JANUARY 24, 2026

Multi-Model Validation Framework

Agenda for Social Equity 2074 – Social Responsibility Standard

CREATED BY

EUSL AB

Care to Change the World

Table of Contents

Multi-Model Validation Framework

Introduction

This Framework governs the plurality of validation models operating under the A2074-SRS and ensures coherence, equivalency, and lawful interoperability across stars, points, badges, maturity scales, sector-specific modules, and pillar-specific deep dives. It establishes a unified methodological architecture that preserves proportionality, non-comparative evaluation, and privacy-by-default across all models while allowing Validation Partners to innovate within clearly defined boundaries.

The Framework is grounded in the institutional architecture of the A2074-SRS, in which Agenda 2074 defines the substantive standard, Validation Partners design and administer models, and GSIA serves as the independent ethics and compliance custodian. It ensures that no model—regardless of form—creates competitive hierarchies, coercive incentives, or misleading impressions of certification. Instead, each model expresses a distinct and legitimate pathway for recognising progress toward the 17 Social Global Goals (SGGs) in a manner that accommodates differing sizes, sectors, capacities, and objectives.

This Framework must be interpreted in harmony with the Foundational Charter, the Rules for Interpretation of the SGG Pillars, the Validation Ethics and Integrity Code, the Governance & Oversight Manual, the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol, and the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. All models remain subject to identical confidentiality, consent, revocation, independence, and anti-coercion obligations. Public disclosure is voluntary, granular, time-limited, revocable, and controlled exclusively by the validated entity.

Chapter 1 — Overview of Multi-Model Validation

The A2074-SRS operates a multi-model validation architecture to provide flexibility, proportionality, and accessibility across diverse organisational contexts. The Standard recognises that no single model can accommodate the full range of entities—from microenterprises and local cooperatives to multinational corporations and public institutions—while preserving fairness, inclusion, and dignity. Multiple models are therefore permitted, but they must coexist under a unified conceptual and procedural framework.

Stars, points, badges, maturity scales, sector-specific modules, and deep dives are all independently legitimate expressions of the A2074-SRS. None holds superior status, and none may be marketed or interpreted as more advanced or prestigious. Their coexistence is governed by the non-comparative principle: progress is measured against the SGG pillars, not against other entities.

The star model provides a hospitality-style recognition tool designed for clarity and accessibility, primarily suited to entities seeking a recognisable but non-competitive symbol of alignment. The points model offers a more granular pathway within defined ranges, emphasising proportional achievement without implying ranking or percentile placement. Badges provide domain-specific indicators that allow entities to highlight particular contributions without implying full-spectrum validation. Maturity models recognise organisational development along descriptive scales without quantification, focusing on narrative, institutional growth, and capability evolution. Deep dives, by contrast, provide pillar-specific or sub-pillar-specific assessments that allow entities to concentrate on one target area while preserving confidentiality for the remainder.

All models share a unified evidentiary foundation, derived from the Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars. Their methodological differences must not alter the substantive meaning of any pillar or indicator. Validation Partners may design variations in format or workflow, but only to the extent that such variations do not distort substantive requirements, undermine confidentiality, or create inference-based pressure to choose one model over another.

Model selection must be voluntary, free of coercion, and informed by neutral descriptions of each model's structure, evidentiary load, and maintenance requirements. Validation Partners must ensure that business development practices do not influence or bias model selection and must maintain clear internal firewalls between commercial functions and validation decision-making, as required by the Validation Ethics and Integrity Code.

Finally, all models must integrate seamlessly into the digital governance architecture. They must support consent ledgering, immutable audit trails, AI guardrails, and controlled evidence storage in accordance with the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. They must also maintain compatibility with GSIA oversight mechanisms for audits, reviews, and appeals.

Chapter 2 — Single-Goal (Pillar-Specific) Validation Rules

Single-goal validation—also referred to as pillar-specific or deep-dive validation—is a formal mechanism that allows entities to obtain recognition for progress under one of the 17 SGG pillars without undergoing full-spectrum assessment. This model enables focused advancement, supports capacity-constrained organisations, and aligns with the A2074-SRS commitment to proportionality and inclusion. However, its use must remain strictly controlled to avoid misinterpretation, over-extension, or the creation of de facto certification schemes.

Pillar-specific validation must be anchored in the Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars. Each deep dive must adhere to a rigorously defined indicator set, calibrated sampling strategies, and an evidence-based methodology that preserves reliability while maintaining proportional burden relative to entity size and context. Deep dives must also be non-comparative and may not imply or suggest superiority within a sector, region, or peer group.

The scope of deep-dive validation is limited to the designated pillar or sub-pillar. Validation Partners must ensure that communications, internal or public, do not imply full-scope validation or broader institutional confirmation. Partial assessments must always include a neutral explanatory statement clarifying that only a selected pillar was reviewed. Any public disclosure must comply with the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol, including use of standardised marks, validity periods, and mandatory disclaimers.

Deep dives may contribute to sector-specific or narrative models but may not be aggregated or combined in a manner that suggests incremental certification toward full validation. The accumulation of deep dives across multiple pillars does not constitute multi-pillar validation unless the entity voluntarily transitions to a multi-model pathway using the appropriate methods and evidence requirements.

Validation Partners may not create conversion formulas that imply mathematical equivalence between deep-dive outcomes and stars, points, or maturity levels. Any such conversion creates a misleading impression of comparability and is prohibited. Where entities request multi-model transition, reassessment must occur under the new model's full evidentiary requirements; no shortcuts, partial imports, or preferential scoring may be used.

Deep-dive methodology must integrate identical confidentiality protections as all other models. Evidence, deliberations, findings, and narratives remain private unless the entity explicitly consents to disclosure. Consent must be granular, specifying which pillar outcome is disclosed, through which channels, and for what duration.

Validation Partners must distinguish clearly between ISO 26000 self-declarations referencing particular themes and deep-dive validation. ISO self-declarations cannot substitute for evidence in a deep dive and must not influence scoring or findings without independent verification.

GSIA retains authority to review deep-dive models, oversee methodological consistency, adjudicate boundary questions, and impose corrective measures or sanctions where deep-dive assessments are misused, misrepresented, or used to pressure entities into disclosure or into transitioning between models.

Chapter 3 — Sectoral or Industry-Specific Models

This Chapter governs the creation, approval, and operation of sector-specific or industry-specific validation modules under the A2074-SRS. These modules exist to accommodate contextual realities that cannot be fully captured through generic indicators, while ensuring that sector-tailored approaches do not distort the meaning of the 17 SGG pillars or undermine equivalency across models.

Sector-specific models may be developed by Validation Partners but remain subject to GSIA oversight, the Rules for Interpretation of the SGG pillars, and the interpretive hierarchy established by the Foundational Charter. Sector modules must preserve the non-comparative structure of the A2074-SRS, must avoid rankings or sectoral hierarchies, and must never suggest that achievement within a sector module equates to broader institutional or multi-pillar validation.

Sector modules must follow five binding requirements.

First, they must retain the substantive meaning of each SGG pillar. Sector tailoring may refine indicators, sampling methods, or evidentiary expectations, but may not reinterpret or dilute the underlying obligations of the SGG framework. Tailoring must also preserve proportionality, ensuring that micro, small, medium, and large sector actors can all meaningfully participate without prohibitive burden.

Second, sector modules must maintain methodological equivalency across Validation Partners. Where multiple Partners operate within the same sector, GSIA may issue harmonisation notes, require joint calibration sessions, or mandate shared interpretive guidance to ensure that variations in practice do not create structural inequities or undermine fairness.

Third, sector modules must be accompanied by a sector rationale that identifies the specific operational, regulatory, or contextual considerations necessitating sector tailoring. This rationale must be documented, reviewed periodically, and updated in response to regulatory developments, technological advances, or evolving sector risks.

Fourth, sector modules must integrate seamlessly with the digital governance system. Indicators, artefacts, and scoring justifications must remain compatible with consent ledgering, immutable audit trails, AI guardrails, and secure storage requirements under the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual. Sector modules may not include data-intensive requirements that override confidentiality protections or introduce indirect pressure to disclose.

Fifth, Validation Partners must avoid commercialisation of sector modules in ways that imply superiority or exclusivity. Sector modules are not premium offerings; they are tailored pathways to equitable participation. Marketing materials must remain neutral, descriptive, and fully consistent with the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol.

To assist with consistent implementation, the following matrix provides a non-exhaustive mapping of permitted forms of sector tailoring:

Sector Tailoring Category	**Permitted Adjustments**	**Prohibited Adjustments**
Indicator Precision	Additional clarifications, sector-specific examples	Alteration of pillar meaning or substantive obligations
Sampling Methods	Size- and risk-based sampling unique to sector	Reduced sampling that weakens evidence integrity
Evidence Types	Sector-specific documents or compliance artefacts	Mandatory disclosures beyond proportionality limits
Narrative Context	Sector-appropriate framing	Marketing language, superiority claims
Review Tools	Sector-specific technical checklists	Tools implying sector-based ranking

Sector modules strengthen proportionality and inclusion, but only when applied within strict interpretive boundaries. GSIA retains authority to suspend, amend, or revoke sector modules that diverge from the SGG pillars, undermine equivalency, or create implicit hierarchies among models or participants.

Chapter 4 — Equivalency, Cross-Recognition, and Conversion

This Chapter establishes the principles that govern equivalency, cross-recognition, and conversion between validation models. Its purpose is to preserve coherence across stars, points, maturity models, badges, and deep dives while preventing misuse, coercion, or structural bias within the multi-model architecture.

Equivalency refers to the conceptual integrity shared across all models. Although stars, points, badges, and maturity levels differ in format and expression, they are grounded in identical SGG interpretations, evidentiary requirements, and confidentiality protections. This underlying unity ensures that achievements across models are comparable in meaning, even if presented differently. Equivalency does not imply interchangeability, and Validation Partners may not claim that a particular result under one model is the “same as” or “equivalent to” an outcome under another model unless defined by GSIA through a formal equivalency note.

Cross-recognition permits entities to move between models without repeating foundational assessments, but only where the evidence base is demonstrably compatible and where re-validation procedures ensure that no model confers unintended advantage or disadvantage. Cross-recognition must be neutral, non-hierarchical, and strictly governed by GSIA-approved guidelines.

Conversion refers to the translation of results between models. Conversion mechanisms must be transparent, lawful, non-comparative, and free from mathematical formulas that imply rankings or precision beyond what the model permits. For example, star ratings cannot be expressed as numerical point equivalents, point ranges cannot be expressed as star equivalents, and maturity stages cannot be transformed into any quantitative form. Such conversions create misleading impressions of granularity or superiority and are prohibited.

Any conversion permitted under this Framework must meet four strict criteria. It must be descriptive and narrative rather than numerical; it must avoid comparative or escalating terminology; it must be contextualised within the limitations of the originating model; and it must be approved by GSIA prior to use. Conversion may not occur without GSIA approval under any circumstances.

Cross-model movement must respect confidentiality, consent boundaries, and revocation rights. Evidence submitted under one model may not be transferred or reused in another model without explicit consent, and entities must be informed of potential consequences, evidentiary requirements, and any need for supplementary assessments. Conversion processes must not create pressure to disclose outcomes or to transition to a more public or granular model.

The following table illustrates the conversion and cross-recognition boundaries:

Model Interaction Type	**Permitted Under this Framework**	**Prohibited Under this Framework**
Cross-Recognition	Narrative acknowledgement that prior evidence may inform a new model	Automatic equivalence or import of prior outcomes
Conversion	GSIA-approved, narrative-only translation	Numerical or formulaic score transformations
Model Transition	Voluntary movement with consent-bound evidence reuse	Implied progression, pressure, or insinuation of superiority
Public Disclosure	Disclosure only within consent scope	Presenting converted results as original outcomes
Evidence Transfer	Consent-based reuse with reassessment	Using evidence without consent, or without reassessment duties

GSIA retains exclusive authority to approve, amend, revoke, or interpret equivalency and conversion mechanisms. Validation Partners must notify GSIA of proposed changes to cross-recognition pathways, and may not implement them independently. All public references to equivalency or conversion must comply strictly with the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol.

Equivalency, cross-recognition, and conversion ensure that the multi-model ecosystem remains coherent and fair. When executed within the boundaries of this Chapter, they enhance accessibility and reduce redundancy; when misused, they risk structural bias, coercion, or misrepresentation. This Framework exists to prevent the latter while supporting the former.

Chapter 5 — Confidentiality Controls Across Models

This Chapter establishes the binding confidentiality, consent, and revocation requirements that apply uniformly across all validation models within the A2074-SRS. The purpose is to ensure absolute equivalency in privacy protections irrespective of whether an entity elects stars, points, maturity models, badges, sector-specific modules, or single-goal deep dives. Confidentiality is not model-dependent; it is a structural obligation embedded in the architecture of the A2074-SRS and is enforceable across every partner, channel, and jurisdiction.

Confidentiality is the default rule for all evidence, analysis, working papers, deliberations, intermediate findings, results, and narratives. This applies equally to full-spectrum validations and to narrow-scope pillar-specific deep dives. The nature of the model chosen does not alter or dilute confidentiality standards, nor does model selection grant any implicit permission for publication, partial disclosure, or redisclosure. Any use of information outside the validation process requires explicit, informed, granular, and revocable consent in accordance with the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol and the Digital Integration & Platform Governance Manual.

Evidence collected under one model remains confined to that model unless the validated entity authorises its reuse. Consent for evidence reuse must be granular, specifying which artefacts may be transferred, for what purpose, in connection with which model, through which channels, and for what duration. The mere fact that evidence has been verified in one model does not authorise its application in another; reuse without consent constitutes a breach of confidentiality irrespective of whether evidence content appears generic or low-risk.

All models must maintain the same technical safeguards, including role-based access controls, encryption in transit and at rest, immutable audit logging, pseudonymisation where feasible, and time-limited access approvals. No model may adopt a lighter confidentiality posture on the basis that it is perceived as less intensive or narrower in scope. Sector-specific modules and deep dives often involve highly sensitive or context-specific evidence; therefore they must apply confidentiality standards equal to or greater than those governing full-spectrum assessments.

Consent mechanisms must be model-neutral. Digital interfaces used to capture consent must not steer entities toward disclosure or toward more public models. Pre-selected options, dark patterns, urgency messaging, colour cues, or differential menu placement that favours disclosure are prohibited. Consent must be a deliberate act, unbundled from unrelated permissions, and accompanied by a clear explanation of the scope and implications of disclosure.

Revocation of consent must be honoured identically across all models. When an entity withdraws consent for disclosure, Validation Partners must remove or amend public materials irrespective of the model from which they originated. This includes stars, points, maturity descriptors, badges, sector module outcomes, and deep dive results. Model type does not affect the obligation to withdraw. In cases where technical or historical impossibility prevents full removal, corrective notices must be issued, coupled with documentation in the consent ledger and notification to GSIA.

Differences in model format must never result in differences in privacy expectations. Where a model naturally produces less narrative material, such as point ranges or badges, Validation Partners must refrain from assuming that disclosure is less sensitive or less impactful. The privacy-by-default covenant applies identically to all forms of output and must be interpreted strictly to prevent inference from silence or from partial disclosure.

The following matrix illustrates uniform confidentiality obligations across models:

Model Type	Confidentiality Obligations	Consent Requirements	Revocation Duties
Stars	Full privacy by default; no implied disclosure	Explicit, granular, channel-specific	Immediate takedown and correction
Points	Equivalent privacy protections; no inference allowed	Consent for point range and narrative context	Withdrawal triggers removal of all displays
Maturity Models	Narrative privacy; no promotional reinterpretation	Consent for excerpted use	Revocation requires withdrawal of excerpts
Badges	Strictly neutral contextual use; no aggregation	Consent for each badge individually	Takedown of badge and associated materials
Sector Modules	High-sensitivity default posture	Consent for sector disclosures	Model-neutral revocation obligations
Deep Dives	Strictest confidentiality due to narrow scope	Consent for pillar-specific publication	Immediate removal and corrective notices

GSIA retains full authority to audit confidentiality practices across models, issue corrective directives, mandate re-training, or impose sanctions for breaches. Model differentiation cannot be used as justification for weaker safeguards, reduced record-keeping, or informal practices. All participants in the A2074-SRS ecosystem must uphold the confidentiality obligations in this Chapter to ensure the integrity, equity, and trustworthiness of the multi-model architecture.

Chapter 6 — Calibration, Inter-Model Learning, and Updates

This Chapter establishes the institutional mechanisms through which Validation Partners maintain methodological consistency, reduce divergence, prevent interpretive drift, and embed continuous learning across all validation models under the A2074-SRS. Calibration and inter-model learning preserve fairness, equity, and coherency across a diverse validation ecosystem, ensuring that entities are treated consistently regardless of which model or Validation Partner they select.

Calibration is a structured, recurring obligation that requires Validation Partners to align their evidentiary expectations, interpretive judgments, sampling techniques, narrative rationales, and decision-making thresholds. Calibration applies equally to stars, points, badges, maturity models, sector-specific modules, and pillar-specific deep dives. It is grounded in the Rules for Interpretation of the 17 SGG Pillars and reinforced by GSIA oversight. Calibration is not optional; it is a condition of continued accreditation and essential to preventing fragmentation of the Standard across jurisdictions or sectors.

Calibration activities must incorporate real-case anonymised samples, model-specific scenario tests, and structured peer review to ensure that interpretations remain aligned. Partners must participate in joint calibration sessions convened by GSIA, including cross-partner technical reviews, consensus-building exercises, and scenario analysis. These sessions are conducted under strict

confidentiality and must not involve the sharing of identifiable data, proprietary methodologies, or commercially sensitive information. Only anonymised, redacted, or synthetic materials may be used.

Inter-model learning ensures that improvements, innovations, or refinements developed within one model are assessed for their relevance across others. No model may develop in isolation. When a Validation Partner identifies an interpretive clarification, methodological improvement, or evidence approach that strengthens fairness or accuracy, the insight must be shared through GSIA-governed channels. GSIA then determines whether the improvement should be incorporated into all models, limited to a sector-specific context, or treated as optional guidance.

Updates to models must follow a formal process. Validation Partners may propose enhancements to indicators, evidence requirements, narrative structures, or model workflows. All proposals must be submitted to GSIA with justification grounded in proportionality, sector realities, evidence integrity, and alignment with the SGG pillars. GSIA reviews proposals for methodological soundness, ethical compliance, confidentiality implications, and inter-model coherence. Approved updates become binding across the ecosystem and must be implemented within prescribed timeframes.

No Partner may unilaterally modify a model's interpretation of any SGG pillar, nor may they update evidence burdens or narrative structures in ways that create advantage, disadvantage, or inconsistency for subjects. Unapproved updates constitute a violation of this Framework and may result in corrective measures or sanctions under the Governance & Oversight Manual.

Calibration, learning, and updates must respect confidentiality and consent boundaries. Evidence used in calibration cannot include identifiable documents or materials unless the validated entity has explicitly consented to such use for training or learning purposes. Consent for calibration must be fully voluntary, granular, and revocable. Partners must not pressure entities to allow the use of their materials for calibration purposes.

The following matrix summarises the calibration and learning architecture:

Area of Calibration	**Required Activity**	**Prohibited Practices**
Interpretive Alignment	Joint GSIA-run sessions; scenario testing	Unapproved reinterpretation of SGG pillars
Evidence Standards	Harmonised sampling, load, and burden checks	Increasing evidence demands without GSIA approval
Narrative Reasoning	Shared anonymised examples for consistency	Sharing identifiable evidence or entity-specific materials
Model Updates	Formal proposals reviewed by GSIA	Unilateral model changes or silent updates
Inter-Model Learning	Cross-model impact assessment	Using insights to create coercive model preference

Through these mechanisms, the A2074-SRS maintains a unified, credible, and equitable validation ecosystem that evolves responsibly while preserving the Standard's foundational integrity.

Final Word

This Framework defines the structural, ethical, and methodological architecture that enables multiple validation models to coexist under the A2074-SRS without hierarchy, distortion, or inequity. It affirms that stars, points, badges, maturity models, sector modules, and deep dives are all legitimate pathways for recognising progress toward the 17 Social Global Goals, provided they adhere to identical confidentiality obligations, ethical safeguards, interpretive standards, and GSIA oversight.

The Framework ensures that model choice remains voluntary, non-coercive, and free from structural pressure. It establishes strict rules governing sector tailoring, single-goal validation, equivalency, cross-recognition, conversion, confidentiality, and updates. It also institutionalises calibration and inter-model learning to maintain fairness and methodological coherence across Validation Partners and jurisdictions.

Most importantly, this Framework protects the privacy-by-default architecture at the core of the A2074-SRS. Regardless of the model used, evidence remains confidential unless voluntarily disclosed; consent is explicit, granular, and revocable; and all public communication follows the strict standards set out in the Communication and Public Disclosure Protocol. Model diversity therefore strengthens rather than weakens the legitimacy of the ecosystem.

With this Framework, the A2074-SRS ensures that innovation in validation does not compromise consistency; that flexibility does not compromise fairness; and that diversity in pathways does not compromise the integrity of the Standard. It positions the multi-model system as a coherent, rights-respecting, and institutionally robust mechanism capable of supporting meaningful social responsibility advancement across all sectors and organisational types.