Deep dives are optional instruments available to licensed Validation Partners and remain subject to GSIA oversight, patient-level confidentiality, non-comparative publication, and the evidentiary hierarchy established in Chapters 6, 8–10, and 21–22.

The single-goal instrument is a self-contained assurance engagement that produces a scoped attestation concerning one canonical pillar only. It shall never be represented as a composite score, ranking, or proxy for entity-wide social performance. Cross-model conversions, if any, are tightly constrained under Chapter 8 and Chapter 18 and may not be used to infer equivalency across pillars.

### 17.1 Scope, Eligibility, and Anti-Fragmentation Guardrails

Single-goal validation is available to all entity types provided the engagement can be executed proportionately and safely. To prevent canonical fragmentation and impact washing, the following constraints apply in all cases.



Element	Binding Rule	Interpretive Note
Scope	One and only one SGG per engagement; the canonical title and interpretation in Chapters 13–16 control.	Sector annexes may refine indicators and evidence burden but may not alter pillar meaning.
Minimum Cross-Pillar Checks	Guardrail checks are mandatory for SGG 8 (integrity and grievance safety), SGG 12 (non-discrimination and inclusion), and SGG 17 (privacy-by-design and AI/data safeguards) to the extent they materially affect the single pillar under review.	These are not scored as additional pillars; they function as eligibility screens and conditions of engagement.
Anti-Masking	Overperformance within the target pillar shall not offset any failure of the guardrail checks.	Publication is withheld where guardrail failure presents material risk to affected stakeholders.
Publication Form	Result is expressed as a pillar-specific badge and narrative attestation; no league tables or peer rankings.	Non-comparative canon in Chapter 10 applies in full.
Use in Commerce	Pricing, eligibility for services, or contracting shall not be conditioned on public disclosure of the result.	Publication independence in Chapter 22 applies.

## 17.2 Naming, Versioning, and Validity

Every deep-dive certificate must state the canonical pillar and versioned model details to ensure traceability and prevent confusion with composite validations. The validity period reflects risk and capacity.

Field	Required Content
Instrument Name	“A2074-SRS SGG-[Number] Deep Dive: [Pillar short title]”
Model Metadata	Validation Partner ID; indicator pack version; algorithm/config version; sector annex version (if used)
Assurance Level	“Limited” or “Reasonable” assurance (see 17.5)
Scope Statement	Boundaries of operations, locations, legal entities, and period of performance covered
Validity	Up to 24 months for reasonable assurance; up to 12 months for limited assurance; shortened in high-risk contexts



Renewal	Requires surveillance review and evidence of progress on any corrective actions outstanding
---------	---

Versioning and sunsetting are governed by Chapter 23. Where a model or indicator pack is superseded, the certificate remains valid only for its stated period and must display the model version to avoid implied portability.

### 17.3 Procedural Architecture and Required Artefacts

Deep-dive engagements follow a fixed sequence to preserve consistency, proportionality, and privacy-by-design. The sequence and artefacts are binding on Validation Partners.

Step	Required Artefacts	Oversight and Controls
Scoping & Materiality	Scoping note; materiality screen per Chapter 4; guardrail pre-check (SGG 8/12/17)	Human review mandatory; conflict-of-interest declaration by assessors
Indicator Pack Selection	Indicator pack mapped to pillar interpretation and sector annex; weighting within approved ranges (Chapter 7–8)	Deviation outside ranges requires pre-authorisation and notation
Evidence Plan & Privacy Design	Evidence register aligned to the hierarchy (Chapter 6); consent ledger and sensitivity tiers (Chapter 21)	Least-intrusive sufficiency analysis; redaction plan approved before collection
Fieldwork & Testing	Sampling plan; test scripts; interview guides with retaliation protections	Secure handling, role-based access, and encryption enforced
Scoring & Anti-Masking	Normalised scoring at indicator level; anti-masking controls within pillar domains (Chapter 9)	No imputation without authorisation and uncertainty notation
Human Review & AI Support	Analyst memo; algorithmic outputs with explainability notes (if used)	Human primacy; bias tests per Chapter 20
Decision & Lettering	Decision memo; certificate text; corrective action plan if applicable	Internal quality review; GSIA spot-check or audit right
Surveillance & Renewal	Surveillance note; progress verification; escalation if commitments lapse	Grounds for suspension where remedies fail or risks escalate

### 17.4 Indicator Design, Weighting, and Sub-Domain Floors

Within a single pillar, indicators must span the material sub-domains of that pillar (e.g., for SGG 1, coverage, continuity, quality, and grievance safety within essential services; for SGG 10, job creation/formalisation, standards/safety, and employability). To prevent narrow “spotlighting,” at least two-thirds of the material sub-domains must meet their minimum floors, and none may fall below the guardrail floor specified for the pillar family. Weighting must remain in the approved range under Chapter 8; dominance by convenience measures is prohibited.



### 17.5 Evidence and Assurance Levels

Assurance level determines evidentiary intensity, sampling depth, and independence requirements. The levels below are exhaustive for deep-dive use.

Assurance Level	Evidentiary Threshold	Sampling & Independence	Typical Use
Limited	Tier 3–2 predominates, with corroboration where risks are moderate; Tier 1 used selectively for high-material indicators	Risk-based samples; internal records acceptable with targeted external corroboration	Early-stage entities; low-risk contexts; time-bound improvement plans
Reasonable	Tier 2–1 predominates for material indicators; attribution tests applied where outcomes claimed	Larger samples; external or system-generated evidence; independent attestations for high-risk claims	Mature entities; higher-risk sectors; financing or procurement reliance

In all cases, least-intrusive sufficiency applies. Where Tier-1 outcome evidence is infeasible for micro-entities, credible proxies may be accepted with staged plans and periodic re-validation.

### 17.6 Proportionality by Enterprise Size and Capacity

The proportionality doctrine in Chapter 11 applies. Micro and small enterprises may utilise simplified indicator packs and credible proxies, provided pillar meaning is preserved and improvement trajectories are time-bound and verified. Large and multinational entities must supply higher-tier evidence, system logs, and, where appropriate, independent attestations. No entity is exempt from guardrail checks or grievance safety.

### 17.7 Conversion, Badging, and Use of Results

A deep-dive result is a pillar badge with a narrative attestation. Conversions are strictly limited to preserve non-comparative integrity and prevent misrepresentation.

From / To	Permissible Conversion	Constraint
Deep-Dive Badge → Points	Internal management only; not for public ranking or cross-entity comparison	Parameter transparency and documented uncertainty bands
Deep-Dive Badge → Stars	Prohibited as a composite representation; may be referenced only as a pillar status alongside a multi-pillar star model that independently meets composite eligibility	Anti-masking and floors enforceable under Chapter 8–9
Deep-Dive Badge → Maturity Level	Permissible within the same pillar rubric; ordinal anchors must be published	Human review of boundary cases; last-verified date displayed



Any public display must include the model version, date of validation, assurance level, scope statement, and explicit language that results are non-comparative and pillar-specific.

### **17.8 Use in Contracts, Finance, and Procurement**

Where deep-dive results are referenced in contracts, financing, or procurement, the scope statement and assurance level must be attached, and no inference may be made about performance on other pillars. If the engagement is referenced as a condition precedent or performance covenant, corrective-action pathways, escalation, and suspension criteria must be explicit and proportionate. Validation Partners shall refuse engagements where the single-pillar attestation would predictably be used to mislead stakeholders about overall social performance.

### **17.9 Confidentiality, Consent, and Sensitive Evidence**

All data collection and handling follow Chapter 21. Patient-level confidentiality is default and universal; consent must be explicit, informed, and revocable. Sensitive health, employment, or grievance data are classified and redacted by design. Where evidence cannot be collected safely, alternative verification pathways—such as anonymised testimonies, aggregated indicators, or third-party attestations—shall be employed without penalising the entity for non-collection.

### **17.10 Investigations, Appeals, Suspension, and Withdrawal**

Allegations of misrepresentation, retaliation, coercion, or material non-conformity trigger safeguards under Chapter 25. GSIA may order an investigation, require remedial actions, suspend the badge pending outcome, or withdraw the attestation. Entities have access to the appeals mechanism in Chapter 25; decisions and rationales are recorded for incorporation into the version log under Chapter 23.

### **17.11 Localisation, Translation, and Sector Annex Interface**

Deep-dive materials, including user-facing attestations, must follow Chapter 19 to ensure linguistic fidelity and cultural appropriateness. Sector annexes under Chapter 12 govern indicator augmentation, risk elevation, and evidence escalation in high-risk sub-sectors. Any localisation that risks altering canonical meaning is prohibited and must be returned for revision.

### **17.12 Recordkeeping, Model Cards, and Public Statements**

Validation Partners maintain a complete file comprising scoping documents, materiality screens, evidence registers, sampling plans, scoring artefacts, model cards, bias tests (where AI is used), decision memos, and certificate text. Public statements must include the canonical pillar, assurance level, scope, model version, last-verified date, and the non-comparative notice. Marketing materials shall not imply multi-pillar excellence or cross-entity superiority.

### **17.13 Final Canonical Clause**

Single-goal validation is a precision instrument designed to deepen practice within one pillar while respecting the indivisible nature of the Agenda 2074 canon. Where tension arises between market convenience and pillar fidelity, confidentiality, fairness, or the anti-comparative doctrine, the latter prevails. GSIA's determinations on deep-dive interpretation are binding and incorporated into subsequent revisions pursuant to Chapter 23.

## **Chapter 18 — Multi-Model Equivalency and Cross-Recognition**

### **Purpose and Binding Effect.**

This chapter establishes the conditions under which results produced by different, duly licensed A2074-SRS validation models—points, hospitality-style stars, badges, and maturity ladders—may be



recognised as equivalent for registry, portability, or continuity purposes. Equivalency is an administrative construct for interoperability; it is not a device for public comparison between entities. All provisions herein are mandatory for Validation Partners and subject to GSIA oversight, with publication independence, patient-level confidentiality, and the non-comparative doctrine remaining controlling law.

### **Equivalency Canon.**

Equivalency must be monotonic, transparent, reversible within the calibration domain, and incapable of masking underperformance in any material pillar. Conversions may never inflate apparent performance, suppress uncertainty, or allow overperformance in one area to offset a floor breach in another. The canonical meaning of each SGG pillar as set in Chapters 13–16 governs all mappings. Where a conflict arises between convenience and pillar fidelity, the latter prevails.

### **Eligibility Conditions.**

Only accredited model families and versions that (a) declare indicator sets, weighting ranges, anti-masking controls, and treatment of N/A/missing/deferred statuses; (b) publish model cards and calibration datasets (with privacy protection); and (c) pass GSIA methodological review are eligible for equivalency. Any change to a model's core parameters triggers recalibration or suspension of its equivalency artefact until re-approved.

### **Conversion Artefacts and Parameter Bands.**

Each equivalency statement must be accompanied by a “conversion artefact” describing the mathematical transform, parameter bands, monotonicity proof, uncertainty intervals, treatment of outliers, and anti-masking constraints. Artefacts are versioned, time-stamped, and lodged in the technical annex. Where parameter bands are wide (e.g., converting a coarse star level into a points range), the public representation must display ranges rather than single values and must restate the non-comparative doctrine.

### **Scope of Use.**

Equivalency is permissible for four restricted purposes: (i) registry continuity when an entity relocates between model families under the same pillar canon; (ii) portability when a Validation Partner consolidates archives; (iii) longitudinal analysis for a single entity changing models; and (iv) administrative eligibility checks where a programme defines a minimum pillar floor that multiple model families can demonstrate. Equivalency may not be used to rank entities, to create league tables, or to suggest parity across different pillars.

### **Required Controls for Cross-Recognition.**

Equivalency Use Case	Conversion Constraint	Required Metadata	Safeguards and Notes
Points $\leftrightarrow$ Stars (same pillar)	Mapping only when all pillar floors and presence thresholds are met; no conversion if any floor is breached	Model version; weighting schema; anti-masking caps; N/A treatment	Display ranges for back-calculation; no inter-entity comparison; narrative context mandatory
Points $\leftrightarrow$ Maturity (same pillar)	Ordinal mapping must preserve anchor definitions and avoid pseudo-precision	Rubric anchors; boundary rules;	Human review of boundary cases; last-verified date published



		adjudication rules for ties	
Stars ↔ Maturity (same pillar)	Only where anchor sets are pre-approved as commensurate	Anchor concordance table; pilot calibration set	Publish anchor text; show uncertainty interval if anchors differ in granularity
Badge ↔ Any Composite	Prohibited; badges remain non-composite pillar attestations	Badge scope; evidence class	Cross-reference allowed, aggregation prohibited

### Calibration, Recalibration, and Drift.

Trigger for Recalibration	Required Action	Oversight and Timing
Indicator pack revision altering weights outside approved ranges	Suspend artefact; submit new monotonicity and anti-masking proofs	GSIA review; re-authorise before further use
Evidence policy change affecting Tier composition	Update model card; re-test equivalency on hold-out set	GSIA notation; 90-day transition period
Observed drift in fairness metrics (e.g., size or sector bias)	Conduct bias audit; adjust mapping bands	GSIA may impose conditions or suspend
Material data quality anomalies in calibration set	Replace or cleanse dataset; re-run sensitivity analyses	Independent replication required

### Registry, Recordkeeping, and Transparency.

Partners must register each live equivalency artefact with: model name and version; pillar(s) covered; calibration dataset description and provenance; transform equations or tables; uncertainty intervals; anti-masking caps; and effective dates. Artefacts must include a plain-language explainer. Raw evidence used for original scoring remains private by default and may not be shared across partners without explicit, informed, and revocable consent recorded in the consent ledger specified in the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

### Fairness, Bias, and Accessibility.

All artefacts require pre-deployment bias testing against enterprise size, capacity, geography, and sector, with results summarised in the model card. Where accessibility concerns arise (e.g., SMEs facing ambiguous range outputs), partners must provide an explanation note and an outreach channel. No equivalency will be approved where bias or opacity risks undermine proportionality or non-comparative publication.

### Dispute Resolution, Suspension, and Withdrawal.

Disputes concerning equivalency are adjudicated by GSIA. Where evidence of mis-calibration, model drift, or misleading public use is found, GSIA may suspend or withdraw the artefact, require corrective statements, and mandate re-validation. All decisions are version-logged under Chapter 23 and may be appealed under Chapter 25.



### **Privacy, Consent, and Publication Independence.**

Equivalency never alters confidentiality defaults. Publication remains voluntary and decoupled from pricing or outcomes. No artefact may require or presume disclosure of sensitive data; conversions for any public display must use anonymised, aggregate outputs and restate that results are not comparable across entities.

## **Chapter 19 — Localisation and Translation Protocol**

### **Purpose and Binding Effect.**

This chapter governs linguistic translation and cultural adaptation of the A2074-SRS canon, including pillar titles and interpretations, indicator catalogues, evidentiary guidance, consent and privacy notices, and public-facing attestations. Its purpose is to enable accurate, culturally appropriate use across languages and jurisdictions while preserving canonical meaning, doctrinal integrity, and safeguards. All localisations are subject to GSIA approval where they affect normative content, with version control and transparency under Chapter 23.

### **Principles of Semantic Fidelity.**

Localisation must preserve meaning, scope, and legal effect of canonical text. Controlled terms set in Chapter 3 have priority; where a target language lacks an exact analogue, the closest semantically stable term is selected and accompanied, on first use, by the canonical term in parentheses. Examples and illustrations may be culturally adapted; obligations, floors, and guardrails may not.

### **Process and Governance.**

All translations of normative content follow a dual-control process: independent translation by a qualified practitioner; independent review by a subject-matter expert; and, where ambiguity persists, a back-translation step to confirm semantic fidelity. Material divergences are escalated to GSIA for adjudication. Public-facing texts that affect consent or grievance pathways must include plain-language summaries in the local vernacular to ensure accessibility without altering legal effect.

### **Taxonomy, Glossaries, and Reserved Terms.**

The canonical taxonomy in Chapter 3 is binding. Each language pack shall include a maintained glossary covering SGG pillar titles, evidence tiers, assurance levels, anti-masking, non-comparative benchmarking, publication independence, and consent ledging. Reserved terms (e.g., “certificate,” “badge,” “assurance,” “outcome,” “policy evidence,” “process evidence,” “output,” “confidentiality,” “consent”) may not be substituted with colloquialisms that dilute legal effect.

### **Cultural Adaptation Boundaries.**

Adaptation Type	Permissible Changes	Prohibited Changes	Safeguards
Illustrative Examples	Replace with culturally relevant scenarios	Altering obligations, floors, or guardrails	Reviewer attestation; disclose that examples are illustrative
Tone and Register	Adjust for clarity and readability in target language	Shifting legal-narrative style to marketing claims	Editor checklist and sign-off



Visuals and Icons	Use culturally familiar symbols that do not mislead	Symbols implying ranking or competition	GSIA style guidance; accessibility testing
Public Notices	Add plain-language summaries	Rewriting rights or consent conditions	Dual-column format: canonical text + summary

**Accessibility, Script, and Layout.**

Localisations must comply with accessibility and script requirements. Right-to-left scripts preserve word order; diacritics and ligatures are rendered correctly. Public-facing dashboards and certificates accommodate locale-specific numerals, decimal separators, dates, and times. Where fonts are specified for technical implementation, the selected family must support the language's glyph set and accessibility standards; any substitution is recorded in the language pack and tested for legibility.

**Measurement Units, Numerics, and Dates.**

Units may be localised where this does not affect meaning (e.g., decimal separators, date formats). Normalisation rules for scoring and aggregation remain unchanged. Where unit conversion is necessary for public understanding, the localised output must display both units during a transition period, with the canonical unit retained in the registry.

**Privacy, Consent, and Data Residency.**

Translation of consent notices, grievance procedures, and privacy disclosures must retain legally operative clauses. Personal and sensitive data encountered during localisation (e.g., embedded case narratives) are subject to least-intrusive handling, redaction by default, and secure processing. Where data residency constraints apply, processing occurs in-region, with audit logs and access controls aligned to the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

**Linguistic Quality, Evidence Integrity, and Back-Translation.**

Quality Dimension	Required Standard	Verification Method
Terminology Fidelity	100% alignment with canonical glossary for reserved terms	Term-check report; reviewer countersignature
Semantic Accuracy	No change in scope, duty, or safeguard	Back-translation excerpt with variance notes
Readability	Plain-language summary available for public-facing notices	Field testing with target audience; documented feedback
Layout Integrity	Direction, tables, and emphasis preserved	Visual QA; accessibility checklist

**Change Control and Versioning.**

Each language pack is versioned with change logs describing modified passages, rationale, reviewer identities, and effective dates. Backwards-incompatible changes require a public note and a reasonable transition period proportionate to stakeholder impact. Deprecated translations must be withdrawn from circulation and replaced in registries and public repositories.



### **Dispute Resolution and Precedence.**

In case of conflict between a translation and the canonical English-language text approved by Agenda 2074, the canonical text prevails. GSIA adjudicates disputes and issues binding clarifications, which are incorporated into the next revision cycle under Chapter 23 and appended as translator's notes to the affected language pack.

### **Public Communication and Non-Comparative Doctrine.**

Localised public outputs must restate that A2074-SRS results are non-comparative and that disclosure is voluntary and revocable. No translation may introduce phrasing that implies cross-entity ranking or compulsory publication. Where a language's idiom risks implying competition, neutral constructions must be selected and recorded in the glossary.

### **Records, Training, and Accreditation.**

Validation Partners maintain complete records of translators, reviewers, and QA artefacts. Personnel involved in localisation receive periodic training on the A2074 canon, confidentiality, and non-comparative publication. Partners may seek GSIA accreditation of language packs for high-volume use; accreditation is subject to surveillance audits and may be suspended or withdrawn upon material deviation.

## **Chapter 20 — Human Review and AI-Assisted Interpretation**

This chapter establishes the binding governance architecture for all uses of artificial intelligence, automation, or algorithmic decision-support within the A2074-SRS validation ecosystem. Its purpose is to ensure that human judgment remains paramount, that algorithms are used only to enhance—not replace—expert discretion, and that any AI-supported process is transparent, explainable, proportionate, privacy-preserving, and fully subject to GSIA oversight. No Validation Partner may deploy AI or automated tools for any function within the A2074-SRS unless the requirements set forth here are satisfied in full.

### **Foundational Principle: Human Primacy.**

All scoring, interpretation, materiality decisions, qualitative assessments, relevance judgments, outcome classifications, and final conclusions must be made and signed by an accountable human reviewer. AI may support analysis but shall never produce a binding conclusion or recommendation that bypasses human adjudication. Every validation output must contain a statement of human responsibility, naming the reviewers, confirming that all AI-generated insights were independently examined, and affirming that appropriate discretion was applied.

### **Permitted Functions of AI Support.**

AI systems may assist with evidence triage, pattern recognition, translation aids covered under Chapter 19, anomaly detection, data summarisation, and risk flagging, provided that human reviewers retain full interpretive authority. AI outputs must be treated as non-authoritative suggestions rather than findings. Where an AI system flags a potential concern (e.g., inconsistent data points, missing evidence, privacy risk), the human reviewer must validate or discard the flag based on canonical criteria, evidentiary hierarchy, and contextualisation rules established in Chapters 4 and 6.

### **Prohibited Uses of AI.**

AI may not be used to:

- make or infer final scoring decisions;



- infer ethical, governance, or integrity breaches without human review;
- derive pillar-level performance or composite eligibility;
- automate or manipulate evidence in ways that obscure provenance;
- generate model-to-model equivalency mappings (Chapter 18) or indicator weightings;
- access or process sensitive data without explicit, verifiable consent recorded in the consent ledger;
- circumvent sensitive evidence safeguards under Chapter 21.

#### **Model Transparency and Explainability.**

Any AI system used for validation must provide explainable outputs intelligible to a trained human reviewer. Proprietary black-box models lacking sufficient explainability cannot be used. Each system must be accompanied by a “model card” containing: purpose, training data characteristics, limitations, known biases, interpretive boundaries, and instructions for human oversight. Where uncertainty is high or model behaviour opaque, the output shall be disregarded.

#### **Bias Testing and Fairness Controls.**

All AI systems must undergo documented bias testing across: enterprise size, sector, geography, gender, age, disability, migration status, and other protected characteristics. The results must be recorded and lodged with GSIA. If bias is detected, the model must be suspended from use until remediation is complete. Re-evaluation is required after every major update of training data, model architecture, or algorithmic weighting.

#### **Audit Trails and Integrity Safeguards.**

Every AI interaction within the validation chain must generate a tamper-evident log recording: input category, system action, output type, human reviewer identity, and disposition (accepted, rejected, or revised). Logs must be encrypted, access-controlled, and available to GSIA upon request. Systems must be resilient to manipulation, and no AI system may access data or files beyond its allocated scope.

#### **Interaction with Evidence Types.**

AI may assist in classifying evidence (policy, process, output, outcome), but final classification must be determined by a human reviewer using the definitions in Chapter 6. Where evidence includes sensitive information, AI must be configured to process only redacted, anonymised, or synthetic proxies unless consent explicitly permits otherwise.

#### **Incident Reporting and Suspension.**

Validation Partners must immediately report any AI malfunction, anomaly, security breach, data leakage, unexplained behaviour, or suspected manipulation to GSIA. GSIA may suspend model use, mandate corrective actions, or require third-party audits. Harmful or misleading outputs must trigger immediate review of all validations dependent on that system.

#### **Public Statements.**

Public-facing deep-dives, certificates, dashboards, or attestations must disclose whether AI was used, the types of tasks performed, the model version, and the scope of human oversight. No public statement may imply automated certification, automated scoring, or AI-driven equivalency.

#### **Precedence Clause.**



Where tension arises between automation efficiency and human judgment, the latter prevails. Where tension arises between model capability and confidentiality, the latter prevails. Where tension arises between technological innovation and the anti-comparative doctrine, the doctrine prevails. GSIA determinations concerning AI governance are binding and incorporated into the revision cycle under Chapter 23.

## Chapter 21 — Confidentiality and Sensitive Evidence

This chapter articulates the binding confidentiality, consent, and evidence-handling rules that govern all validation, scoring, publication, and audit activities under the A2074-SRS. It reinforces the principle—already established in Chapters 3, 6, 8, 10, and 17—that privacy is not a procedural requirement but a fundamental safeguard central to the legitimacy of the entire standard. These rules apply to all entities, all partners, all technologies, and all forms of evidence.

### **Foundational Rule: Privacy by Default.**

All person-level and patient-level data are confidential by default. No evidence may be collected, accessed, reviewed, transferred, stored, or disclosed unless the method used is the least intrusive possible for the purpose and is strictly necessary to establish indicator reliability. The entity under review has no authority to waive confidentiality on behalf of individuals.

### **Consent as a Condition Precedent.**

Consent must be explicit, informed, freely given, specific to the validation context, and revocable at any time without consequence. Consent records must be stored in the ledger defined by the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual and must indicate: scope, duration, data types, redaction status, and permitted reviewers. Coercion, implied consent, bundled consent, or employer-mandated consent are prohibited.

### **Sensitivity Classification.**

All evidence must be classified into one of the following tiers (illustrative, non-exhaustive):

Sensitivity Tier	Description	Handling Requirements
Tier A (Highly Sensitive)	Health, mental-health, disability, GBV-related, legal grievance, or identity-risk data	Access restricted to named human reviewers; full encryption; redaction mandatory; AI processing prohibited unless synthetic or anonymised
Tier B (Sensitive)	Payroll, HR, demographic disaggregation, internal grievance logs	Encryption; role-based access; anonymisation for publication
Tier C (Operational)	Policies, SOPs, system logs without personal identifiers	Standard security controls; review permitted under duty of confidentiality
Tier D (Public or Public-Equivalent)	Information already public or designed for public disclosure	May be used without redaction, subject to non-comparative doctrine



### **Redaction and Least-Intrusive Sufficiency.**

Any evidence containing personal or sensitive data must be redacted prior to review unless the individual has explicitly consented to unredacted review. Redaction must occur before transfer to Validation Partners. The burden is on the Partner to demonstrate that less intrusive forms of evidence (e.g., aggregated metrics, attestations, sampling data, system-generated logs) were considered and could not provide sufficient reliability.

### **Grievance Evidence and Survivor Protections.**

Evidence related to harassment, discrimination, violence, abuse, or exploitation must be handled under survivor-centred principles:

- no disclosure of identities;
- anonymised case summaries only;
- non-retaliatory safe channels guaranteed;
- alternative verification (third-party attestation, aggregated logs) prioritised;
- publication requires aggregation and removal of all traceable details.

### **Cross-Border Transfers.**

Evidence must not be transferred across jurisdictions unless:

- data residency rules permit it;
- individuals have been explicitly informed;
- encryption, access control, and redaction measures are in place;
- GSIA is notified if the jurisdiction poses elevated rights risks.

Where cross-border transfer poses harm or risk, local verification pathways must be used instead.

### **Use of Technology.**

Any AI or automated system interacting with sensitive evidence must comply with Chapter 20. AI must not process Tier A data unless fully anonymised or synthetic. Logging, encryption, and access controls must be enforceable at the system level, not discretionary.

### **Publication Independence and Non-Reidentification.**

All public outputs (dashboards, attestations, certificates, badges) must present only aggregated or narrative information. At no time may published information allow reidentification of individuals or signal performance differences across entities (Chapter 10). Data suppression techniques must be used where small-n groups would otherwise create identification risk.

### **Data Retention and Deletion.**

Evidence retention must be limited to the minimum period necessary for auditability, after which secure deletion is mandatory. Validation Partners must maintain a retention schedule aligned to risk and regulatory obligations. Individuals may request deletion of their personal data except where retention is required for legal compliance; such requests must be honoured promptly.

### **Breach Notification and Response.**

Any incident involving unauthorised access, data breach, mishandling, or loss must be reported to GSIA immediately, followed by a formal root-cause analysis, containment measures, harm-mitigation steps,



and, where applicable, notification to affected individuals. Validation activities depending on compromised evidence must be re-assessed or invalidated.

**Precedence Clause.**

Where tension exists between evidentiary completeness and confidentiality, confidentiality prevails unless GSIA authorises a controlled exception that still preserves least-intrusive sufficiency. Where tension exists between publication interests and privacy, privacy prevails. No institution, including Validation Partners or entities under review, may prioritise analytical convenience above individual rights.

**Final Safeguard.**

Confidentiality and sensitive evidence rules are mandatory, universal, and non-waivable. Any violation is grounds for immediate suspension, audit, corrective action, or withdrawal of validation rights. All interpretations of this chapter fall under GSIA jurisdiction and are incorporated into the revision cycle per Chapter 23.

## Chapter 22 — Publication Independence

This chapter establishes the binding doctrine of *Publication Independence*, a foundational safeguard within the A2074-SRS. It ensures that all disclosures, attestations, certificates, dashboards, and public communications arising from validation exercises are voluntary, non-coercive, and insulated from economic pressure, political leverage, or competitive dynamics. Publication Independence is not a communications preference; it is a structural guarantor of legitimacy and a mandatory condition of all use of the A2074-SRS by entities and Validation Partners.

**Foundational Rule of Voluntariness.**

No entity shall be required, pressured, or incentivised—financially, contractually, or reputationally—to publish validation outcomes or any related materials. Publication must remain a voluntary act undertaken by the entity alone. Validation Partners may not condition pricing, scope, delivery, or levels of assurance on publication. Governments, regulators, investors, and counterparties may not require publication as a condition of access to services or benefits, unless such requirement is independently established under applicable law and does not originate from the A2074-SRS ecosystem.

**Prohibition on Implicit or Structural Coercion.**

Validation Partners, investors, and commercial actors are prohibited from creating indirect pressures to publish outcomes, such as preferential pricing for public disclosures, bundled service offerings, public-rating mechanisms, or access limitations. Any practice that has the foreseeable effect of compelling publication violates this doctrine. Partners must implement internal controls to ensure that staff, contractors, and marketing functions do not induce publication under any guise.

**Non-Comparative Public Outputs.**

Where an entity elects to disclose results, the format must adhere strictly to the non-comparative doctrine set out in Chapter 10. Public outputs must emphasise: (a) pillar-specific narratives; (b) non-comparative nature of all scores; and (c) clear statements that outcomes are not rankings and do not measure superiority or inferiority relative to other entities. Cross-entity comparisons, league tables, percentile rankings, and performance claims against peers are prohibited.

**Mandatory Disclaimers in All Public Outputs.**

All public disclosures must include the following disclaimers, rendered in clear, accessible language:



- The validation is non-comparative and cannot be interpreted as ranking any entity against others.
- Publication is voluntary and not required for certification or participation in any A2074-SRS process.
- Results relate solely to the scope, timeframe, and pillar(s) explicitly stated.
- No inference may be made about performance on non-validated pillars.

Validation Partners must verify before publication that all disclaimers are included and prominently displayed.

#### **Protection of Confidentiality and Sensitive Evidence.**

Publication may not include personal data, sensitive evidence, identifiable grievance records, or disaggregated information that could enable reidentification. Aggregation thresholds apply, and where groups are small or risk-sensitive, suppression techniques must be used. Publication does not override Chapter 21; confidentiality remains paramount.

#### **Treatment of Negative Results.**

Entities may choose whether to publish positive, neutral, or adverse results. Validation Partners may not selectively encourage disclosure of favourable outcomes or discourage disclosure of unfavourable ones. Any such conduct constitutes manipulation and is cause for sanctions under Chapter 25.

#### **Marketing and Public Claims.**

Entities may describe themselves as “validated under the A2074-SRS” only with reference to the specific pillar(s), model version, assurance level, and date of validation. Broad claims of “A2074-compliant” or “A2074-certified” across all pillars are prohibited unless the entity has undergone full multi-pillar validation. Marketing statements must not imply superiority or comparative advantage over non-validated entities.

#### **Partner Communications and Platform Governance.**

Validation Partners hosting dashboards, registries, or directories must not display comparative elements, including ordering, sorting, highlighting top performers, or offering filtering that implies relative standing. Entities opting out of publication must remain invisible in such directories without penalty or notation.

#### **Remedies and Enforcement.**

Violations of this doctrine trigger immediate review by GSIA and may lead to suspension of validation rights, withdrawal of certificates, public corrective notices, or required re-training. Entities pressured into publication may seek remedy under Chapter 25.

#### **Precedence Clause.**

Where publication independence conflicts with commercial, strategic, or governance considerations of any actor, this doctrine prevails. No justification for overriding publication independence is acceptable unless explicitly required by applicable law and consistent with individual privacy rights and the anti-comparative doctrine.

## **Chapter 23 — Revision, Versioning, and Sunset Protocol**

This chapter codifies the mechanisms through which the A2074-SRS evolves over time while preserving legal certainty, interpretive stability, backward compatibility, and institutional trust. All modifications



to canonical text, indicator catalogues, model artefacts, equivalency tables, sector annexes, language packs, and validation methodologies must comply with this chapter.

#### **Governance of Revisions.**

GSIA acts as the supreme authority for approving, amending, retiring, or replacing normative content within the A2074-SRS. Revisions may be proposed by Validation Partners, sector bodies, academic institutions, or stakeholder groups through formal submission. Proposals must include rationale, evidence base, potential impacts, and transition considerations.

#### **Categories of Revisions.**

Revisions fall into three categories:

- *Editorial revisions*—grammatical, formatting, and non-substantive clarifications that do not alter meaning.
- *Technical revisions*—changes to indicator definitions, weighting ranges, evidence requirements, digital governance architecture, or sector annexes.
- *Substantive revisions*—changes to canonical pillar interpretations, doctrine (e.g., anti-masking, non-comparative rules), assurance structures, or model family definitions.

Editorial revisions may be approved by delegated authority within GSIA; technical and substantive revisions require full GSIA review and formal publication.

#### **Version Control.**

Each normative instrument must carry:

- a unique version identifier;
- an issuance date;
- an effective date;
- a summary of changes;
- a list of impacted sections;
- transition requirements; and
- any backward-compatibility limitations.

Version identifiers must follow an immutable major-minor structure (e.g., 3.0, 3.1, 4.0). Major versions denote substantive changes requiring transition; minor versions denote technical updates.

#### **Transition Periods and Sunset Mechanisms.**

When a major revision is issued, GSIA shall set a transition period proportionate to the scope of change, typically between 12 and 24 months. During transition, entities may complete validations under either the legacy or new version, but may not mix components of different versions within the same engagement. At the end of the transition period, the legacy version sunsets and is withdrawn from active use, except where special derogations are granted for small or fragile entities.

#### **Backward Compatibility and Historical Integrity.**

Legacy validations remain valid for their stated period even after a version sunsetting, provided they were performed under a version still active at that time. Validation Partners must maintain archived



versions for at least ten years for auditability and reference. Historical outputs must not be retroactively altered unless required by legal or safeguards concerns; in such cases, a corrective note must be issued.

#### **Impact Assessments.**

Before issuing any technical or substantive revision, GSIA must conduct and publish an impact assessment addressing:

- effects on enterprise burden and proportionality;
- effects on indicator comparability and equivalency (Chapter 18);
- confidentiality and data-handling implications;
- risks of bias or discriminatory impact;
- transition resource requirements;
- operational feasibility across sectors and geographies.

Entities must be given notice and opportunity to provide input during consultations for substantive or major technical revisions.

#### **Emergency Amendments.**

Where urgent risks arise (e.g., confidentiality breaches, AI safety concerns, legal changes, or sector-wide integrity failures), GSIA may issue an emergency amendment with immediate effect. Emergency amendments must be narrowly tailored, time-limited, and reviewed within six months to determine permanence or withdrawal.

#### **Language Pack Synchronisation.**

All translations and localisations (Chapter 19) must be synchronised with the canonical version. When a revision is made, language packs must either be updated concurrently or temporarily marked as “pending alignment.” No outdated translation may be used in public-facing outputs once the corresponding canonical version has taken effect.

#### **Recordkeeping and Public Repository.**

GSIA shall maintain a public repository of all versions, including superseded and sunset materials, with change logs and effective dates. Validation Partners must maintain internal repositories of versions used for each engagement and make these available for audit. All records must align to the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

#### **Derivative Works and Licensing.**

No derivative model, tool, interpretation, training package, or software implementation may be distributed or represented as A2074-SRS-compliant unless it aligns fully with the active canonical version. Derivative works must include a version reference and must not introduce competing interpretations or imply certification by GSIA without approval.

#### **Precedence Clause.**

In case of conflict between versions, the version in force at the time of validation governs the engagement. For interpretive conflicts within a version, GSIA’s formal interpretation notes prevail. Where no interpretation exists, the principle of preserving confidentiality, equity, and non-comparative integrity governs until GSIA issues an authoritative clarification.



## Chapter 24 — Public Consultation and Participatory Governance

This chapter establishes the compulsory procedures for public consultation, participatory governance, and stakeholder engagement within the A2074-SRS ecosystem. Its purpose is to ensure that all revisions, annexes, sector notes, indicator catalogues, and methodological instruments evolve through transparent, inclusive, and accountable processes. Public consultation is not discretionary; it is a structural safeguard preventing insularity, bias, and stakeholder exclusion.

### **Foundational Doctrine of Participatory Legitimacy.**

The A2074-SRS rests upon the premise that social equity standards must be shaped through dialogue with those affected by their implementation. Validation Partners, sector bodies, civil society organisations, academic institutions, and individuals must have meaningful opportunities to comment on proposed changes, lodge concerns, and contribute evidence. Participation must be timely, accessible, non-retaliatory, and open to diverse voices irrespective of size, capacity, geography, or affiliation.

### **Triggers for Mandatory Consultation.**

Consultation is required for all proposed changes to:

- canonical pillar interpretations;
- indicator catalogues, weighting ranges, or evidence hierarchies;
- sector annexes, model artefacts, or calibration datasets;
- translation or localisation changes that materially affect meaning;
- equivalency or cross-recognition methodologies;
- governance doctrines, including anti-masking, non-comparative rules, confidentiality, or publication independence.

Editorial clarifications not altering meaning may proceed without consultation but must still be recorded under Chapter 23.

### **Structure and Stages of Consultation.**

Consultation follows a three-stage structure, all of which are mandatory.

#### **1. Notice Stage**

GSIA publishes a formal Consultation Notice describing the proposed change, rationale, affected sections, potential impacts, and the deadline for submissions. The notice must be publicly accessible, translated into all approved language packs, and disseminated through Validation Partners and stakeholder networks.

#### **2. Submission Stage**

All stakeholders may submit written comments, evidence, case studies, alternative formulations, or impact assessments. Submissions must be reviewed without prejudice. Entities may request confidential treatment of sensitive materials, and GSIA must honour such requests unless disclosure is legally required.

#### **3. Response and Outcome Stage**

4. GSIA must publish a Consultation Outcome Report summarising received inputs, explaining accepted and rejected proposals, providing rationale for decisions, and stating the final



adopted language. The report must explicitly address concerns relating to confidentiality, bias, burden, feasibility, and impact on vulnerable groups.

**Accessibility, Representation, and Safeguards.**

Consultations must be accessible to groups with limited capacity, including micro-enterprises, non-profits, community organisations, and individuals. GSIA and Validation Partners must provide plain-language summaries, multilingual materials, and open channels for oral or simplified submissions. Participation must be non-retaliatory, and anonymous submissions are permitted where safety concerns exist.

**Balancing Expertise and Lived Experience.**

Consultation outcomes must weigh both technical evidence and lived experience, particularly where standards influence essential services, vulnerable populations, digital governance, or grievance pathways. GSIA must avoid over-dependency on highly resourced actors whose perspectives may not reflect systemic realities.

**Consultation Records and Archiving.**

All consultation notices, submissions (subject to confidentiality requests), outcome reports, and adopted revisions must be archived for at least ten years. These records form part of the public repository referenced in Chapter 23 and serve as interpretive materials in future disputes.

**Precedence Clause.**

Failure to conduct mandatory consultation renders any resulting revision or annex void until the consultation is completed. GSIA retains final authority to determine whether consultation was adequate, fair, and procedurally compliant.

## Chapter 25 — Investigations, Enforcement, and Appeals

This chapter defines the formal mechanisms for investigation, enforcement, sanction, remedy, and appeals within the A2074-SRS. Its purpose is to uphold integrity, fairness, confidentiality, non-retaliation, and trust across all validation and governance activities. These mechanisms apply to Validation Partners, entities under review, subcontractors, and any third parties whose conduct materially affects the legitimacy of the standard.

**Foundational Principle of Procedural Fairness.**

Every investigation or enforcement action must observe strict rules of neutrality, due process, confidentiality, proportionality, and non-retaliation. No individual or entity may be penalised for raising concerns, providing evidence, or participating in investigations. The process must protect whistleblowers, survivors, and vulnerable groups.

**Grounds for Investigation.**

GSIA may initiate an investigation upon credible indication of:

- manipulation or falsification of evidence;
- coercive publication or breach of Publication Independence (Chapter 22);
- retaliation against complainants, employees, or community members;
- confidentiality breaches or improper handling of sensitive evidence (Chapter 21);
- discriminatory practices or prohibited use of AI (Chapter 20);



- material non-conformity with canonical pillar interpretations or methodological rules;
- conflict-of-interest violations;
- systemic bias or integrity failures by a Validation Partner.

Investigations may also be triggered by stakeholder complaints, whistleblower disclosures, or observed anomalies in validation files.

#### **Types of Investigations.**

Investigation Type	Scope and Trigger	Characteristics
Desk Review	Minor anomalies or documentation gaps	Conducted via remote file review; rapid turnaround
Targeted Investigation	Specific allegation of breach	Involves interviews, evidence tracing, and expanded sampling
Comprehensive Audit	Systemic concerns or partner-level failures	Full assessment of processes, governance, AI use, evidence handling
Emergency Review	Immediate risk of harm to individuals or communities	Fast-track intervention; may suspend validations pending outcome

Emergency Reviews may be initiated without notice if patient-level confidentiality, safety, or rights are at risk.

#### **Protective Measures During Investigations.**

GSIA may impose temporary measures, including:

- suspension of ongoing validations;
- postponement of publication;
- restricted access to sensitive data;
- interim corrective plans;
- appointment of independent observers.

Such measures must be proportionate and time-bound.

#### **Sanctions and Corrective Actions.**

Upon completion of an investigation, GSIA may impose any of the following measures, individually or cumulatively:

- written warnings;
- mandatory corrective-action plans with defined timelines;
- enhanced oversight or probation;
- suspension of validation rights or specific model permissions;



- withdrawal of issued certificates or badges;
- permanent disqualification of a Validation Partner;
- public corrective statements, where required for trust and transparency.

Sanctions must be proportionate to severity, risk, and recurrence, and must avoid penalising individuals or entities for cooperating or disclosing concerns.

#### **Remediation and Restorative Measures.**

Where harm has occurred—such as confidentiality breaches, discriminatory outcomes, misrepresentation, or retaliation—GSIA must require remedial actions tailored to the harm. These may include:

- revised indicators or methodologies;
- retraining of personnel;
- redress for affected individuals;
- revision of grievance pathways;
- independent monitoring for a defined period.

Remediation must be survivor-centred where GBV, discrimination, or harassment is involved.

#### **Appeals Mechanism.**

Any entity or Validation Partner subject to sanctions may file an appeal with GSIA. Appeals must:

- be submitted within 60 days of the decision;
- identify specific grounds (procedural error, evidentiary misinterpretation, disproportionate sanctions, or new material evidence);
- request reconsideration or modification of findings.

GSIA must appoint an independent panel to review appeals, with no member who participated in the original investigation. The decision of the appeals panel is final and binding.

#### **Whistleblower and Complainant Protections.**

No person providing information in good faith may be retaliated against. Retaliation includes dismissal, demotion, harassment, intimidation, or negative performance actions. Anyone alleging retaliation triggers automatic protective review. Validation Partners must maintain anonymous reporting channels with escalation to GSIA.

#### **Transparency and Confidentiality Balance.**

Investigation outcomes may be published in anonymised form where public trust requires it, but personal identities, sensitive evidence, and privileged information must remain protected under Chapter 21. Corrective statements must be factual, neutral, and free of comparative or reputational implications.

#### **Cross-Reference with Other Chapters.**

Investigations intersect with:

- confidentiality (Chapter 21),



- publication independence (Chapter 22),
- revision processes (Chapter 23),
- AI governance (Chapter 20),
- deep-dive safeguards (Chapter 17), and
- equivalency oversight (Chapter 18).

Where procedures conflict, the approach that maximises safety, confidentiality, proportionality, and interpretive fidelity prevails.

#### **Final Clause on Integrity.**

The enforcement system under this chapter protects the social equity mission of Agenda 2074. Any attempt by individuals or institutions to undermine investigations, intimidate participants, or bypass mandated safeguards constitutes a violation of the A2074-SRS and may result in permanent exclusion from the ecosystem. GSIA decisions in such matters are binding and incorporated into the next revision cycle under Chapter 23.

## **Chapter 26 — Registry, Archives, and Evidence Lifecycle Management**

This chapter constitutes the binding architecture for the canonical registry, confidential archives, and the full lifecycle management of evidence and validation artefacts under the A2074-SRS. Its purpose is to guarantee legal certainty, auditability, confidentiality, and publication independence while enabling proportionate, privacy-preserving verification across diverse partner models. All Validation Partners are subject to these provisions, which operate in continuous harmony with Chapters 6 (Evidence Standards), 11 (Proportionality), 18 (Equivalency), 19 (Localisation), 20 (Human Review and AI), 21 (Confidentiality), 22 (Publication Independence), and 23 (Revision and Versioning). GSIA retains ultimate custodianship and adjudicatory powers.

#### **Registry Classes and Binding Effect.**

Two classes of registries are recognised. The Canonical Registry is the authoritative, read-only catalogue of normative instruments and model artefacts, including canonical pillar interpretations, indicator catalogues and versions, approved sector annexes, cross-walks, and equivalency artefacts. The Validation Record Registry is a secure, access-controlled ledger of issued attestations, model versions used, assurance levels, scope statements, and non-comparative public extracts. Canonical entries are public by default; validation records are private by default and disclosed only under voluntary, revocable consent, or as required by applicable law consistent with Chapters 21 and 22. No registry shall contain person-level data beyond what is strictly necessary for integrity, and never without consent.

#### **Archive Obligations and Chain-of-Custody.**

Validation Partners must maintain confidential archives comprising scoping notes, materiality screens, evidence registers, consent ledgers, sampling plans, test scripts, scoring artefacts, human review notes, algorithmic model cards (where AI decision support is used), and decision memoranda. Every record must be cryptographically sealed at creation or ingestion; each subsequent access, transformation, or transfer must update the tamper-evident chain-of-custody. Archives must be logically segregated from the Canonical Registry; only hashed references to archived items may appear in any public-facing log.



### Minimum Metadata for Registered Items.

The following fields are mandatory for all items recorded in the Canonical Registry and the Validation Record Registry, respectively. The fields below are exhaustive for minimum compliance and may be extended by GSIA directives where warranted.

Registry	Required Fields (Minimum)	Notes on Use and Safeguards
Canonical Registry	Instrument name; version identifier (major–minor); issuance and effective dates; summary of changes; impacted sections; cross-references (e.g., sector annex IDs, equivalency artefact IDs)	All entries are public; no sensitive evidence; deprecated items flagged and sunset per Chapter 23
Validation Record Registry	Entity identifier (non-personal); scope statement; pillar(s) validated; model family and version; assurance level; date of decision; validity and surveillance terms; non-comparative public summary (if published); consent status	Private by default; public extracts require explicit, informed, revocable consent; no person-level data

### Evidence Lifecycle and Controls.

The lifecycle of evidence is governed by least-intrusive sufficiency and patient-level confidentiality. Each stage below is binding and auditable.

Lifecycle Stage	Required Controls	Canonical Guardrails
Collection	Data minimisation; purpose limitation; explicit, revocable consent; sensitivity classification	No covert collection; no employer-mandated consent; survivor-centred handling for grievance evidence
Ingestion	Cryptographic sealing; classification to Tier A–D (Chapter 21); initial redaction plan	Tier A never leaves secure enclave; AI interaction prohibited unless fully anonymised
Processing	Role-based access; dual-control for exports; human-in-the-loop for all AI outputs	No automated scoring; no inference of pillar-level claims by AI
Storage	Encryption at rest; immutable audit logs; key rotation; segregation from canonical repositories	Access on need-to-know and time-bound basis only
Use in Validation	Evidentiary hierarchy applied; triangulation; least-intrusive sufficiency	Anti-masking and non-comparative rules strictly enforced



Publication (if any)	Aggregate or narrative only; mandatory disclaimers (Chapter 22); de-identification and small-cell suppression	No cross-entity comparisons; no person-level data
Retention	Schedule proportionate to risk and legal obligations; litigation hold capability	Default to minimum necessary period; never indefinite retention of Tier A
Deletion	Verified, irreversible deletion; cryptographic attestations	Deletion rights for individuals honoured unless lawful hold applies

#### **Access, Segregation of Duties, and Key Management.**

Partners must implement strict segregation of duties among roles responsible for collection, analysis, and publication. Cryptographic keys must be lifecycle-managed with rotation, escrow, and recovery procedures that do not compromise confidentiality. Administrative access to archives requires dual authorisation and real-time logging. GSIA and its appointed auditors retain right of secure read-only inspection of logs and cryptographic attestations.

#### **Interoperability and Portability.**

Where an entity migrates between model families or Validation Partners, validation records may be ported through privacy-preserving, consent-led transfers. Only hashed artefact references and non-sensitive metadata travel with the record by default. Any additional evidence transfer requires renewed, purpose-specific consent and must respect data residency constraints under Chapter 27.

#### **Continuity, Disaster Recovery, and Incident Management.**

Partners must maintain business continuity and disaster recovery plans commensurate with their risk profile. Backups must be encrypted, access-controlled, and geographically distributed in line with lawful data residency constraints. Incidents are reportable per Chapter 21 and must include impact assessment, containment, root-cause analysis, and corrective actions. Any incident that compromises registry integrity triggers GSIA notification and may result in suspension of the implicated model or partner permissions.

#### **Precedence and Invalidity.**

Where an item lacks required metadata, breaks chain-of-custody, or breaches confidentiality guardrails, it is invalid for validation and publication purposes. GSIA may order removal, quarantining, or remediation and may impose sanctions under Chapter 25. In conflicts between archival convenience and confidentiality, the latter prevails.

## **Chapter 27 — Cross-Border Operations and Jurisdictional Harmonisation**

This chapter establishes the doctrinal and operational rules for conducting A2074-SRS validations across multiple jurisdictions, ensuring that the canon retains uniform meaning while respecting applicable law, data residency constraints, and cultural-linguistic requirements. It harmonises conflicts through principles of non-derogation of rights, subsidiarity, and the application of the stricter safeguard where rights and confidentiality are implicated.

#### **Uniform Canon, Local Law, and the Stricter-Rule Principle.**

Canonical pillar meaning, non-comparative publication, confidentiality, and least-intrusive sufficiency are non-derogable. Where local law provides stronger privacy, consent, or anti-retaliation protections,



the stricter local rule applies. Where local law mandates practices that would weaken A2074-SRS safeguards (e.g., compelled disclosure of person-level evidence, public ranking of entities, or collection beyond necessity), the Validation Partner must adopt privacy-preserving alternatives or, failing that, decline the engagement and seek GSIA guidance.

**Jurisdictional Mapping and Cross-Walk Discipline.**

All cross-border engagements shall begin with a documented mapping of legal, regulatory, and cultural obligations to the canonical taxonomy (Chapter 3) and cross-walk methodology (Chapter 5). The mapping is recorded as an annex to the engagement and must identify variances, the applicable stricter rule, and any constraints on evidence movement or publication.

Harmonisation Domain	Required Mapping Elements	Binding Constraint
Data Protection & Consent	Lawful basis; consent standards; data subject rights; breach notification timelines	Apply the stricter standard; consent remains revocable; patient-level confidentiality prevails
Evidence & Discovery	Rules on evidence admissibility, cross-border discovery, and state access	Least-intrusive sufficiency; no transfer where risk to rights is material
Disclosure & Publication	Statutory transparency requirements and exemptions	Non-comparative doctrine controls public outputs; aggregate only
Labour & Non-Discrimination	Protected classes, grievance and redress frameworks	Survivor-centred protections and non-retaliation are non-derogable
AI & Digital Governance	Algorithmic accountability, model auditability, localisation of data	Explainability and bias testing mandatory; human primacy prevails

**Data Residency, Transfers, and Local Mirrors.**

Where data residency rules restrict cross-border movement of sensitive evidence, Validation Partners must conduct in-region review using secure enclaves or controlled local mirrors. Only hashed artefacts and non-sensitive summaries may exit the jurisdiction. If lawful transfer is permissible and consented, transfers must be encrypted, logged, and limited to the minimum necessary. If a destination jurisdiction presents heightened rights risk, partners must avoid transfer and rely on attestation-based or anonymised verification.

**Governmental Requests and Legal Process.**

Any governmental request for access to archives or to registry items containing sensitive information must be evaluated under the stricter-rule principle. Partners must notify GSIA promptly, challenge overbroad or rights-eroding requests where legal avenues exist, and disclose only what is strictly required by law after applying redaction and minimisation. Individuals whose data may be affected should be notified where lawful and safe to do so.



### **Localisation, Translation, and Cultural Adaptation.**

All cross-border operations must use approved language packs and glossaries per Chapter 19. Where local idiom risks implying comparison or coercive publication, neutral constructions must be selected. Cultural examples may be adapted; canonical meaning, floors, and guardrails may not.

### **High-Risk Jurisdictions.**

In contexts with elevated risks of retaliation, discrimination, conflict, or weak rule of law, Validation Partners must adopt enhanced safeguards, including increased reliance on anonymised testimonies, third-party attestations, secure interview protocols, and off-site evidence handling. GSIA may require additional measures or deny operations where safeguards cannot be assured.

### **Cross-Border Teams and Independence.**

Assessors must disclose conflicts of interest across jurisdictions and adhere to rotation rules to prevent capture. Where national regulations require local participation, local assessors operate under the same confidentiality and non-retaliation standards and receive the same training on A2074-SRS safeguards.

### **Dispute Resolution and Venue.**

Contractual engagements should identify a neutral dispute venue for cross-border issues affecting validation integrity, with explicit reference to the A2074-SRS hierarchy and doctrines in this document. Disputes concerning canonical meaning, confidentiality, non-comparative publication, or AI governance fall under GSIA's adjudicatory authority; its determinations are binding and incorporated into the version cycle under Chapter 23.

### **Refusal and Withdrawal.**

Where applicable law, policy, or practice in a jurisdiction renders it impossible to preserve confidentiality, non-comparative publication, or pillar fidelity, Validation Partners must refuse or withdraw from the engagement, record the rationale, and notify GSIA. No convenience, commercial advantage, or pressure from public authorities justifies derogation from these core protections.

### **Final Harmonisation Clause.**

Cross-border implementation is an administrative challenge, not a basis for diminishing rights. In every instance of ambiguity, the rule most protective of confidentiality, non-retaliation, equity, and pillar fidelity prevails. Where uncertainty persists, operations pause pending GSIA clarification.

## **Final Word**

This document closes with a reaffirmation of purpose and method. The A2074-SRS exists to protect people, preserve fairness, and make social equity measurable without turning human welfare into a competition. Everything set out above—definitions, materiality rules, evidence hierarchy, scoring parameters, anti-masking and non-comparative doctrines, digital guardrails, equivalency constraints, and publication independence—serves a single, continuous aim: to keep the canonical meaning of the 17 Social Global Goals intact while allowing institutions of every size and context to demonstrate credible progress with dignity and safety.

The canon is uniform and non-derogable. Pillar meaning is not a marketplace variable and cannot be re-defined by convenience, capacity, or fashion. Partners may tailor indicators and evidentiary burdens in proportion to risk and capability, but they may not alter what a pillar means or use any tool—points, stars, badges, or maturity ladders—to disguise underperformance or to coerce disclosure. Where methodology and canon diverge, the canon prevails. Where data appetite conflicts with confidentiality,



confidentiality prevails. Where automation appears efficient but undermines human judgment or explainability, human primacy prevails. These are not stylistic preferences; they are binding safeguards.

The system stands on three indispensable pillars of governance. First, GSIA oversight and adjudication ensure that interpretive disputes, revisions, investigations, and appeals are resolved by an independent custodian whose mandate is fairness, not expedience. Second, patient-level confidentiality and consent ledgering ensure that evidence is collected and handled through least-intrusive sufficiency, with survivor-centred protections and redaction by default. Third, publication independence ensures that the decision to disclose rests only with the entity concerned, free of pressure, pricing, or reputational leverage. Together, these pillars convert a technical standard into a legitimate public trust.

The rules are intentionally practical. They translate into clear operator behaviours: use the controlled taxonomy; run materiality screens transparently; design indicators that are clear, measurable, verifiable, and proportionate; prefer outcomes while accepting credible proxies where necessary; record weighting and anti-masking controls; maintain auditable model cards; apply bias tests when using AI; respect localisation protocols; keep chain-of-custody intact; and version everything. None of these behaviours require spectacle or comparison; they require discipline.

The annexes are living instruments, not back doors. Sector notes, indicator catalogues, cross-walks, and worked examples are maintained so practitioners can do real work safely and consistently. They may refine, illustrate, and prioritise, but they cannot dilute or re-label the canon. Where annexes evolve, they do so through consultation, with change logs, transition periods, and sunset rules that preserve legal certainty for entities already in cycle.

The pathway forward is continuous and deliberate. Validation Partners embed these rules into training, software, contracts, and audit practice; entities adopt them in policies, operating routines, and grievance handling; communities encounter them as intelligible rights and safe recourse; financiers and public authorities recognise them as credible, non-comparative assurances; and technologists align systems to privacy-by-design and explainability. Progress will be visible as fewer exclusions, safer evidence handling, and steadier, verified improvements against each pillar—not as league tables or marketing claims.

If at any point we drift—toward convenience over fidelity, toward data appetite over privacy, toward comparison over learning—the correction is already here: the precedence clauses in each chapter, GSIA adjudication, and the consultation, revision, and enforcement mechanisms that keep the standard honest. This document therefore concludes as it began: with a commitment to equity that is practical, proportionate, and guarded by rules that respect people first.

Effective upon its entry into the Canonical Registry, this instrument supersedes inconsistent partner methodologies to the extent of any conflict, and it will be maintained through the revision and versioning protocol already established. Read it as one coherent whole. Apply it with care. Audit it with integrity. And when in doubt, choose the interpretation that best protects confidentiality, fairness, and the undiluted meaning of the 17 SGG pillars.