

JANUARY 28, 2026

# Agenda for Social Equity 2074

## Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol





## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Chapter 1 — Principles of Public Communication .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Chapter 2 — Private by Default and the Non-Inference Rule .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 3 — Consent Models and Granular Choices.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 4 — Rules for Display of Outcomes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 5 — Public Registry of Validation Partners .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 6 — Optional Public Registry of Validated Entities .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 7 — Misuse, Enforcement, and Remedies .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Final Word .....</b>	<b>12</b>



# Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol

## Introduction

This Protocol governs all voluntary public communications concerning validation outcomes under the Agenda for Social Equity 2074 – Social Responsibility Standard. It ensures that the dissemination of information remains accurate, fair, non-coercive, and consistent with the privacy-by-default architecture that is foundational to the A2074-SRS ecosystem. It also provides safeguards against misleading claims, improper inference, selective presentation of results, and any practice that could compromise the integrity of the Standard or the rights of individuals and entities participating in validation processes.

The Protocol must be interpreted in harmony with the Foundational Charter, the Governance & Oversight Manual, the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, the Validation Ethics and Integrity Code, the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, and the Legal Compliance & International Law Note. No public communication may override the confidentiality obligations that form the default posture for all validation outcomes. All disclosure requires explicit, informed, and revocable consent recorded in the consent ledger, and must adhere to the non-comparative nature of the A2074-SRS, which prohibits using validated entities to benchmark, rank, or imply superiority or deficiency relative to others.

Validation Partners, including EUSL and all accredited bodies, must ensure that communications remain proportionate, clear, and free of inference-creating language. Public narratives must not risk misrepresentation, and any use of badges, star ratings, maturity levels, points, or deep dive marks must follow the uniform display rules set out in this Protocol. Entities may choose whether to disclose, what to disclose, for how long, in which formats, and through which channels. Withdrawal of consent must be honoured in full unless technically impossible with respect to materials already disseminated, and even in such cases, updates, corrections, and takedown notices must be issued in accordance with GSIA guidance.

GSIA serves as the ethics and compliance custodian for all matters relating to public communication. It retains authority to review communications, order corrective notices, mandate takedowns, and impose proportionate sanctions where misuse or misrepresentation occurs. This Protocol is a binding instrument for all Validation Partners, and adherence to it is a condition for continued accreditation within the A2074-SRS ecosystem.

## Chapter 1 — Principles of Public Communication

Public communication under the A2074-SRS must adhere to a set of principles designed to safeguard the integrity of the Standard, protect the autonomy and dignity of validated entities, and maintain trust in the validation ecosystem. These principles apply to all communications, including digital publications, printed materials, website content, social media posts, marketing campaigns, press releases, annual reports, investor briefings, and third-party statements referencing validation outcomes.



The first principle is clarity. Communications must be written in a manner that is understandable to a general audience without compromising accuracy. Technical terms must be defined or contextualised, and all statements must truthfully reflect the scope, nature, and date of the validation. Partial disclosures must not create ambiguity or invite mistaken assumptions about undisclosed elements.

The second principle is fairness. Public communications may not exaggerate achievements, minimise limitations, or present outcomes in a manner that distorts their meaning. Validation Partners and validated entities must refrain from using the Standard to suggest commercial, political, or competitive superiority. The non-comparative design of the A2074-SRS prohibits referencing other entities, peers, sectors, or competitors in a way that implies rankings, league tables, or hierarchical placement.

The third principle is accuracy. All disclosed outcomes must correspond exactly to the validated findings authorised for disclosure. Manipulation of graphics, badges, or ratings is strictly prohibited, as is the alteration of colours, layouts, or wording in a manner that deviates from the approved formats in this Protocol.

The fourth principle is non-misrepresentation. Communications may not imply validation of areas not assessed, may not present expired validations as current, and may not blend validated and non-validated achievements in a manner that obscures boundaries. Time-bound validations must clearly display their validity period, and any updates, reassessments, or withdrawals must be accurately reflected in public representations.

The fifth principle is contextual neutrality. Communications must avoid language that overextends the scope of validation, such as references to compliance, certification, endorsement, or guarantees of performance. In particular, references to ISO 26000 must follow the Self-Declaration Protocol and may not imply certification or equivalence to ISO-based schemes.

To ensure consistent application of these principles, the following table provides an illustrative mapping of common communication scenarios to the corresponding obligations.

Communication Scenario	Required Ethical Posture	Key Constraints
Press release announcing a voluntary disclosure	Accuracy, clarity, non-misrepresentation	Must specify exact model disclosed, date of assessment, and consent scope
Website badge placement	Fairness, contextual neutrality	Must use approved visuals; no comparative statements
Annual report inclusion	Clarity, accuracy	Must not imply certification; must note non-comparative nature
Social media announcement	Proportionality, fairness	Must avoid sensational language; require link to full approved disclosure
Third-party commentary	Accuracy, fairness	Validation Partners must correct misuse or distortion by third parties

These principles apply globally across every jurisdiction where the A2074-SRS is implemented.



## Chapter 2 — Private by Default and the Non-Inference Rule

The A2074-SRS is governed by a privacy-by-default posture, meaning that all validation outcomes—findings, ratings, narratives, badges, star assessments, or deep dive results—remain confidential unless the validated entity grants explicit, informed, and revocable consent for disclosure. This confidentiality applies to initial outcomes, interim findings, draft recommendations, and any material generated during the validation process. Consent for disclosure is never presumed and cannot be inferred from prior publications, informal communications, or historical practices.

The non-inference rule reinforces this posture by prohibiting any communication or conduct that implies, directly or indirectly, that non-disclosure signifies poor performance, lack of achievement, failure to meet expectations, or reluctance to be transparent. Silence may not be interpreted or presented as evidence of insufficiency, deficiency, or underperformance. Validation Partners may not suggest or insinuate that disclosure is the norm or that non-disclosing entities are atypical, less credible, or less committed to social responsibility.

This rule extends to comparisons and marketing. Entities that choose to disclose may not imply superiority over entities that elect confidentiality. Validation Partners may not advertise or promote disclosure rates or lists of disclosing entities in a way that could pressure others into disclosure. Communications must avoid phrases such as “leading the way,” “setting the benchmark,” or any language that creates an implicit hierarchy between those who disclose and those who do not.

The non-inference rule also governs internal and external stakeholder interactions. Providers of financing, procurement opportunities, investment due diligence, or partnership decisions may not be encouraged to treat disclosure as a prerequisite or a proxy for trustworthiness. Validation Partners must refrain from designing fee structures, timelines, or service tiers that indirectly pressure entities into disclosure.

Digital systems must adhere to the same principles. Interface design may not use nudges, pre-selected options, or visual prioritisation to favour disclosure. Consent requests must be neutral, unbundled, and free from biasing elements such as colour coding, urgency messaging, or structural disadvantage for declining consent. The consent ledger must record disclosure decisions without ranking, tagging, or categorising entities based on their choices.

Violations of the privacy-by-default and non-inference principles constitute serious ethics breaches and fall under GSIA jurisdiction. Corrective measures may include communications takedowns, issuance of clarifying notices, invalidation of public materials, training requirements, or sanctions as appropriate.

## Chapter 3 — Consent Models and Granular Choices

Public disclosure of validation outcomes under the A2074-SRS requires explicit, informed, granular, and revocable consent recorded in the consent ledger governed by the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. Consent is never bundled, is never a condition for receiving any service, and is never implied from prior disclosures or general communications. The purpose of the consent architecture is to ensure that validated entities retain full control over the scope, duration, form, and context of any public representation of their validation results, consistent with the principles of autonomy, proportionality, and dignity.

Consent must be provided at the level of each specific disclosure action. Entities may authorise disclosure of a full star rating, a particular maturity level, selected deep dive outcomes, narrative highlights, or a limited set of badges, and may decline disclosure of all other components. Consent



must articulate the channels through which disclosure is permitted, such as the entity's own website, the Validation Partner's platform, printed materials, social media, press releases, public registries, or third-party reports. Each channel constitutes a separate consent line item.

Consent must always be time-limited. Expiration periods may differ by disclosure type but must be expressed clearly in the ledger, and reminders must be issued before expiry to prevent unintended continuation. Upon expiration, the Validation Partner must remove public materials unless new consent is granted. Withdrawal of consent is immediate and must be executed without undue delay through takedowns, corrections, or updates to public portals, registries, or partner listings. The sole exception is material already disseminated in formats that cannot feasibly be withdrawn; in such cases, corrective notices must be issued, and GSIA must be informed of residual exposure.

Granularity is essential. Entities may choose to disclose only positive achievements, but such selective disclosure must be clearly identified as partial. Validation Partners must provide neutral language to contextualise partial disclosures and prevent misinterpretation regarding areas not disclosed. Partial disclosures must not imply full validation, certification, or endorsement across all 17 SGG pillars.

Consent must also address redisclosure by third parties. Entities may choose whether Validation Partners may reference their disclosures in aggregated reports, case studies, or promotional materials. Redisclosure may only occur within the exact boundaries of consent. If third parties misrepresent or distort validated outcomes, Validation Partners must intervene promptly to issue clarifications, request corrections, or initiate takedowns, and must notify GSIA where corrective action is resisted or delayed.

The following consent architecture is binding across all Validation Partners:

Consent Category	Scope of Choice	Revocability	Required Partner Actions
Disclosure Scope	Full results, partial results, selected models, selected badges	Fully revocable	Remove or amend materials upon withdrawal
Disclosure Channels	Website, social media, press, registry, printed materials, third-party reports	Fully revocable	Execute channel-specific takedowns
Duration	Defined validity periods (e.g., 12, 24, 36 months)	Fully revocable within period	Issue reminders; sunset expired materials
Redisclosure	Aggregated reports, case studies, partner showcases	Fully revocable	Cease redisclosure and remove related materials
Narrative Content	Publication of full or partial narrative findings	Fully revocable	Withdraw, redact, or archive upon request

Consent decisions must be presented neutrally within digital interfaces, avoiding colours, prompts, or menu designs that favour disclosure. The consent ledger must timestamp all consents, amendments, withdrawals, expirations, redisclosure controls, and publication events. GSIA may access the ledger to ensure accuracy and adherence to the non-coercion, non-inference, and privacy-by-default principles.



## Chapter 4 — Rules for Display of Outcomes

This Chapter establishes the mandatory rules governing the visual, textual, and structural presentation of voluntarily disclosed validation outcomes. Consistency in display safeguards against misrepresentation, ensures that disclosures across sectors and jurisdictions retain a unified meaning, and protects the non-comparative nature of the A2074-SRS. No Validation Partner or validated entity may alter, stylise, fragment, or re-engineer badges, star representations, maturity labels, point indicators, or deep dive marks in a manner inconsistent with the formats set out in this Protocol.

All disclosure elements must use the approved designs issued through the Licensing & Accreditation Framework and the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. Approved formats are maintained in a controlled repository, and Validation Partners must ensure that entities use only the current version. Colour schemes, typography, iconography, and layout are integral to the meaning of disclosure and may not be modified for branding, marketing, or aesthetic reasons.

Star ratings must be displayed exactly as awarded, with clear reference to the model used and the date of assessment. No star may be enlarged, stylised, dimmed, or emphasised in a manner that implies greater or lesser significance. When representing maturity levels, the corresponding descriptors must be presented in full without replacement by commercial terminology such as “premium,” “advanced,” or “leader.” Point-based results must show the precise score range and must clearly indicate that they do not represent rankings or comparative placement.

Deep dive marks must specify the SGG pillar or sub-domain addressed, the nature of the deep dive (thematic, sectoral, or structural), and the year of assessment. Deep dive outcomes may not be merged with unrelated achievements or displayed adjacent to commercial branding that could imply endorsement of products or services.

Any narrative disclosure must reproduce the validated text or an authorised summary. Narratives may not be edited for marketing purposes, and qualifiers, caveats, and contextual notes may not be removed. Where narrative excerpts are used, they must be marked as such and include a reference directing readers to the complete authorised disclosure.

Partial disclosures must include a neutral explanatory statement indicating that only selected components have been made public at the discretion of the validated entity. This statement must be displayed adjacent to the disclosed outcome, with clear language avoiding inference about the status of undisclosed areas. The explanatory statement is standardised and may not be replaced or rephrased.

All disclosures must include a validity indicator specifying the date of validation and the period for which the outcome remains valid. Expired validations must be removed from public view or accompanied by an expiration notice pending removal. Validation Partners are responsible for monitoring public channels within their control to ensure that outdated materials are not inadvertently displayed.

Where display involves digital media, hyperlinked elements must direct users to the official hosted disclosure page maintained by the Validation Partner or by a GSIA-approved platform. No external link may lead to marketing pages that blend validated and non-validated claims. Offline materials, including printed brochures and reports, must include the full text or an official extract, along with the validity period and the consent reference identifier.



A uniform display matrix is provided to ensure consistent application:

Outcome Type	Mandatory Display Elements	Prohibited Representations
Star Ratings	Exact star count, model, date, validity period	Enlarged stars, rankings, comparative language
Points	Exact score range, model, date	Leaderboards, percentile claims, superiority claims
Maturity Levels	Exact label, full descriptor text, date	Substituted commercial terms, colour gradients implying hierarchy
Deep Dive Marks	Pillar, sub-domain, type, date	Mixing with unrelated badges, omission of context
Narrative Findings	Authorised text or extract, disclaimer for partial excerpts	Edits removing caveats, promotional re-writes

Compliance with these rules is mandatory. Any deviation constitutes misrepresentation and triggers the corrective and enforcement mechanisms described in Chapter 7. Validation Partners remain responsible for educating validated entities on proper usage and for monitoring misuse, whether intentional or inadvertent.

## Chapter 5 — Public Registry of Validation Partners

This Chapter establishes the rules governing the public registry of Validation Partners accredited to operate within the A2074-SRS ecosystem. The registry is a transparency instrument, designed to provide the public with accurate, current, and non-misleading information about institutions authorised to conduct A2074-SRS validations. It does not reveal any information regarding validated entities or their outcomes, which remain confidential unless voluntarily disclosed in accordance with Chapters 3 and 4 of this Protocol.

The registry is maintained under the authority of GSIA, which serves as custodian of the accreditation system and ensures consistency across jurisdictions. It records each Validation Partner's legal name, jurisdiction of establishment, accreditation tier, authorised scopes and models (including star, points, maturity, sector modules, and deep dive capabilities), the validity period of their accreditation, and any conditions, limitations, or supervisory requirements imposed following compliance reviews. Only information pertaining to the existence and status of accreditation may be included; commercial, competitive, or narrative descriptions of the Partner are prohibited.

Accreditation tiers reflect the depth and breadth of a Validation Partner's authorisation. Tiers may include, for example, single-model accreditation, multi-model accreditation, sectoral specialisation, or designation as a strategic regional partner. Tiers do not imply superiority, ranking, or hierarchical status, and any attempt by a Validation Partner to present tier information as proof of comparative advantage constitutes misuse under Chapter 7.

The registry is updated continuously. Validation Partners must notify GSIA immediately of any changes to legal name, ownership structure relevant to independence, management, accreditation scope,



contact points, or compliance status. GSIA may correct or amend entries at its discretion following review. Suspension, probation, and revocation decisions are recorded with clear indication of their scope and duration and with phrasing consistent with due process obligations.

The registry may not be used as a marketing or promotional channel. Links from the registry to external websites must direct exclusively to the Validation Partner's official landing page, and content on that page must adhere to the Principles of Public Communication. Validation Partners are prohibited from embedding ratings, testimonials, comparative claims, or any language implying GSIA endorsement beyond the fact of accreditation.

The following table clarifies the required elements of each registry entry:

Registry Element	Mandatory Content	Prohibited Content
Legal Identity	Full legal name, registration jurisdiction	Branding slogans, commercial descriptors
Accreditation Tier	Approved tier category only	Claims of superiority, rankings, market leadership
Scope of Authorisation	Models, sectors, geographic permissions	Any implication of exclusivity or competitive advantage
Status	Active, probationary, suspended, revoked	Narrative commentary, justification language
Validity Period	Effective and expiry dates	Marketing narrative or promotional framing
Contact Information	Neutral, functional contact details	Sales channels, promotional links

GSIA exercises oversight to ensure that registry entries remain consistent, accurate, and free from inference-creating statements. Misuse of the registry or attempts to manipulate perceptions through its content constitute ethics breaches and may result in suspension or revocation of accreditation. The registry operates solely to support informed understanding of who is authorised to conduct A2074-SRS validation—not to create competitive differentiation or encourage the disclosure of validation outcomes.

## Chapter 6 — Optional Public Registry of Validated Entities

This Chapter governs the optional public registry of validated entities, which may list organisations that have chosen, through explicit, informed, granular, and revocable consent, to have their participation in the A2074-SRS validation ecosystem publicly acknowledged. Inclusion in the registry is strictly voluntary, and the decision to be listed may not be used to pressure or influence disclosure of outcomes or to imply any correlation between listing and performance.

The registry does not contain validation results, ratings, scores, maturity levels, deep dive marks, narratives, or any other data generated through validation. Its sole permissible function is to record the fact that an entity has participated in an A2074-SRS validation and has consented to appear in the public registry. The decision to publish the outcomes themselves remains governed by Chapters 3 and 4.



Validated entities may, if they so choose, specify the form of their listing. Choices may include full legal name, trading name, sector classification, and jurisdiction. No descriptive, narrative, or promotional content may accompany the listing. Consent for registry listing is separate from consent for outcome disclosure and must be individually authorised, time-bound, and revocable without consequence.

The registry is maintained in a manner that avoids any implication of rankings, comparative positioning, or frequency-based interpretation. It must not display or allow sorting by size, sector, geography, or date in a way that could be construed as hierarchies or patterns. Searchability is permitted only by exact match to the entity's name or unique consent identifier. The display format must be uniform and devoid of visual cues that imply performance or endorsement.

When an entity withdraws consent, the Validation Partner must immediately notify GSIA so that the entry may be removed without delay. Entities may request removal for any reason, and no justification is required. Following removal, only anonymous ledger records of the consent and revocation event remain accessible to GSIA for compliance and audit purposes.

The registry must follow strict content limitations. The following matrix defines what may and may not be included:

Registry Content	Permitted	Prohibited
Legal or trading name	Yes, if consented	Any descriptive tagline or promotional text
Sector category	Yes, if neutrally defined	Any implication of ranking or comparative achievement
Jurisdiction	Yes	Any geopolitical commentary, competitive positioning
Validation date	Optional and only with specific consent	Any detail implying performance, score, or rating
Outcome data	Never permitted	All ratings, stars, maturity, deep dives, narratives

Validation Partners must monitor third-party references to the registry and intervene to correct any misrepresentation or inference that registry inclusion reflects particular performance levels. The registry is an opt-in transparency mechanism, not a public scoreboard, marketing tool, or reputational instrument.

GSIA retains the authority to oversee the registry's governance, review listing practices, audit consent records, mandate removals where consent has expired or been withdrawn, and sanction Validation Partners that misuse the registry or fail to maintain the privacy-by-default ethos of the A2074-SRS.

## Chapter 7 — Misuse, Enforcement, and Remedies

This Chapter establishes binding rules to prevent, detect, and remedy misuse of the A2074-SRS identity, artefacts, and disclosures, including misleading claims, unauthorised badge use, improper inference from non-disclosure, redistribution beyond consent, and any representation that undermines the



non-comparative, privacy-by-default architecture of the Standard. It shall be interpreted and enforced in concert with the Validation Ethics and Integrity Code, the Governance & Oversight Manual, the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, and the Legal Compliance & International Law Note.

Misuse occurs when any person or entity, whether an accredited Validation Partner, subcontractor, validated entity, media outlet, or third party, publicly communicates in a manner that distorts, exaggerates, fabricates, or decontextualises A2074-SRS validation participation or outcomes. This includes implying certification or endorsement beyond the scope of authorised disclosure; modifying badges, star marks, maturity labels, points, or deep dive icons; presenting expired or withdrawn outcomes as current; suggesting comparative superiority; using consent artefacts outside their granted scope or duration; and inferring poor performance from non-disclosure. Misuse also includes presenting ISO 26000 as a certification under A2074-SRS or implying parity with ISO-based certification schemes, contrary to the Self-Declaration Protocol.

Enforcement is guided by proportionality, due process, and the imperative to prevent ongoing or foreseeable harm to individuals, validated entities, the public, and the credibility of the A2074-SRS. Upon detection or credible allegation of misuse, the responsible Validation Partner shall act without delay to preserve evidence, initiate correction, and notify GSIA. Where misuse originates with the partner or its subcontractors, immediate self-remediation is mandatory. Where misuse originates with a validated entity or third party, the partner shall issue a corrective notice and takedown request, escalate as needed, and keep GSIA apprised. In cases presenting significant risk—such as misrepresentation that could cause reputational harm, investor or consumer deception, or violation of privacy-by-default—GSIA may direct emergency measures, including immediate takedown, suspension of further disclosure activity, and temporary removal of registry listings related to the misused content.

Corrective measures must restore the truth and prevent recurrence. At minimum, these include removal or correction of public materials across all channels within the misuser's control; issuance of a clear corrective statement equal in prominence and reach to the original communication; and adjustments to internal processes, training, and controls to forestall repetition. Where disclosure travelled through redistributors or aggregators, the misuser must make best efforts, documented in the compliance record, to secure downstream corrections and takedowns, including on social media platforms and search-indexed pages. All corrections shall avoid comparative or stigmatizing language and shall be strictly factual.

GSIA retains jurisdiction to impose remedies and sanctions calibrated to severity, intent, impact, and cooperation, consistent with the Governance & Oversight Manual. Remedies may include mandated corrective notices, supervised communications for a defined period, invalidation of tainted public materials, temporary or permanent suspension of disclosure privileges, probationary oversight, and, in serious or repeated cases, suspension or revocation of accreditation. Financial remedies may include recovery of costs associated with detection, investigation, and remediation; clawback of fees associated with misused disclosures; and contractual penalties under the Licensing & Accreditation Framework. Where misuse involves wilful deception, data protection violations, fraud, or infringement of protected marks, GSIA may refer the matter to competent authorities.

The following matrix provides a non-exhaustive mapping of frequent misuse scenarios to indicative remedies. It does not limit GSIA's discretion to impose additional or alternative measures where warranted by the facts and applicable law.



Misuse Scenario	Illustrative Conduct	Primary Remedies	Additional Measures
Unauthorised badge or mark alteration	Re-coloured, resized, or re-labelled stars; modified icons; added superlatives	Immediate takedown; replace with approved artefact; corrective notice	Supervised communications period; training on display rules
Misleading scope or currency	Presenting expired/withdrawn outcomes as current; implying full validation from partial disclosure	Correction stating precise scope and validity; removal of stale materials	Invalidation of misused pages; probationary oversight
Comparative or hierarchical claims	“Leader,” “top tier,” “benchmark,” or rankings based on A2074-SRS	Retraction; publication of non-comparative clarification	Suspension of disclosure privileges if repeated
Inference from non-disclosure	Implying that silence equals poor performance	Removal; clarified statement on privacy-by-default	Targeted training; monitoring for recurrence
Redisclosure beyond consent	Sharing narratives, scores, or badges in new channels without ledgered consent	Channel-specific takedown; ledger update; corrective notice	Cost recovery for remediation; supervised consent workflows
ISO misrepresentation	Claiming ISO 26000 certification or equivalence	Retraction; explicit disclaimer per Self-Declaration Protocol	Sanctions for repeated breach; public censure where lawful
Third-party distortion	Media or aggregator misquotes or blends validated and non-validated claims	Formal correction request; documented escalation; public clarification	GSIA advisory to platform; temporary pause on new disclosures

Where urgent harm is likely or ongoing, GSIA may require corrective action within compressed timelines proportionate to the risk. Failure to comply promptly with directives, to cooperate with investigation, or to effectuate takedowns and corrections constitutes an independent ethics breach. Appeals shall follow the procedures in the Governance & Oversight Manual but do not automatically stay emergency measures designed to prevent harm. Any public communication of sanctions shall follow the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol and the privacy-by-default rule; disclosure of identities or details occurs only with explicit, informed, and revocable consent or where legally compelled.

Costs of correction and mitigation are borne by the misuser. Validation Partners are responsible for ensuring that their contracts, brand guidelines, and client education materials include enforceable obligations to comply with this Protocol, to honour consent boundaries, and to execute takedowns and



corrections on demand. Nothing in this Chapter limits rights or obligations under applicable law; where legal requirements impose stricter standards for consumer protection, advertising fairness, data protection, or intellectual property, the stricter standard prevails.

## Final Word

This Protocol translates the ethical architecture of the A2074-SRS into a precise regime for public communication. It affirms that validation outcomes are private by default; that public disclosure is a voluntary, consent-bound exception; and that any representation must be clear, accurate, non-comparative, and faithful to approved formats. It establishes a disciplined framework for consent, display, registries, and remedies, ensuring that transparency never becomes coercion and that recognition never becomes misrepresentation.

The Protocol functions as an integrated instrument alongside the Foundational Charter, the Validation Ethics and Integrity Code, the Licensing & Accreditation Framework, the Governance & Oversight Manual, the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual, the Legal Compliance & International Law Note, and the ISO 26000 Self-Declaration Protocol. Together, these texts safeguard dignity, autonomy, confidentiality, and fairness for microenterprises and large corporates alike, while preserving public confidence in the integrity of the A2074-SRS.

Responsibility is shared. Validation Partners must design systems, contracts, and training that prevent misuse and honour consent. Validated entities must communicate with care, avoiding inferences and respecting the non-comparative ethos. GSIA provides the independent oversight that adjudicates disputes, orders corrections, and, where necessary, imposes proportionate sanctions. Through disciplined adherence to this Protocol, participants ensure that communication becomes an instrument of trust rather than pressure, and that the public record remains an accurate, rights-respecting reflection of voluntary disclosures made under the A2074-SRS.