

Standards Body · Institutional-design proposal, public edition · Released July 17, 2026
Canonical record: <https://standardsbody.ai/library/institutional-design/contributor-framework/>
Standards Body is an independent research and institutional-design project. It is not currently a regulator, accreditation body, certification body, or governmental authority. This document is research; it is not an adopted standard.

CONTRIBUTOR_FRAMEWORK.md

Standards Body Contributor Framework

Project: Standards Body

Primary domain: standardsbody.ai

Core line: Foundations for Frontier AI

Document type: Canonical contributor participation, role, access, credit, conduct, intellectual-property, security, accountability, and community-governance framework

Version: 1.0

Status: Approved foundational source

Document owner: Standards Body

Present institutional stage: Foundational research and institutional design

Applies to: Individual contributors, institutional representatives, researchers, authors, reviewers, editors, maintainers, standards participants, evaluators, domain experts, public-interest participants, translators, software contributors, data contributors, advisors, fellows, volunteers, contractors, working-group members, community participants, and future members

Related canonical sources: PROJECT_IDENTITY.md, PROJECT_MANIFESTO.md, INSTITUTION_DESIGN.md, GOVERNANCE_FRAMEWORK.md, STANDARDS_DEVELOPMENT_PROCESS.md, TRANSPARENCY_FRAMEWORK.md, FOUNDATIONS.md, FOUNDATIONS_APPENDIX.md, TERMINOLOGY.md, EVIDENCE_STANDARDS.md, RESEARCH_METHODODOLOGY.md, TAXONOMY.md, EVALUATION_PHILOSOPHY.md, and the eight foundation papers

Research basis reviewed through: July 16, 2026

Review cycle: Annual review, with event-triggered revision after a material contributor dispute, misconduct case, security incident, intellectual-property issue, participation failure, institutional-stage transition, or change in applicable law or standards practice

Authority Note

This document defines how Standards Body should invite, recognize, govern, protect, and hold accountable people and organizations that contribute to its work.

It does not establish that every person who interacts with Standards Body is:

- An employee
- A member

- A fiduciary
- An authorized spokesperson
- A governing representative
- A standards voter
- An accredited evaluator
- A certified expert
- An agent of Standards Body
- A representative of a country, institution, community, industry, or public
- Entitled to confidential access
- Entitled to authorship
- Entitled to compensation
- Entitled to continued participation
- Authorized to bind Standards Body

Contributor status creates only the rights and responsibilities explicitly assigned to the person's role.

A contribution does not automatically create:

- Employment
- partnership
- joint ownership
- certification
- accreditation
- endorsement
- governance authority
- legal representation
- decision rights
- publication rights
- access rights
- future appointment

Nothing in this framework overrides applicable law, employment obligations, confidentiality duties, research ethics, intellectual-property rights, export controls, sanctions, privacy law, or binding institutional agreements.

Document Purpose

This document establishes the complete contributor framework for Standards Body.

It defines:

- Who qualifies as a contributor
- Which contributor roles exist
- How roles are assigned
- Which rights and responsibilities attach to each role

- How contributors enter, participate, advance, pause, and leave
- How contributions are proposed, reviewed, accepted, revised, rejected, credited, licensed, archived, and corrected
- How authorship, attribution, acknowledgement, and contributor-role records are determined
- How maintainers, editors, reviewers, chairs, stewards, and decision makers are selected
- How conflicts of interest are disclosed and governed
- How confidentiality, security, and protected evidence are handled
- How intellectual property, copyright, patents, code, data, and model-generated material are managed
- How contributors may use names, logos, titles, and public affiliation
- How conduct expectations, complaints, enforcement, appeals, and restorative responses operate
- How accessibility, international participation, translation, and financial barriers are addressed
- How compensation, expenses, grants, and volunteer status are disclosed
- How contributor well-being, workload, recognition, succession, and concentration risks are managed
- How AI-assisted contributions are documented and reviewed
- How contributors participate in research, standards, evaluations, reviews, incident work, registries, and governance
- How the contributor system is audited and improved

The framework is designed to solve a central institutional problem:

Standards Body needs broad, competent, independent, and internationally diverse contribution without converting participation into unbounded authority, invisible labor, unclear ownership, or institutional capture.

Executive Summary

A frontier AI standards institution cannot be built by a founder or staff alone.

It requires contributions from:

- Evaluation scientists
- machine-learning researchers
- domain experts
- standards professionals
- auditors
- security specialists
- public-interest organizations
- legal experts
- government practitioners
- open-source communities
- affected persons
- translators
- editors

- software engineers
- data stewards
- institutional designers
- international partners

Contribution creates value.

It also creates governance obligations.

A contributor system can fail when:

- A small inner circle controls access
- unpaid contributors perform essential work without recognition
- prestigious names receive credit disproportionate to actual work
- authorship is used as a political reward
- contributors are presented as endorsing conclusions they opposed
- institutional representatives participate without disclosing mandates
- a company supplies many contributors and quietly dominates a process
- confidential information is shared without sufficient controls
- intellectual-property rights are unclear
- maintainers accumulate unreviewable power
- volunteers burn out
- harassment or retaliation discourages dissent
- public-interest contributors are invited after technical decisions are already fixed
- participation is formally open but financially inaccessible
- contributors use the Standards Body name to imply official status
- AI-generated text enters the record without verification
- people cannot leave without losing credit or exposing themselves to retaliation

The contributor framework therefore separates:

- Contribution
- authorship
- credit
- decision authority
- governance authority
- institutional representation
- employment
- membership
- access
- public endorsement

These are related but distinct.

Contributor Architecture

The framework uses seven broad contributor families.

1. Community Contributors

People who submit:

- Comments
- corrections
- sources
- proposals
- examples
- translations
- implementation feedback
- issue reports

2. Project Contributors

People assigned to a bounded research, standards, software, data, or operational project.

3. Review Contributors

People who perform:

- Peer review
- methodological review
- technical review
- public-interest review
- security review
- legal review
- implementation review

4. Stewardship Contributors

People with continuing responsibility for:

- Editing
- maintenance
- repositories
- registries
- protocols
- terminology
- data
- releases
- contributor support

5. Working-Group and Committee Contributors

People who participate in chartered institutional bodies and may receive defined decision rights.

6. Fellows, Advisors, and Institutional Contributors

People or organizations contributing through formal appointments, fellowships, secondments, grants, or liaison arrangements.

7. Staff and Contracted Contributors

Employees and contractors whose rights and obligations also arise from employment or service agreements.

Role Principle

Contributor roles should be assigned by function.

A person may hold several roles.

Each role should state:

- Scope
- authority
- access
- expected work
- conflict requirements
- confidentiality
- credit
- term
- removal and appeal

Contribution Principle

A contribution enters a defined lifecycle:

1. Submission
2. identity and rights check
3. security and sensitivity screening
4. scope triage
5. substantive review
6. revision
7. acceptance or rejection
8. attribution
9. integration
10. publication or controlled use
11. maintenance
12. correction, withdrawal, or archival

Acceptance should be based on relevance, quality, evidence, safety, rights, and institutional need.

It should not depend on prestige, affiliation, or agreement with leadership.

Credit Principle

Credit should reflect actual contribution.

Standards Body should use structured contributor-role records adapted from the CRediT Contributor Role Taxonomy, which identifies 14 research-contribution roles and is intended to make diverse contributions more visible.^[^credit]

Standards Body should extend this with institution-specific roles such as:

- Standards drafting
- standards process facilitation
- public-interest consultation
- evaluation administration
- protocol stewardship
- task custody
- security review
- interoperability mapping
- registry maintenance
- community moderation

Authorship should not be granted solely for:

- Funding
- seniority
- title
- supervision
- institutional prestige
- access
- general advice

Acknowledgement, contributor credit, authorship, editorship, and approval should remain distinct.

Decision Principle

Merit or contribution can support eligibility for greater responsibility.

It should not create automatic authority.

Decision rights require:

- Defined role
- competence
- independence
- conflict review
- appointment
- term
- accountability
- removal

- appeal

Conduct Principle

Standards Body should maintain a code of conduct across:

- Meetings
- repositories
- email
- chat
- events
- social channels
- private project spaces
- public representation

The code should support respectful, professional, and equitable participation.

Contributor Covenant and W3C provide established examples of community codes that define expected behavior, scope, reporting, and enforcement processes.^{[^contributor-covenant][^w3c-coc]}

The institution should not simply copy a code without establishing:

- Reporting channels
- trained responders
- conflict controls
- evidence handling
- proportionate consequences
- appeal
- nonretaliation
- restorative options where appropriate

Intellectual-Property Principle

Contributors should understand the rights they grant.

For code and certain signed contributions, Standards Body may use a Developer Certificate of Origin model or a contributor license agreement, depending on the project.

The Linux Foundation's Developer Certificate of Origin provides a concise certification that the contributor has the right to submit the contribution and understands that the contribution and sign-off are public and may be redistributed under the project's license.^[^dco]

IETF and W3C processes illustrate more formal approaches in which contribution rights, participant obligations, document licensing, and patent policies are defined before standards contributions are accepted.^{[^ietf-rights][^w3c-process]}

Standards Body should not accept formal standards contributions without a published intellectual-property policy.

Access and Security Principle

Contributor access should follow:

- Need
- competence
- role
- conflict
- legal eligibility
- training
- least privilege
- logging
- review
- revocation

Contribution alone does not justify access to held-out tasks, vulnerabilities, personal data, model credentials, or protected evidence.

Participation Principle

Open participation requires more than an open form.

The institution should reduce barriers through:

- Remote participation
- asynchronous work
- travel and participation support
- compensation or stipends where appropriate
- translation
- accessible formats
- orientation
- mentorship
- clear issue labels
- response expectations
- safe reporting channels

W3C's invited-expert model and support fund demonstrate one mechanism for bringing individuals with relevant expertise into formal work even when they do not participate through a member organization.[^w3c-invited][^w3c-support]

Contributor Independence

Contributors may have employers, funders, clients, political roles, or intellectual commitments.

They should disclose relevant relationships.

A contributor representing an organization should say so.

A contributor acting in personal capacity should say so.

Institutional affiliation should not be used to imply that the institution endorses the contribution unless authorization exists.

Exit Principle

Contributors should be able to:

- Resign
- pause
- transfer work
- preserve earned credit
- report unresolved concerns
- request correction of role records
- retain applicable rights
- remain protected from retaliation

The final contributor proposition is:

Contribution should be open enough to invite expertise, structured enough to preserve quality, bounded enough to protect authority and security, and fair enough that credit, responsibility, access, and accountability remain visible.

1. Foundational Contributor Propositions

1.1 Contribution Is Broader Than Authorship

Research, editing, review, maintenance, translation, software, data, facilitation, and public-interest participation may all be substantive contributions.

1.2 Contribution Does Not Equal Authority

A valuable contribution does not automatically grant decision rights.

1.3 Credit Should Track Work

Recognition should reflect actual contribution rather than status or influence.

1.4 Authority Should Track Role

Decision authority should arise through defined appointment and governance.

1.5 Access Should Track Need

Contributor status alone does not justify access to protected information.

1.6 Participation Should Be Meaningful

People should be able to influence work before decisions are fixed.

1.7 Open Does Not Mean Ungoverned

Open contribution still requires scope, review, conduct, rights, security, and maintenance.

1.8 Independence Should Be Visible

Relevant affiliations and conflicts should be disclosed.

1.9 Dissent Is a Contribution

Reasoned objection, error identification, and contrary evidence are valuable contributions.

1.10 Maintenance Is Contribution

Sustained stewardship should be credited, resourced, and reviewed.

1.11 Invisible Labor Should Be Reduced

Administrative, emotional, moderation, translation, accessibility, and community work should be recognized.

1.12 Volunteer Status Should Be Accurate

Voluntary participation should not disguise employment or uncompensated essential labor.

1.13 Protection and Accountability Should Coexist

Confidential contributors may need protection, while contribution provenance remains governed.

1.14 The Institution Owns Its Decisions

Contributors inform institutional outputs.

The accountable body remains responsible for approval.

1.15 Contributors May Leave

Exit should not erase earned credit or expose the contributor to retaliation.

1.16 Contributor Systems Should Be Correctable

Role, credit, conduct, access, and attribution decisions should support review and correction.

1.17 International Participation Requires Practical Access

A global contributor claim requires more than participants from multiple countries.

1.18 Community Growth Should Not Outrun Governance

The institution should not recruit large numbers of contributors before it can support them responsibly.

2. Scope and Non-Claims

2.1 Covered Contribution

This framework covers contributions to:

- Canonical documents
- research
- standards
- protocols
- evaluations
- software
- data
- task banks
- registries
- reviews
- governance
- incident learning
- translations
- communications
- public consultation
- community operations

2.2 Covered Participants

- Volunteers
- fellows
- advisors
- staff
- contractors
- members
- representatives
- reviewers
- working-group participants
- public commenters
- invited experts
- translators
- maintainers
- students
- institutional partners

2.3 Employment Distinction

Employees and contractors remain subject to applicable agreements and law.

This framework supplements rather than replaces those obligations.

2.4 Membership Distinction

Membership may create participation rights.

It does not create automatic contributor credit or technical authority.

2.5 Governance Distinction

A director or council member may contribute.

Their governance authority arises from appointment, not from contribution volume.

2.6 Representation Distinction

A contributor may participate:

- In personal capacity
- as an authorized institutional representative
- as a liaison
- as an employee
- as an invited expert

The capacity should be recorded.

2.7 No Employment Promise

Voluntary contribution does not promise future paid work.

2.8 No Publication Promise

Submission does not promise acceptance or publication.

2.9 No Endorsement Promise

Credit does not imply endorsement of every institutional conclusion.

3. Canonical Definitions

Definitions in `TERMINOLOGY.md` govern.

3.1 Contributor

A person or organization that provides a substantive input to Standards Body work.

3.2 Contribution

A documented input of knowledge, labor, evidence, review, code, data, facilitation, funding, infrastructure, or other material value.

Funding alone does not normally create authorship.

3.3 Community Contributor

A person who makes bounded contributions without a continuing formal appointment.

3.4 Project Contributor

A person assigned to a defined project with stated responsibilities.

3.5 Maintainer

A person with continuing responsibility for the quality, integration, status, and continuity of a project or artifact.

3.6 Steward

A person or body entrusted with the long-term care, governance, or maintenance of a defined resource.

3.7 Editor

A person responsible for preparing, structuring, and integrating content under defined substantive authority.

3.8 Reviewer

A person assigned to assess quality, validity, compliance, security, public interest, or implementation.

3.9 Author

A person credited with substantial intellectual responsibility for a published work under the applicable authorship criteria.

3.10 Acknowledged Contributor

A person whose contribution merits public acknowledgement but does not meet authorship or formal role criteria.

3.11 Institutional Representative

A person authorized to participate on behalf of an organization.

3.12 Invited Expert

A person invited because of relevant expertise or perspective outside ordinary membership pathways.

3.13 Liaison

A person formally authorized to maintain communication between Standards Body and another institution.

3.14 Fellow

A person appointed for a defined period to conduct research, practice, or institutional work.

3.15 Volunteer

A person who contributes without an employment relationship and without expectation of ordinary wages, subject to applicable law.

3.16 Decision Right

Authority to make or formally participate in a defined institutional decision.

3.17 Contribution Record

A structured record of a person's role, activity, output, dates, status, and credit.

3.18 Attribution

Identification of the person or organization responsible for a contribution.

3.19 Authorship

Formal credit for substantial intellectual responsibility for a published work.

3.20 Contribution Agreement

The terms governing rights, conduct, confidentiality, access, and use of a contribution.

3.21 Maintainer Capture

Concentration of practical control in maintainers without sufficient review, succession, or accountability.

3.22 Contribution Debt

Accumulated unreviewed submissions, unresolved contributor requests, incomplete credit, or unsupported maintenance obligations.

3.23 Institutional Capacity

The ability of Standards Body to review, support, secure, credit, and maintain contributions responsibly.

4. Contributor Architecture

4.1 Community Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Issue reports
- factual corrections
- source suggestions
- public comments
- implementation examples
- translations
- usability feedback
- accessibility feedback
- incident leads
- public-interest concerns

Default authority:

- Advisory input only

Default access:

- Public information

4.2 Project Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Research
- drafting
- software
- data
- analysis
- protocol design
- standards work
- implementation
- testing

Authority:

- Defined by project charter

Access:

- Project-specific

4.3 Review Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Peer review
- methodology review
- technical review
- standards review
- public-interest review
- legal review
- security review
- translation review

Authority:

- Findings and recommendations within mandate

Access:

- Sufficient for assigned review

4.4 Stewardship Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Repository maintenance
- issue triage
- editing
- release management
- registry administration
- protocol maintenance
- terminology maintenance
- contributor support
- archival work

Authority:

- Continuing operational authority within scope

4.5 Working-Group Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Deliberation
- drafting
- voting
- consensus
- objections

- pilot design
- comment resolution

Authority:

- Defined by charter and eligibility

4.6 Advisory Contributors

Typical contributions:

- Strategic advice
- expert consultation
- contextual review
- future-work recommendations

Authority:

- Advisory unless explicitly delegated

4.7 Institutional Contributors

Organizations may contribute:

- Staff time
- model access
- data
- compute
- funding
- facilities
- expertise
- implementation sites

The organization should not receive authorship merely for providing resources.

4.8 Staff and Contractors

Staff and contractors may hold contributor roles.

Their employment or service agreement governs:

- Compensation
- ownership
- confidentiality
- performance
- termination

4.9 Multiple Roles

A person may be:

- Author and reviewer on different work
- maintainer and working-group member
- staff member and institutional representative
- funder representative and public commenter

Conflicting roles should be identified and controlled.

4.10 Role Register

Maintain a current register identifying:

- Person
 - role
 - capacity
 - affiliation
 - project
 - authority
 - access
 - term
 - conflict status
 - public status
-

5. Contributor Role Taxonomy

Standards Body should use a structured role taxonomy.

5.1 Research and Knowledge Roles

Conceptualization

Developing core ideas, questions, objectives, or intellectual architecture.

Methodology

Designing methods, protocols, study structures, or analytic approaches.

Investigation

Conducting research, evaluation, interviews, experiments, or evidence collection.

Formal Analysis

Applying statistical, logical, computational, legal, or structured analytic methods.

Data Curation

Cleaning, documenting, preserving, governing, and making data usable.

Validation

Replicating, checking, verifying, or challenging methods and results.

Source Curation

Identifying, evaluating, organizing, and maintaining sources.

Synthesis

Integrating multiple bodies of evidence into a coherent account.

5.2 Writing and Publication Roles

Writing, Original Draft

Preparing substantive first-draft content.

Writing, Review and Editing

Providing critical revision, commentary, restructuring, or improvement.

Technical Editing

Improving precision, consistency, terminology, cross-references, and normative language.

Copy Editing

Improving grammar, spelling, formatting, and readability without changing substance.

Visualization

Creating diagrams, figures, tables, and other explanatory artifacts.

Publication Production

Preparing accessible, machine-readable, and final publication formats.

5.3 Standards Roles

Standards Proposal

Developing a new-work proposal or standards need.

Requirements Drafting

Creating normative requirements.

Standards Process Facilitation

Chairing, scheduling, recording, and enforcing standards procedure.

Comment Resolution

Reviewing and responding to public comments.

Consensus Assessment

Assessing broad agreement and substantial objections.

Implementation Testing

Piloting and evaluating the draft standard.

Standards Maintenance

Managing interpretations, errata, amendments, revisions, and retirement.

5.4 Evaluation Roles

Construct Design

Defining the capability, behavior, risk, safeguard, or property evaluated.

Task Design

Creating tasks, items, scenarios, environments, or task-generation methods.

Elicitation

Developing prompts, scaffolds, tools, fine-tuning, and capability-elicitation procedures.

Evaluation Administration

Operating the protocol.

Scoring

Applying rubrics, judges, measurements, or environment outcomes.

Result Interpretation

Connecting evidence to claims, uncertainty, risk, and decisions.

Task Custody

Protecting held-out material and chain of custody.

Evaluation Review

Reviewing validity, integrity, and interpretation.

5.5 Institutional and Public-Interest Roles

Governance Design

Developing institutional rules and decision architecture.

Public-Interest Analysis

Assessing rights, distribution, access, competition, labor, or public consequence.

Community Engagement

Organizing participation and communication.

Facilitation

Supporting constructive deliberation and conflict resolution.

Accessibility

Improving access for disabled and other participants.

Translation and Localization

Translating language and adapting context with controlled status.

International Coordination

Supporting cross-jurisdictional participation and interoperability.

5.6 Technical Infrastructure Roles

Software

Designing, coding, testing, documenting, or maintaining software.

Data Engineering

Building data pipelines, schemas, repositories, or storage systems.

Security Engineering

Protecting systems, access, evidence, and operations.

Registry Maintenance

Maintaining authoritative status records.

Release Engineering

Managing versions, artifacts, signing, packaging, and publication.

Technical Support

Helping implementers and contributors use systems and standards.

5.7 Operational Roles

Project Administration

Managing timeline, resources, meetings, documentation, and coordination.

Funding Acquisition

Obtaining support without controlling findings.

Resource Provision

Providing compute, data, access, facilities, tools, or personnel.

Supervision

Providing responsible oversight, mentoring, or leadership.

Contributor Support

Onboarding, mentoring, documentation, and participation assistance.

5.8 Accountability Roles

Independent Review

Providing conflict-screened external challenge.

Ethics Review

Assessing research, rights, conduct, and dual-use concerns.

Conflict Review

Assessing independence and recusal.

Security Review

Assessing disclosure and access risk.

Appeal Review

Reviewing eligible decisions independently.

Audit

Assessing conformity with institutional requirements.

5.9 Role Adaptation

The taxonomy should remain compatible with CRediT where practical while extending beyond scholarly publishing.

5.10 Role Specificity

A contribution record should use specific roles rather than "contributor" alone where feasible.

6. Contributor Statuses

6.1 Prospective

The person has expressed interest but has no active role.

6.2 Applicant

An application or nomination is under review.

6.3 Provisional

The person may participate during orientation, trial, or limited-access status.

6.4 Active

The person currently holds the role.

6.5 Inactive

The role remains recorded but current participation has paused.

6.6 Emeritus

A recognized former contributor with no ordinary current authority.

6.7 Suspended

Participation or access is temporarily restricted.

6.8 Resigned

The contributor voluntarily ended the role.

6.9 Removed

The institution ended the role.

6.10 Completed

A time-limited role ended successfully.

6.11 Archived

The record remains for history but is no longer current.

6.12 Status Transparency

Public role pages should distinguish current from historical status.

7. Contributor Capacity and Participation Capacity

7.1 Capacity Before Recruitment

Standards Body should recruit only when it can:

- Explain the work
- respond to contributions
- review submissions
- protect information
- assign credit
- address conduct
- maintain outputs
- support access needs

7.2 Capacity Assessment

Before opening a project, assess:

- Staff or maintainer availability
- review capacity
- security capacity
- contributor support
- expected volume

- response timelines
- maintenance burden
- compensation or stipend capacity

7.3 Contribution Debt

When contribution debt becomes material:

- Pause broad recruitment
- publish expected delays
- prioritize safety and corrections
- close stale requests
- recruit maintainers
- narrow scope

7.4 No Recruitment Theater

Do not invite public contribution merely to demonstrate openness when meaningful review is unavailable.

7.5 Response Expectations

Each channel should publish:

- What submissions are accepted
- expected response time
- review criteria
- current capacity
- closure policy

8. Entry Pathways

8.1 Open Contribution

Suitable for:

- Public issues
- corrections
- sources
- comments
- translations
- implementation feedback

8.2 Application

Suitable for:

- Project teams
- fellowships
- reviewer pools
- maintainers
- protected work

8.3 Nomination

Suitable for:

- Expert panels
- councils
- chairs
- appeals
- advisory groups

8.4 Invitation

Suitable for:

- Scarce expertise
- affected-party representation
- international liaison
- urgent review

8.5 Organizational Appointment

Suitable for:

- Authorized institutional representatives
- formal liaisons
- government participants
- partner representatives

8.6 Employment or Contract

Suitable for:

- Continuing operational work
- defined deliverables
- controlled access
- accountable service

8.7 Fellowship or Secondment

Suitable for:

- Time-limited research
- capacity building
- institutional exchange
- regional participation

8.8 Public Comment

Public commenters are contributors to the process but do not become members or project contributors automatically.

9. Eligibility

9.1 General Eligibility

A contributor should be able to:

- Perform the role
- comply with conduct
- disclose conflicts
- respect confidentiality
- provide required contribution rights
- communicate sufficiently for the project

9.2 Competence

Competence requirements should match the role.

9.3 No Prestige Requirement

Institutional affiliation, degree, or public reputation should not be required unless necessary.

9.4 Institutional Representative

An institutional representative should provide evidence of authorization where formal representation matters.

9.5 Legal Eligibility

Protected or paid roles may require review of:

- Employment eligibility
- sanctions
- export controls
- contracting
- age
- data access
- security restrictions

9.6 Age

The institution should ordinarily require adult status for roles involving:

- Contracts
- protected evidence
- severe-risk evaluation
- fiduciary decisions
- personal-data access

Youth participation may occur through a separately designed safeguarding process.

9.7 Geographic Eligibility

Participation should be international where lawful.

Restrictions should be disclosed.

9.8 Conflict Eligibility

A conflict may limit a role without excluding all contribution.

9.9 Conduct History

Relevant substantiated misconduct may affect eligibility.

Unverified allegations should not be treated automatically as fact.

9.10 Accessibility

Eligibility criteria should not include avoidable barriers.

10. Application and Selection

10.1 Role Description

Publish:

- Purpose
- activities
- authority
- term
- workload
- compensation
- access
- competence
- conflicts
- selection
- public disclosure
- removal

10.2 Application Fields

- Identity
- contact
- location and time zone
- affiliation
- capacity
- competence
- experience
- motivation
- expected contribution
- availability
- conflicts
- accessibility needs
- compensation need
- security eligibility
- references where appropriate

10.3 Selection Criteria

Use:

- Role fit
- competence
- judgment
- integrity

- independence
- needed perspective
- capacity
- collaboration
- security
- project balance

10.4 Selection Transparency

State the method and criteria.

10.5 No Unstructured Prestige Selection

Prominent names should not bypass conflict, competence, or availability review.

10.6 Underrepresented Expertise

Recruit actively where the project lacks:

- Regional
- linguistic
- public-interest
- small-actor
- disability
- implementation
- domain
- methodological perspectives

10.7 Applicant Privacy

Protect nonpublic application information.

10.8 Decision

Possible outcomes:

- Appoint
- provisional appointment
- waitlist
- alternative role
- decline
- request more information

10.9 Reasons

Provide useful feedback where feasible.

10.10 Appeal

Selection decisions ordinarily do not create a general right to appointment.

Procedural complaints concerning discrimination, conflict, or unequal treatment should remain reviewable.

11. Onboarding

11.1 Onboarding Purpose

A contributor should understand the institution before acting in its name or accessing its systems.

11.2 Core Orientation

Cover:

- Mission
- present stage
- authority limits
- governance
- project scope
- role
- decision rights
- conduct
- conflicts
- confidentiality
- security
- intellectual property
- credit
- public claims
- complaints
- exit

11.3 Role-Specific Orientation

Provide:

- Technical methods
- standards process

- research methods
- repository workflow
- protected access
- reviewer expectations
- public-interest duties

11.4 Required Agreements

Depending on role:

- Code of conduct
- contribution agreement
- confidentiality agreement
- intellectual-property terms
- security acknowledgement
- conflict disclosure
- data-protection terms

11.5 Access Provisioning

Grant access after:

- Role confirmation
- training
- agreements
- conflict review
- security approval

11.6 Mentor or Contact

Assign a responsible contact for continuing roles.

11.7 Provisional Period

A provisional period may assess:

- Contribution quality
- reliability
- communication
- conduct
- security

11.8 Onboarding Record

Maintain completion and access records.

12. Contributor Rights

Contributors should have rights proportionate to role.

12.1 Clear Role

The right to understand the role, scope, expectations, authority, and term.

12.2 Fair Consideration

The right to have contributions evaluated under stated criteria.

12.3 Attribution

The right to accurate recognition for accepted substantive work, subject to lawful privacy or security limits.

12.4 Attribution Correction

The right to request correction of inaccurate role or contribution records.

12.5 Dissent

The right to express reasoned disagreement without retaliation.

12.6 Conflict Information

The right to know material process conflicts relevant to participation.

12.7 Safe Participation

The right to a professional environment free from harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and retaliation.

12.8 Accessibility

The right to request reasonable participation support.

12.9 Privacy

The right to proportionate protection of personal information.

12.10 Notice

The right to notice of material role, access, or status changes.

12.11 Response

The right to respond before material discipline where circumstances permit.

12.12 Appeal

The right to appeal eligible disciplinary, credit, conflict, or access decisions.

12.13 Exit

The right to leave subject to continuing obligations.

12.14 Earned Credit

The right not to lose accurate historical credit solely because of resignation or disagreement.

13. Contributor Responsibilities

13.1 Mission

Act consistently with the project's defined purpose and current authority.

13.2 Accuracy

Do not knowingly submit false, fabricated, plagiarized, or misleading material.

13.3 Evidence

Distinguish evidence, inference, opinion, and proposal.

13.4 Conflicts

Disclose relevant interests and affiliations.

13.5 Conduct

Treat participants professionally and respectfully.

13.6 Confidentiality

Protect information according to classification.

13.7 Security

Follow access, device, storage, and incident rules.

13.8 Intellectual Property

Submit only material the contributor has the right to provide.

13.9 Public Claims

Do not imply authority, approval, endorsement, certification, or representation beyond role.

13.10 Records

Use official channels for material decisions and contributions.

13.11 Maintenance

Contributors accepting stewardship roles should support handoff and continuity.

13.12 Correction

Report material errors promptly.

13.13 Nonretaliation

Do not retaliate against good-faith reporting, dissent, review, or appeal.

13.14 Cooperation

Participate in reasonable integrity, security, and conduct reviews.

14. Contribution Lifecycle

14.1 Submission

A contribution should identify:

- Contributor

- affiliation
- capacity
- project
- type
- source
- rights
- sensitivity
- requested outcome

14.2 Initial Screening

Check:

- Scope
- completeness
- obvious rights issues
- security
- personal data
- conduct
- format

14.3 Triage

Possible outcomes:

- Accept for review
- request clarification
- redirect
- close as duplicate
- reject as outside scope
- quarantine for security
- refer to complaint or incident process

14.4 Substantive Review

Assess:

- Relevance
- accuracy
- evidence
- novelty
- clarity
- compatibility
- risk
- implementation
- maintenance

- public interest

14.5 Revision

Contributors may be asked to revise.

14.6 Decision

- Accept
- accept with changes
- partially accept
- defer
- reject
- archive for future work

14.7 Integration

Accepted content should enter controlled versioning.

14.8 Attribution

Assign contributor roles and credit.

14.9 Publication

Publish or restrict according to classification.

14.10 Maintenance

Identify future owner and issue channel.

14.11 Correction

A contribution may later be corrected, superseded, or withdrawn.

14.12 No Silent Appropriation

The institution should not substantially use a rejected or unpublished contribution without appropriate rights and attribution.

15. Review Criteria

15.1 Relevance

Does the contribution address project scope?

15.2 Accuracy

Are claims supported?

15.3 Evidence Quality

Does the evidence meet the required level?

15.4 Originality and Added Value

Does the contribution improve the work?

15.5 Clarity

Can it be understood and implemented?

15.6 Compatibility

Does it align with canonical terminology, architecture, and versions?

15.7 Safety and Security

Could it create material harm or compromise?

15.8 Rights

Does the contributor have the right to submit it?

15.9 Privacy

Does it expose personal data?

15.10 Public Interest

Does it improve or weaken rights, access, competition, or accountability?

15.11 Maintenance

Can the contribution be supported over time?

15.12 Resource Burden

Is the cost of integration proportionate?

15.13 Independence

Does the contribution reflect an undisclosed interest?

15.14 Decision Record

Material acceptance and rejection decisions should be reconstructable.

16. Authorship, Attribution, and Acknowledgement

16.1 Distinct Recognition Forms

Standards Body should distinguish:

- Authorship
- editorship
- named contributor credit
- reviewer credit
- acknowledgement
- institutional contribution
- funding acknowledgement
- approval authority
- maintainership
- advisory participation

16.2 Authorship Criteria

Authorship should ordinarily require substantial responsibility for several of the following:

- Conceptualization
- methodology
- analysis
- interpretation
- original drafting
- substantive revision
- approval of the final version

- accountability for the work

16.3 Authorship Non-Criteria

The following alone do not establish authorship:

- Funding acquisition
- senior title
- general supervision
- institutional leadership
- routine administration
- access provision
- ceremonial review
- name recognition
- attendance

16.4 Standards Authorship

A consensus standard should ordinarily be attributed to Standards Body and the responsible working group rather than treated as the personal opinion of listed authors.

The contribution record should identify:

- Chairs
- editors
- principal drafters
- working-group participants
- reviewers
- public commenters
- institutional approvers

16.5 Research Authorship

Research publications may list individual authors when they bear substantial intellectual responsibility.

16.6 Group Authorship

Group authorship may be used when:

- The group accepts collective accountability
- membership is defined
- individual roles are recorded
- responsible contacts are identified

16.7 Reviewer Credit

Reviewers may be:

- Named
- anonymously recorded
- confidentially recorded
- acknowledged by group

The review model should be disclosed.

16.8 Anonymous Contribution

Anonymous public contribution may be accepted when:

- Safety
- employment risk
- whistleblowing
- political risk
- privacy

justify it.

The institution should verify provenance internally where feasible.

16.9 Pseudonymous Contribution

Pseudonymous participation may be allowed for public work.

Protected or high-authority roles may require verified identity.

16.10 Institutional Credit

An organization may be credited for:

- Resources
- staff support
- facilities
- data
- model access
- funding
- implementation

Institutional credit should not imply approval of conclusions.

16.11 Credit Agreement

Before publication, contributors should review role attribution where feasible.

16.12 Credit Dispute

A dispute should receive:

- Record review
- contributor input
- conflict-screened decision
- correction
- appeal

16.13 Credit Removal

A contributor's name should not be removed from historical credit merely because they later disagree.

Removal may be justified for:

- Misattribution
- privacy
- legal requirement
- contributor request where feasible
- proven fraudulent participation

16.14 Disclaimer of Endorsement

A contributor may request a note that participation does not imply endorsement of the final conclusion.

17. Contributor Role Records

17.1 Minimum Record

Each substantial project should record:

- Contributor name
- public or protected identity
- affiliation
- participation capacity
- role
- dates
- output
- status
- credit preference
- conflicts
- compensation status

17.2 Contribution Granularity

Use enough detail to distinguish actual work without creating excessive administrative burden.

17.3 CRediT Mapping

For research outputs, map relevant roles to CRediT where practical.

17.4 Standards Body Extensions

Record extended roles for:

- Standards drafting
- process facilitation
- task custody
- public-interest engagement
- protocol maintenance
- security review
- registry work
- translation
- accessibility
- appeals

17.5 Public Record

Public contribution records should avoid unnecessary personal information.

17.6 Protected Record

Sensitive projects may use a controlled contributor register.

17.7 Verification

The project lead and contributor should confirm material role records before publication where feasible.

17.8 Historical Integrity

Preserve the role as it existed at the time.

17.9 Correction

Role records should support correction without erasing history.

18. Editors, Maintainers, and Stewards

18.1 Editor Function

Editors integrate approved changes and maintain clarity and consistency.

18.2 Maintainer Function

Maintainers manage continuing project health.

Common duties:

- Review submissions
- triage issues
- maintain versions
- make releases
- enforce scope
- support contributors
- manage security
- coordinate correction
- preserve continuity

18.3 Steward Function

Stewards protect long-term integrity and institutional purpose.

18.4 Appointment

Maintainers and stewards should be appointed through:

- Demonstrated competence
- sustained contribution
- judgment
- conduct
- conflict review
- availability
- security eligibility
- defined decision

18.5 No Automatic Promotion

Contribution volume alone should not create maintainer authority.

18.6 Scope

Every maintainer role should define:

- Repository or artifact
- authority
- merge or approval rights
- release rights
- access
- term
- reviewer
- escalation
- succession

18.7 Multiple Maintainers

Critical projects should ordinarily have more than one maintainer.

Linux Foundation research on open-source maintainers emphasizes the breadth of maintainer work beyond code, including review, triage, testing, security, infrastructure, and release management.
[[^]If-maintainers]

18.8 Maintainer Decision Review

High-consequence changes should require:

- Second review
- council approval
- public review
- security approval

as applicable.

18.9 Maintainer Capture Controls

- Term review
- shared access
- transparent decisions
- appeal
- contributor pathways
- rotation
- conflict disclosure
- succession

18.10 Inactivity

Inactive maintainers should receive notice before role status changes.

18.11 Handoff

A departing maintainer should transfer:

- Credentials
- open issues
- release state
- risks
- documentation
- contributor relationships

18.12 Emergency Removal

Access may be suspended immediately for a material security or integrity risk.

Due process should follow.

19. Chairs and Facilitators

19.1 Chair Role

A chair governs process rather than owning the substantive outcome.

19.2 Responsibilities

- Agenda
- fair participation
- scope
- conflict declarations
- decision procedure
- objection handling
- records
- escalation
- conduct

19.3 Chair Limits

A chair should not:

- Suppress dissent

- manipulate meeting timing
- rewrite group decisions
- create hidden decisions
- use procedural control for commercial advantage
- claim personal ownership of group work

19.4 Selection

Review:

- Facilitation
- competence
- neutrality
- judgment
- availability
- conflicts
- international participation ability

19.5 Co-Chairs

Co-chairs may improve continuity and balance.

19.6 Chair Review

Review periodically and after complaints.

19.7 Removal

A chair may be replaced for:

- Process manipulation
- misconduct
- persistent bias
- inactivity
- conflict
- failure to preserve records

20. Reviewer Framework

20.1 Reviewer Types

- Editorial
- technical
- methodological

- evidence
- statistical
- security
- public-interest
- legal
- ethics
- implementation
- international
- accessibility

20.2 Reviewer Mandate

Each review should define:

- Question
- scope
- access
- evidence
- output
- confidentiality
- publication
- deadline
- compensation
- conflicts

20.3 Reviewer Competence

Match expertise to the review.

20.4 Reviewer Independence

Assess:

- Employment
- funding
- authorship
- client
- intellectual
- reputational
- future opportunity

20.5 Review Quality

A review should be:

- Specific

- reasoned
- evidence-aware
- within scope
- respectful
- clear about uncertainty

20.6 Reviewer Accountability

Reviewers should not use confidential access for:

- Competitive benefit
- publication theft
- trading
- employment leverage
- unrelated research

20.7 Author Response

Authors or project teams should be able to respond.

20.8 Reviewer Credit

Credit should not compromise anonymity or independence.

20.9 Reviewer Dissent

Minority review findings should be preserved where material.

20.10 Reviewer Removal

A reviewer may be removed for conflict, misconduct, poor performance, or security breach.

21. Contributor Decision Rights

21.1 Decision-Right Principle

Decision rights arise from role and process.

21.2 Advisory Right

The right to provide input.

21.3 Proposal Right

The right to place a defined matter before a responsible body.

21.4 Review Right

The right to issue a formal finding within mandate.

21.5 Drafting Right

The right to prepare text or artifacts.

21.6 Approval Right

The right to approve within delegated scope.

21.7 Voting Right

The right to vote as defined by a charter.

21.8 Merge or Release Right

The right to integrate or publish changes in a repository.

21.9 Stewardship Right

The right to maintain a resource over time.

21.10 Appeal Right

The right to request review of an eligible decision.

21.11 No Implied Rights

Access to meetings, repositories, or drafts does not automatically create approval authority.

21.12 Decision Register

High-consequence contributor decision rights should be recorded.

22. Contribution, Merit, and Advancement

22.1 Merit Principle

Demonstrated contribution may support greater responsibility.

22.2 Merit Limits

Merit should not be reduced to:

- Number of commits
- words written
- meetings attended
- public visibility
- employer prestige
- seniority
- volume of comments

22.3 Advancement Criteria

Consider:

- Quality
- judgment
- reliability
- maintenance
- collaboration
- evidence
- security
- conflict management
- public-interest awareness
- ability to support others

22.4 Advancement Process

- Role need
- nomination or application
- contribution review
- competence
- conflicts
- community or team input
- appointment
- term
- review

22.5 Transparent Pathways

Publish pathways for:

- Contributor
- reviewer
- editor
- maintainer
- chair
- steward
- council eligibility

22.6 No Closed Inner Circle

Critical roles should not depend solely on private invitation when broader recruitment is practical.

22.7 Recognition Without Authority

Awards, public credit, or contributor levels should not automatically create institutional authority.

22.8 Demotion or Role Reduction

Role reduction may occur after:

- Inactivity
- changed scope
- conflict
- capacity
- performance
- misconduct

Use fair process.

23. Code of Conduct

23.1 Purpose

The code should protect professional, equitable, and safe participation.

23.2 Scope

Apply to:

- Meetings
- repositories

- issue trackers
- email
- messaging
- events
- calls
- private project spaces
- public representation
- social interactions materially connected to Standards Body work

23.3 Expected Conduct

Contributors should:

- Treat others with respect
- discuss ideas rather than attack persons
- make room for participation
- disclose conflicts
- preserve confidentiality
- accept correction
- avoid retaliation
- use evidence responsibly
- respect cultural and professional differences
- communicate boundaries
- follow facilitator instructions

23.4 Unacceptable Conduct

- Harassment
- discrimination
- threats
- stalking
- unwanted sexual attention
- intimidation
- doxxing
- deliberate humiliation
- repeated disruption
- retaliation
- misuse of confidential information
- bad-faith impersonation
- corruption
- evidence fabrication
- discriminatory exclusion

23.5 Technical Disagreement

Strong technical disagreement is permitted.

Professional disagreement should not be misclassified as harassment merely because it is uncomfortable.

23.6 Power and Context

Conduct assessment should consider:

- Role power
- employment dependence
- funding
- cultural context
- repetition
- impact
- intent
- prior notice
- safety

23.7 Public Representation

Conduct may apply when a contributor is publicly acting in an official Standards Body role.

23.8 Adoption

Standards Body may adapt a recognized code such as Contributor Covenant, but should publish its exact version and local enforcement process.

23.9 Training

Chairs, maintainers, managers, and responders should receive training.

24. Conduct Reporting and Enforcement

24.1 Reporting Channels

Provide:

- General conduct channel
- confidential channel
- security channel
- board or independent channel for leadership complaints

- emergency channel

24.2 Reporter Choice

A reporter may request:

- Confidentiality
- no direct contact
- support person
- accessibility accommodation
- limited interim action

24.3 Intake

Record:

- Allegation
- date
- context
- persons
- evidence
- immediate risk
- confidentiality
- retaliation concern

24.4 Conflict Screening

The accused or a close associate should not control the response.

24.5 Interim Measures

Possible measures:

- Contact limitation
- meeting separation
- access restriction
- temporary suspension
- change of facilitator
- evidence preservation

24.6 Investigation

Use proportionate:

- Interviews
- records

- messages
- witnesses
- context
- response

24.7 Standard of Decision

The applicable standard should be stated.

24.8 Outcomes

- No finding
- guidance
- facilitated resolution
- warning
- training
- apology or repair
- role limitation
- access restriction
- suspension
- removal
- employment action
- referral

24.9 Consequence Proportionality

Consider:

- Severity
- pattern
- power
- harm
- intent
- acceptance of responsibility
- remediation
- recurrence
- safety

24.10 Restorative Response

Restorative processes may be offered when:

- Affected persons consent
- safety permits
- power imbalance is addressed

- accountability is genuine

24.11 Appeal

Material findings should support conflict-free appeal.

24.12 Public Reporting

Publish aggregate and systemic information while protecting privacy.

25. Nonretaliation

25.1 Protected Activity

- Good-faith complaint
- dissent
- error reporting
- conflict disclosure
- appeal
- whistleblowing
- security reporting
- participation in investigation

25.2 Retaliation Forms

- Removal
- access denial
- credit denial
- employment threat
- funding threat
- public disparagement
- exclusion
- delayed review
- adverse assignment
- intimidation

25.3 Report

Retaliation should have an independent reporting route.

25.4 Burden

Close timing and unexplained adverse action may require enhanced review.

25.5 Remedy

Possible remedies:

- Reinstatement
 - credit correction
 - access restoration
 - role change
 - apology
 - compensation where lawful
 - discipline
 - governance change
-

26. Conflict-of-Interest Requirements

26.1 Disclosure

Contributors should disclose role-relevant:

- Employment
- ownership
- consulting
- clients
- funding
- board roles
- patents
- publications
- advocacy
- government roles
- personal relationships
- access dependencies

26.2 Matter-Specific Conflict

A general annual disclosure does not replace matter-specific review.

26.3 Capacity Disclosure

State whether participation is:

- Personal
- employer-directed
- institutionally authorized
- funded
- contracted

- advisory

26.4 Organizational Mandate

An institutional representative should not present a personal opinion as the organization's official view.

26.5 Conflict Responses

- Disclosure
- monitoring
- role limitation
- no vote
- no review
- no protected access
- independent review
- recusal
- removal

26.6 Intellectual Conflict

Authors of a method may contribute to its evaluation.

They should not be sole reviewers or approvers.

26.7 Commercial Conflict

A contributor whose employer may sell compliance services should disclose that interest.

26.8 Funder Conflict

A funder representative should not control findings.

26.9 Conflict Transparency

Material public roles should have public conflict summaries.

27. Confidentiality

27.1 Classification

Contributor access should follow `TRANSPARENCY_FRAMEWORK.md`.

27.2 Confidentiality Agreement

The agreement should state:

- Information covered
- permitted use
- access
- sharing
- storage
- incident reporting
- term
- return or destruction
- lawful reporting exceptions

27.3 Need to Know

Access should be limited to the work required.

27.4 No Private Advantage

Contributors should not use protected information for:

- Trading
- competition
- publication priority
- employment advantage
- personal leverage
- unrelated products

27.5 Discussion

Protected work should occur in approved channels.

27.6 Exit

Confidentiality may continue after role completion.

27.7 Whistleblowing

Confidentiality should not improperly prevent lawful reporting of serious wrongdoing or risk.

27.8 Breach

A suspected breach should be reported promptly.

27.9 Public Credit

A contributor may receive generalized credit when the exact work is protected.

28. Security and Access

28.1 Least Privilege

Grant the minimum access required.

28.2 Access Criteria

- Role
- competence
- conflict
- training
- legal eligibility
- device and account security
- need
- duration

28.3 Authentication

Use strong identity and authentication controls for protected roles.

28.4 Access Logging

Log access to:

- Held-out tasks
- restricted evidence
- model credentials
- incident records
- personal data
- security systems

28.5 Access Review

Review periodically and after role change.

28.6 Personal Devices

Protected work on personal devices should require approved controls.

28.7 Data Transfer

Use approved channels.

28.8 Incident Reporting

Contributors should report:

- Lost device
- unauthorized access
- accidental sharing
- suspicious request
- phishing
- task exposure
- credential compromise

28.9 Access Suspension

Immediate suspension may occur when risk is material.

28.10 Access Restoration

Restore after review and remediation where appropriate.

28.11 No Prestige Exception

Prominent or senior contributors remain subject to access rules.

29. Intellectual Property

29.1 Public Policy Before Formal Contribution

Standards Body should adopt a published intellectual-property policy before accepting formal contributions to standards, software, data, or protocol repositories.

29.2 Rights Objective

The policy should ensure that Standards Body can:

- Review
- edit
- integrate
- publish
- translate

- maintain
- archive
- correct
- redistribute

accepted contributions under defined terms.

29.3 Contributor Rights

Contributors should understand which rights they retain.

29.4 Contribution Models

Possible models include:

- Developer Certificate of Origin
- contributor license agreement
- copyright assignment
- institutional contribution agreement
- project-specific license
- public-domain dedication where lawful

29.5 Model Selection

Use a model proportionate to:

- Artifact
- standards status
- software license
- data rights
- international participation
- patent risk
- maintenance
- contributor burden

29.6 Developer Certificate of Origin

A DCO model may be suitable for open software repositories when contributors certify that they have the right to submit the work.

The sign-off process should be technically enforced and documented.

29.7 Contributor License Agreement

A CLA may be suitable when Standards Body needs broader rights or explicit patent terms.

A CLA should not demand unnecessary rights.

29.8 Employer Rights

Contributors should determine whether their employer owns or restricts the contribution.

29.9 Third-Party Content

A contributor should identify:

- Quotations
- code
- data
- images
- standards text
- model outputs
- licensed material
- confidential sources

not created solely by the contributor.

29.10 Copyright Notices

Accepted artifacts should include applicable copyright and license notices.

29.11 Moral Rights

Address moral rights where relevant and lawful.

29.12 Withdrawal of Contribution

A contributor may request withdrawal before acceptance.

After integration, withdrawal may be limited by the granted rights and institutional need.

The contributor may still request correction of attribution or privacy-sensitive information.

29.13 Infringement Claim

A claim should trigger:

- Preservation
- legal review
- temporary restriction if necessary
- contributor response
- correction, replacement, or removal

- downstream notice
-

30. Patent and Standards Contributions

30.1 Patent Disclosure

Participants in technical standards work should disclose known patent interests that may be essential to implementation, under the adopted patent policy.

30.2 Patent Policy Before Approval

Standards likely to implicate patents should not advance without:

- Disclosure rules
- licensing expectations
- conflict treatment
- records
- withdrawal options

30.3 Essential Claims

The policy should define essential claims carefully.

30.4 Licensing Approaches

Possible approaches:

- Royalty-free
- reasonable and nondiscriminatory
- exclusion of the patented feature
- equivalent implementation path
- case-specific commitment

30.5 No Validity Adjudication

Standards Body should not claim to determine patent validity unless lawfully authorized.

30.6 Patent Search Disclaimer

The institution cannot guarantee all relevant patents have been identified.

30.7 Contributor Duty

A contributor should not knowingly conceal a material patent interest while advocating a requirement that would create dependence.

30.8 Open Implementation

Prefer standards that can be implemented broadly and interoperably.

31. Software Contributions

31.1 Repository Rules

Each repository should publish:

- Purpose
- scope
- license
- contribution process
- review
- testing
- security
- release
- maintenance
- conduct

31.2 Contribution Requirements

Software submissions should include:

- Description
- issue
- tests
- documentation
- dependency changes
- security effect
- license confirmation
- sign-off where required

31.3 Code Review

Protected branches should require qualified review.

31.4 Automated Checks

Use:

- Testing
- linting
- dependency scanning
- secret scanning
- license checks
- security checks

31.5 Generated Code

AI-generated or machine-assisted code requires:

- Human review
- provenance record where material
- license and training-data uncertainty consideration
- security testing
- no assumption of originality

31.6 Dependencies

Review:

- License
- maintenance
- security
- provenance
- necessity
- concentration

31.7 Security Reporting

Provide a private vulnerability channel.

31.8 Release Authority

Define who may release and sign artifacts.

31.9 Maintainer Sustainability

Critical software should have:

- Multiple maintainers
- documentation

- backup access
- funding or support
- succession

31.10 Forks

Forks may use applicable open licenses.

They should not imply continued Standards Body approval or maintenance.

32. Data Contributions

32.1 Data Rights

Contributors should establish that data may be lawfully provided and used.

32.2 Data Documentation

Record:

- Source
- collection
- consent or legal basis
- license
- subjects
- geography
- time
- transformations
- limitations
- sensitivity
- retention

32.3 Personal Data

Apply privacy, ethics, and security requirements.

32.4 Sensitive Data

Sensitive data may require:

- Controlled access
- use agreement
- secure environment
- output review

- deletion
- audit

32.5 Data Quality

Assess:

- Accuracy
- completeness
- representativeness
- bias
- duplication
- contamination
- provenance
- currentness

32.6 Data Correction

Provide a process to correct or remove invalid data.

32.7 Dataset Credit

Credit:

- Collectors
- curators
- annotators
- maintainers
- community sources

where feasible.

32.8 Indigenous and Community Data

Use appropriate governance, consent, benefit, and sovereignty considerations.

32.9 Synthetic Data

Disclose:

- Generating system
- method
- source relationship
- validation
- limitations

32.10 Evaluation Data

Protected task data should follow Foundation 2 and the security framework.

33. AI-Assisted Contributions

33.1 Human Accountability

The submitting contributor remains accountable for an AI-assisted contribution.

33.2 Disclosure

Disclose material AI assistance in:

- Drafting
- analysis
- coding
- translation
- summarization
- task generation
- scoring
- visualization
- source discovery

33.3 Routine Assistance

Minor spelling, formatting, or grammar assistance may not require public item-level disclosure.

33.4 Verification

Contributors should verify:

- Facts
- citations
- quotations
- calculations
- code
- legal interpretations
- standards references
- translations

33.5 Protected Information

Do not enter protected information into unauthorized AI services.

33.6 Model Provenance

For material assistance, record:

- Tool or system
- version where known
- purpose
- date
- human review
- major revisions

33.7 Authorship

An AI system should not be listed as a human author or accountable contributor.

33.8 Attribution

The publication may include an AI-assistance statement when material.

33.9 Bias and Homogenization

Review for:

- Repeated generic language
- missing dissent
- fabricated consensus
- cultural bias
- source distortion
- style homogenization

33.10 AI Reviewers

Automated review may assist triage.

It should not independently decide high-consequence acceptance, conduct, credit, or appeal.

34. Research Contributors

34.1 Research Role

Research contributors should follow:

- RESEARCH_METHODOLOGY.md
- EVIDENCE_STANDARDS.md

- ethics requirements
- security requirements
- project registration

34.2 Research Lead

The lead is responsible for:

- Protocol
- role assignment
- records
- review
- publication
- correction
- contributor welfare

34.3 Research Independence

Contributors should disclose sponsor and provider influence.

34.4 Methods

Contributors should preserve:

- Data
- code
- decisions
- exclusions
- deviations
- uncertainty

34.5 Research Participants Versus Contributors

A research participant is not automatically a contributor or author.

34.6 Community-Based Research

Community contributors should receive:

- Meaningful role
- clear benefit
- credit
- support
- protection
- result access

34.7 Negative Findings

Contributors should not be pressured to suppress unfavorable findings.

34.8 Publication Dispute

Use the research-integrity and appeal process.

35. Standards Contributors

35.1 Standards Capacity

Participants should disclose whether they act:

- Personally
- for an employer
- as an authorized representative
- as a liaison
- as an invited expert

35.2 Working-Group Rights

Rights may include:

- Drafting
- proposals
- objections
- comments
- votes
- consensus participation
- minority statements

35.3 Standards Responsibilities

- Follow charter
- disclose affiliations
- respect scope
- address evidence
- preserve records
- avoid dominance
- declare patents
- respect public review
- maintain confidentiality

35.4 Organizational Multiplication

Multiple participants from one organization may contribute.

Voting and balance rules should prevent multiplied control.

35.5 Public Comment Credit

Public commenters should be included in the comment record.

35.6 Objection Credit

A contributor whose objection materially improves or prevents a weak requirement should receive appropriate recognition where feasible.

35.7 Consensus Non-Endorsement

A participant in a consensus process may remain opposed to parts of the standard.

35.8 Editor and Chair Disclosure

Leadership roles and affiliations should be public.

36. Evaluation Contributors

36.1 Roles

Evaluation contributors may include:

- Construct experts
- task authors
- elicitation specialists
- administrators
- scorers
- judges
- security custodians
- reviewers
- interpreters

36.2 Separation

High-consequence evaluation should consider separation among:

- Task author

- administrator
- scorer
- reviewer
- decision owner

36.3 Task Author Credit

Exact task authorship may remain protected during active use.

A controlled record should preserve credit.

36.4 Access

Task authors do not automatically receive system-result access.

Evaluators do not automatically receive the full task bank.

36.5 Developer Contributors

Developer personnel may provide:

- System information
- elicitation support
- factual correction
- security guidance

They should not control independent conclusions.

36.6 Scorer Accountability

Scoring contributors should record:

- Rubric
- judge
- uncertainty
- conflicts
- deviations

36.7 Evaluation Safety

Contributors should receive appropriate domain, security, and mental-health support for disturbing or dangerous content.

36.8 Result Credit

Credit should distinguish evaluation administration from independent review.

37. Independent Review Contributors

37.1 Reviewer Independence

Review contributors should receive sufficient independence from:

- Authors
- sponsor
- developer
- evaluator
- leadership
- future employment pressure

37.2 Access

The review record should state whether access was sufficient.

37.3 Confidentiality

Protected reviewers may receive generalized public credit.

37.4 Dissent

Reviewers may issue minority opinions.

37.5 Reviewer Selection Record

Preserve competence, conflicts, selection, funding, and mandate.

37.6 Factual Review

The subject may correct facts.

It should not control findings.

37.7 Withdrawal

A reviewer may withdraw if:

- Access is insufficient
- independence is compromised
- scope changes
- security is inadequate

The public record should state the limitation where material.

38. Incident and Vulnerability Contributors

38.1 Good-Faith Reporting

The institution should support good-faith reports of:

- Incidents
- near misses
- vulnerabilities
- task compromise
- misconduct
- privacy breach
- standards failure

38.2 Safe Harbor Within Institutional Control

Standards Body should not retaliate against good-faith reporting that follows published rules.

It cannot promise immunity from external law.

38.3 Vulnerability Disclosure

Publish:

- Scope
- contact
- encryption
- expected response
- testing boundaries
- disclosure process
- recognition

38.4 Reporter Credit

Offer:

- Named credit
- pseudonymous credit
- anonymous credit
- no public credit

according to preference and safety.

38.5 Bounties and Rewards

Any reward program should define:

- Eligibility
- scope
- duplicate handling
- severity
- payment
- tax
- disclosure
- appeal

38.6 Incident Sources

Protect confidential sources.

38.7 No Suppression Purchase

Payment should not purchase permanent silence concerning unresolved public harm.

39. Translators and Localizers

39.1 Translation Role

Translation is a substantive contribution.

39.2 Status

Translations should be labeled:

- Official
- approved
- informative
- community
- machine-assisted
- draft

39.3 Qualification

Normative translations require:

- Language competence
- domain competence

- terminology access
- second review

39.4 Controlling Version

State which language controls.

39.5 Credit

Credit translators and reviewers.

39.6 Cultural Localization

Localization may adapt:

- Examples
- institutions
- context
- terminology

It should not silently change normative meaning.

39.7 Machine Translation

Disclose and review material machine assistance.

39.8 Correction

Provide an accessible translation-error channel.

40. Public-Interest and Affected-Party Contributors

40.1 Role

Public-interest contributors bring evidence concerning:

- Rights
- labor
- privacy
- disability
- discrimination
- competition
- public services
- community impact

- environmental impact
- democratic institutions

40.2 Expertise

Lived experience and professional expertise are both relevant.

40.3 Support

Provide:

- Orientation
- technical explanation
- compensation where appropriate
- accessibility
- confidentiality
- anti-retaliation protection

40.4 Timing

Participation should occur before scope and requirements are fixed.

40.5 Representation Limits

One contributor should not be described as representing an entire community without mandate.

40.6 Extractive Participation

Do not request traumatic, personal, or community knowledge without:

- Purpose
- protection
- consent
- support
- appropriate credit or compensation
- feedback on outcome

40.7 Influence

Document how public-interest contributions affected the work.

41. Institutional Representatives and Liaisons

41.1 Authorization

A representative should identify the source and scope of authorization.

41.2 Personal Versus Institutional View

Statements should be labeled when the contributor speaks personally.

41.3 Organization Change

Update the role after employment or mandate change.

41.4 Liaison Duties

- Accurate exchange
- confidentiality
- records
- conflict disclosure
- no unauthorized commitment

41.5 Liaison Limits

A liaison does not automatically vote or represent a government formally.

41.6 Replacement

The appointing institution may replace a representative subject to project eligibility.

41.7 Institutional Contribution Record

Record the organization and individual roles separately.

42. Fellows and Advisors

42.1 Fellowship

A fellowship should state:

- Purpose
- term

- funding
- deliverables
- supervision
- publication
- rights
- access
- conflicts
- status

42.2 Advisor

An advisor provides recommendations and does not automatically govern.

42.3 Advisory Nonclaim

Public pages should not imply that every advisor endorses every output.

42.4 Compensation

Disclose whether the role is paid, unpaid, stipend-supported, or institutionally funded.

42.5 Term

Advisory roles should be time-limited or periodically renewed.

42.6 Output

Record substantive advice and dissent.

42.7 Inactivity

Remove stale advisory listings from current-status pages after notice.

43. Compensation, Stipends, and Expenses

43.1 Compensation Principle

Compensation should reflect:

- Work
- expertise
- burden
- opportunity cost

- responsibility
- market and nonprofit context
- equity
- available resources

43.2 Role Classification

Each role should state whether it is:

- Employee
- contractor
- fellow
- stipend-supported
- expense-supported
- volunteer
- institutionally seconded
- honorarium-based

43.3 No Hidden Unpaid Core Labor

Standards Body should not rely indefinitely on unpaid contributors for critical continuing operations that should be staffed.

43.4 Volunteer Choice

Volunteer status should be genuinely voluntary and lawful.

43.5 Stipends

Stipends may support:

- Public-interest participation
- affected-party consultation
- translation
- accessibility
- lower-resource regions
- independent review
- students and early-career contributors

43.6 Honoraria

Honoraria may compensate bounded expert contributions.

They should not purchase favorable opinions.

43.7 Expense Reimbursement

Publish rules for:

- Travel
- accommodation
- accessibility
- caregiving
- connectivity
- visas
- local transportation
- approved materials

43.8 Payment Transparency

Contributors should understand:

- Amount
- schedule
- tax responsibility
- conditions
- cancellation
- deliverables
- rights

43.9 Compensation Conflict

Compensation should not depend on:

- Positive evaluation
- standards approval
- favorable review
- suppression of dissent
- continued confidentiality beyond legitimate duties

43.10 Equity Review

Review whether uncompensated participation excludes important perspectives.

43.11 Institutional Funding

An employer may pay a contributor's time.

That support should be disclosed where material to influence.

44. Contributor Well-Being and Sustainable Participation

44.1 Sustainability Principle

Contributor systems should not depend on burnout.

44.2 Workload Transparency

Roles should state expected:

- Hours
- meeting load
- deadlines
- travel
- review burden
- emergency availability

44.3 Workload Monitoring

Project leads should monitor:

- Contribution concentration
- unresolved queues
- after-hours work
- emotional burden
- repeated urgent requests
- maintenance debt

44.4 High-Risk Content

Contributors exposed to:

- Abuse
- exploitation
- violence
- harmful biological or chemical content
- cyber threats
- traumatic incident records

should receive appropriate support and ability to rotate.

44.5 Leave and Pause

Continuing contributors should be able to pause without unnecessary stigma.

44.6 Backup Coverage

Critical roles should have backups.

44.7 Recognition

Maintenance and support work should receive credit.

44.8 No Hero Culture

Institutional praise should not reward unsustainable overwork.

44.9 Support Resources

Possible resources:

- Peer support
- supervision
- professional support
- debriefing
- workload changes
- access to counseling through employment arrangements

44.10 Burnout Exit

A contributor leaving because of workload should receive a supported handoff and retain credit.

45. Accessibility and Inclusion

45.1 Accessibility Principle

Participation should be designed for diverse contributors rather than adapted only after exclusion occurs.

45.2 Accessibility Measures

- Captions
- transcripts
- accessible documents
- screen-reader compatibility
- keyboard access
- interpreters
- flexible communication

- asynchronous participation
- breaks
- sensory considerations

45.3 Accommodation

Provide a confidential process for reasonable accommodations.

45.4 Meeting Design

Use:

- Agendas in advance
- defined decisions
- accessible platforms
- readable materials
- multiple participation methods
- clear turn-taking

45.5 Technical Access

Do not assume:

- High bandwidth
- expensive hardware
- proprietary software
- one operating system
- one time zone
- one communication style

45.6 Disability Expertise

Include disability and accessibility contributors in relevant design, not only compliance review.

45.7 Inclusion Metrics

Track:

- Access requests
- response
- reported barriers
- participation
- retention
- influence

45.8 Privacy

Accommodation records should be protected.

46. International and Regional Participation

46.1 International Principle

International contribution should involve real influence.

46.2 Barriers

- Language
- time zone
- travel
- visas
- funding
- legal restrictions
- sanctions
- technology
- institutional recognition
- security clearance

46.3 Mitigation

- Rotating meeting times
- asynchronous ballots
- translation
- regional meetings
- travel support
- local partners
- lower-bandwidth tools
- clear legal restrictions

46.4 Regional Expertise

Local experts should contribute to:

- Language
- law
- institutions
- risk
- deployment
- human baselines

- public interest
- implementation

46.5 No Geographic Tokenism

A participant from a region should not be treated as representing the entire region.

46.6 International Role Records

Record:

- Location
- capacity
- institutional mandate
- language
- project
- conflict

only to the degree appropriate and lawful.

46.7 Cross-Border Data

Protected data access should follow legal and security requirements.

46.8 Capacity Building

Contributor programs may include:

- Fellowships
- training
- mentorship
- regional evaluation support
- translation grants
- shared infrastructure

47. Mentorship and Contributor Development

47.1 Mentorship Purpose

Build competence and reduce dependence on established institutions.

47.2 Mentorship Models

- One-to-one

- cohort
- project-based
- reviewer apprenticeship
- maintainer shadowing
- regional fellowship
- standards orientation

47.3 Mentor Responsibilities

- Clarify expectations
- provide feedback
- support access
- avoid exploitation
- disclose conflicts
- help with credit
- support safe escalation

47.4 Mentee Rights

- Clear goals
- feedback
- credit
- boundaries
- complaint channel
- no promise of appointment unless stated

47.5 Apprenticeship Decisions

A trainee should not independently make high-consequence decisions without supervision.

47.6 Mentorship Credit

Mentorship is a substantive contribution.

47.7 Evaluation

Assess whether mentorship improves:

- Contributor retention
- competence
- diversity
- independent participation
- succession

48. Meetings, Communication, and Collaboration

48.1 Official Channels

Material work should use approved channels.

48.2 Decision Capture

A decision made in an informal conversation should be recorded in the official system.

48.3 Meeting Notice

Provide:

- Time
- time zone
- agenda
- materials
- access
- confidentiality
- decision purpose

48.4 Asynchronous Work

Use:

- Repositories
- issue trackers
- mailing lists
- documents
- written ballots

to support international participation.

48.5 Private Messages

Private communication may be appropriate for:

- Support
- security
- complaints
- personal matters

Substantive project decisions should return to the record.

48.6 Communication Records

Retain records according to classification and retention rules.

48.7 Language

Communicate professionally and define jargon.

48.8 Meeting Record

Record:

- Attendance
- conflicts
- decisions
- dissent
- actions
- owners
- deadlines

48.9 Recording

Audio or video recording should require notice and appropriate consent or legal basis.

48.10 Public Meetings

State whether attendance implies participation, observation, or contribution rights.

49. Public Representation and Use of Affiliation

49.1 Authorized Representation

Only authorized persons may speak for Standards Body.

49.2 Contributor Description

Approved descriptions may include:

- Contributor to Standards Body
- Working-group participant
- Reviewer for a named project
- Standards Body fellow
- Advisor to Standards Body
- Maintainer of a named project

49.3 Prohibited Implications

A contributor should not claim:

- Official regulator
- Standards Body-certified expert
- accredited evaluator
- government representative
- institutional spokesperson
- approval authority

unless exactly authorized.

49.4 Personal Views

Contributors should distinguish personal views from institutional positions.

49.5 Logo and Marks

Use should follow brand and mark policy.

49.6 Resume and Biography

A contributor may accurately describe completed work and status.

49.7 Media

Media participation in an official capacity requires authorization.

49.8 Social Media

Contributors should not disclose protected information or imply official conclusions prematurely.

49.9 End of Role

Historical descriptions should use past-tense or completed status.

50. Confidential and Anonymous Contribution

50.1 Purpose

Confidential or anonymous pathways may support:

- Whistleblowing

- incident reporting
- employer-sensitive dissent
- vulnerable communities
- politically sensitive participation
- security reports

50.2 Verification

The institution may verify identity privately without public disclosure.

50.3 Credit Options

- Named
- pseudonymous
- anonymous
- delayed
- confidential institutional record

50.4 Decision Weight

Anonymous contribution should be assessed on evidence and credibility.

50.5 Due Process

Material accusations require fair handling and corroboration.

50.6 Security

Protect metadata, communication, and access.

50.7 Limits

Complete anonymity may prevent:

- Access to protected systems
- formal voting
- legal agreements
- payment
- fiduciary roles

50.8 Later Disclosure

A contributor may choose later disclosure subject to rights and security.

51. Resignation, Pause, and Completion

51.1 Voluntary Resignation

A contributor may resign through notice.

51.2 Continuing Duties

Possible continuing duties:

- Confidentiality
- intellectual-property grants
- record preservation
- conflict disclosure related to unfinished work
- return or deletion of protected material

51.3 Handoff

Continuing roles should provide:

- Open work
- decisions
- credentials
- risks
- contacts
- documentation

51.4 Pause

A role may become inactive during temporary absence.

51.5 Completion

Time-limited roles should close with:

- Deliverable
- credit
- access removal
- feedback
- records
- future contact permission

51.6 Exit Interview

For significant roles, discuss:

- Experience
- barriers
- risks
- unresolved concerns
- maintenance
- retaliation

51.7 Credit

Resignation does not erase earned credit.

51.8 Public Status

Update current-role pages promptly.

52. Suspension and Removal

52.1 Grounds

- Conduct violation
- security breach
- confidentiality breach
- fraud
- plagiarism
- fabrication
- unmanaged conflict
- retaliation
- persistent process abuse
- inactivity
- lack of competence for role
- legal restriction
- role elimination

52.2 Immediate Suspension

May be necessary for:

- Security
- safety
- evidence preservation

- serious retaliation
- active risk

52.3 Notice

Provide the person with:

- Action
- reason
- scope
- duration
- evidence or safe summary
- response route
- appeal

where circumstances permit.

52.4 Investigation

Use conflict-free reviewers.

52.5 Proportionality

Role removal should be proportionate.

52.6 Inactivity Removal

Inactivity should ordinarily use:

- Contact
- reasonable response period
- role change
- archival status

rather than misconduct language.

52.7 Access

Access may be removed before final role decision when risk requires.

52.8 Public Disclosure

Publish only what accountability requires.

52.9 Credit Preservation

Historical contribution remains unless inaccurate or legally restricted.

52.10 Appeal

Material suspension and removal should support appeal.

53. Contributor Complaints and Appeals

53.1 Eligible Issues

- Credit
- role
- access
- selection procedure
- conflict
- conduct
- retaliation
- discrimination
- removal
- confidentiality
- intellectual property
- public misrepresentation

53.2 Informal Resolution

Use when safe and appropriate.

53.3 Formal Complaint

Record:

- Matter
- decision
- grounds
- evidence
- requested outcome
- confidentiality

53.4 Independent Review

The original decision maker should not control the appeal.

53.5 Outcomes

- Affirm
- modify
- restore
- correct
- re-review
- mediate
- compensate where lawful
- remove
- outside scope

53.6 Timeliness

Publish expected timelines.

53.7 Nonretaliation

Protect the complainant and witnesses.

53.8 Public Learning

Publish aggregate and systemic lessons.

54. Contributor Privacy and Records

54.1 Data Minimization

Collect only role-relevant information.

54.2 Public Record

Possible public fields:

- Name
- professional affiliation
- role
- project
- contribution
- term
- public conflict summary

54.3 Protected Record

Possible protected fields:

- Personal contact
- application
- payment
- identity verification
- accommodation
- complaint
- security
- detailed conflict information

54.4 Access

Limit by role.

54.5 Retention

Retain according to:

- Legal duty
- institutional history
- contribution rights
- appeals
- privacy
- security

54.6 Correction

Contributors may request correction of personal and role records.

54.7 Deletion

Deletion requests should be balanced against:

- Public record integrity
- legal requirements
- intellectual property
- security
- research preservation
- complaint evidence

54.8 Breach

Notify and remediate as required.

55. Succession and Continuity

55.1 Bus-Factor Reduction

Critical projects should not depend on one contributor.

55.2 Succession Plan

Define:

- Backup
- access
- documentation
- open issues
- release process
- protected custody
- emergency transfer

55.3 Maintainer Rotation

Periodic rotation may improve:

- Independence
- learning
- resilience
- access
- fairness

55.4 Institutional Memory

Preserve:

- Decisions
- rationale
- issue history
- role records
- conflicts
- versions
- lessons

55.5 Emergency Succession

A designated authority may temporarily assume bounded stewardship.

55.6 No Personal Asset Control

Critical repositories, domains, credentials, and records should not remain solely in personal accounts.

55.7 Project Closure

Closing a project should preserve:

- Artifacts
 - credit
 - status
 - security
 - correction channel
 - successor information
-

56. Contributor Recognition and Prestige

56.1 Recognition Purpose

Recognition should reward valuable contribution and support future participation.

56.2 Recognition Methods

- Named credit
- role record
- contributor profile
- letters
- certificates of participation
- awards
- fellowships
- speaking
- maintainer status
- public thanks

56.3 Recognition Limits

Recognition should not imply:

- Certification
- accreditation
- universal expertise
- institutional endorsement of outside work
- governance authority

56.4 Anti-Gaming

Avoid recognition based only on:

- Quantity
- visibility
- social influence
- employer prestige
- funding
- meeting dominance

56.5 Maintenance Recognition

Reward sustained and often invisible work.

56.6 Correction Recognition

Recognize contributors who identify material errors or reverse weak institutional positions.

56.7 Dissent Recognition

Reasoned dissent that improves the work should not be penalized.

56.8 Equitable Recognition

Review whether credit systematically favors:

- Senior participants
- fluent English speakers
- visible authors
- technical roles
- well-resourced organizations

57. Contributor Assembly and Community Voice

57.1 Assembly Purpose

The Contributor and Community Assembly provides a structured voice without replacing fiduciary or technical governance.

57.2 Eligibility

Eligibility may depend on:

- Current or recent contribution
- conduct compliance
- verified identity for voting
- defined participation period

57.3 Functions

- Propose work
- nominate representatives
- review contributor policy
- identify barriers
- discuss institutional performance
- request responses
- surface emerging issues

57.4 Proposal Threshold

A proposal with defined support should receive a reasoned institutional response.

57.5 Elections

Any elections should prevent organizational multiplication and purchased influence.

57.6 Limits

The Assembly should not automatically:

- Approve standards
- access restricted evidence
- appoint staff
- control budget
- reverse appeals
- create legal obligations

57.7 Records

Publish agendas, decisions, and safe summaries.

57.8 Representation

Assembly representatives remain accountable to defined terms and do not represent all contributors automatically.

58. Contributor Metrics

58.1 Purpose

Metrics should improve participation, quality, fairness, and sustainability.

58.2 Participation Metrics

- Active contributors
- new contributors
- returning contributors
- role distribution
- geographic distribution
- institutional distribution
- language
- project participation

58.3 Contribution Metrics

- Submissions
- acceptance
- review time
- correction
- maintenance
- unresolved backlog
- contribution types

58.4 Inclusion Metrics

- Accessibility requests
- stipends
- translation
- time-zone distribution
- under-resourced participation
- influence on outcomes

58.5 Credit Metrics

- Role-record completion
- credit disputes
- correction time
- seniority concentration
- invisible-labor recognition

58.6 Conduct Metrics

- Reports
- response time
- outcomes
- retaliation
- recurrence
- appeal

58.7 Sustainability Metrics

- Workload concentration
- maintainer coverage
- inactive critical roles
- burnout departures
- succession coverage

58.8 Security Metrics

- Access reviews
- incidents
- training completion
- access termination
- task exposure

58.9 Anti-Metric Rule

Do not equate:

- More contributors with better participation
- more commits with quality
- fewer complaints with safety
- unanimous votes with inclusion
- retention at all costs with healthy community

59. Contributor Audit

59.1 Audit Scope

- Role register
- selection
- onboarding
- conflicts
- access
- rights
- contribution decisions
- credit
- intellectual property
- conduct
- compensation
- accessibility
- removal
- succession

59.2 Audit Questions

- Are roles clear?
- Are contributors accurately classified?
- Are decision rights bounded?
- Are protected systems accessible only to authorized contributors?
- Are credits accurate?
- Are unpaid contributors performing staff functions?
- Are conflicts disclosed?
- Are complaints independent?
- Are maintainers concentrated?
- Are inactive roles current?
- Are international and public-interest contributors influential?
- Are AI-assisted contributions verified?

59.3 Findings

- Critical
- material
- minor
- improvement

59.4 Critical Findings

- Contributor used as false endorsement

- concealed controlling affiliation
- protected access without authorization
- retaliation
- systematic credit theft
- intellectual-property infringement
- essential unpaid labor misclassified
- maintainer with sole uncontrolled access
- discriminatory exclusion
- complaint controlled by accused leader

59.5 Corrective Action

Assign owner, deadline, verification, and public summary where material.

59.6 External Review

A mature contributor program should receive periodic independent review.

60. Contributor Maturity Model

Level 0: Ad Hoc Contribution

Characteristics:

- Informal submissions
- unclear rights
- personal decisions
- inconsistent credit
- no conduct process

Level 1: Documented Contribution

Characteristics:

- Contribution guide
- code of conduct
- review workflow
- licenses
- basic attribution

Level 2: Role-Based Participation

Characteristics:

- Role taxonomy
- onboarding
- conflicts
- access
- contributor records
- complaints
- maintainers

Level 3: Accountable Contributor Community

Characteristics:

- Transparent advancement
- participation support
- credit review
- independent appeals
- security controls
- contributor assembly
- succession

Level 4: International Institutional Contribution

Characteristics:

- Multilingual participation
- regional pathways
- standards and evaluation roles
- fellowships
- protected-review capacity
- contribution interoperability

Level 5: Adaptive Contributor Ecosystem

Characteristics:

- Measured influence
- sustainable maintenance
- distributed stewardship
- machine-readable role records
- continuous audit
- effective function transfer
- demonstrated fairness and resilience

60.1 Maturity Rule

A large contributor list does not establish a mature contributor system.

61. Consolidated Contributor Failure Modes

61.1 Founder-Centered Contribution

Failure:

All meaningful work depends on the founder's review, relationships, and approval.

Controls:

- Maintainers
- delegated roles
- contribution records
- succession
- independent review

61.2 Prestige Capture

Failure:

Well-known contributors receive authority or credit disproportionate to actual work.

Controls:

- Role criteria
- contribution records
- conflict review
- transparent appointment

61.3 Institutional Multiplication

Failure:

One organization supplies many participants and controls an apparently broad process.

Controls:

- Affiliation records
- balance analysis
- voting controls
- independent recruitment

61.4 Open-Door Theater

Failure:

The institution invites contribution but does not review or integrate it.

Controls:

- Capacity review
- response targets
- contribution-debt reporting
- scoped calls

61.5 Invisible Labor

Failure:

Editing, facilitation, moderation, accessibility, translation, and maintenance are omitted from credit.

Controls:

- Expanded role taxonomy
- contribution records
- credit review
- compensation assessment

61.6 Gift Authorship

Failure:

A senior person, funder, or advisor receives authorship without substantial contribution.

Controls:

- Authorship criteria
- CRediT-style roles
- contributor confirmation
- dispute process

61.7 Ghost Contribution

Failure:

A person performs substantial work without attribution.

Controls:

- Role register
- prepublication confirmation

- anonymous-credit options
- audit

61.8 Credit Retaliation

Failure:

Credit is removed because a contributor dissents or leaves.

Controls:

- Historical integrity
- appeal
- nonretaliation
- correction record

61.9 Authority by Contribution Volume

Failure:

Frequent participation becomes unreviewed governance authority.

Controls:

- Appointment
- competence
- term
- decision-right register
- review

61.10 Maintainer Capture

Failure:

One maintainer controls access, releases, credit, and contributor advancement.

Controls:

- Multiple maintainers
- oversight
- access sharing
- appeal
- succession

61.11 Maintainer Burnout

Failure:

Critical work depends on sustained unpaid overwork.

Controls:

- Workload monitoring
- funding
- backup
- rotation
- staffing

61.12 Reviewer Capture

Failure:

Authors, sponsors, or future employers control reviewers.

Controls:

- Independent selection
- conflict disclosure
- funding disclosure
- reviewer withdrawal rights

61.13 Advisory Theater

Failure:

Prominent advisors are listed but do not contribute or govern.

Controls:

- Term
- mandate
- contribution record
- current-status review

61.14 Public-Interest Tokenism

Failure:

Affected persons are invited after technical decisions are complete.

Controls:

- Early participation
- compensation
- influence records
- reconsideration rights

61.15 International Tokenism

Failure:

A few international names support claims of global legitimacy without influence.

Controls:

- Regional roles
- multilingual access
- participation support
- decision analysis

61.16 Unpaid Labor Misclassification

Failure:

The institution treats continuing operational labor as voluntary contribution to avoid employment obligations or compensation.

Controls:

- Role classification
- legal review
- compensation audit
- workload limits

61.17 Pay-to-Participate Exclusion

Failure:

Fees, travel, or unpaid time exclude critical perspectives.

Controls:

- Waivers
- stipends
- remote participation
- asynchronous work
- support funds

61.18 Confidentiality Overreach

Failure:

Broad agreements prevent lawful reporting or conceal institutional misconduct.

Controls:

- Scoped terms
- whistleblower exceptions
- review
- public minimum

61.19 Confidentiality Underreach

Failure:

Contributors receive protected information without sufficient training or controls.

Controls:

- Least privilege
- agreements
- logging
- revocation
- security review

61.20 Intellectual-Property Ambiguity

Failure:

The institution cannot lawfully maintain or publish accepted work.

Controls:

- Published policy
- DCO or CLA
- rights screening
- third-party material disclosure

61.21 Patent Ambush

Failure:

A contributor promotes a requirement while concealing an essential patent interest.

Controls:

- Patent policy
- disclosure
- alternative implementation
- process review

61.22 AI-Assisted Hallucination

Failure:

Generated content introduces false claims, citations, code, or legal language.

Controls:

- Human accountability
- provenance
- source verification
- testing

61.23 AI Confidentiality Breach

Failure:

A contributor enters restricted content into an unauthorized model.

Controls:

- Training
- tool restrictions
- access policy
- incident response

61.24 Complaint Capture

Failure:

A conduct complaint is handled by the accused person's manager, sponsor, or close collaborator.

Controls:

- Conflict screening
- independent channel
- appeal
- board access

61.25 Conduct Weaponization

Failure:

The code of conduct is used to suppress technical disagreement or criticism.

Controls:

- Clear distinction
- evidence

- independent review
- appeal

61.26 Tolerance of Harassment

Failure:

Prestigious or technically valuable contributors receive exceptions.

Controls:

- Consistent enforcement
- no prestige exception
- public aggregate reporting
- leadership accountability

61.27 Retaliation

Failure:

Contributors lose access, credit, work, or reputation after reporting concerns.

Controls:

- Nonretaliation
- independent review
- remedy
- monitoring

61.28 Anonymous Accusation as Proof

Failure:

An anonymous allegation is treated as established fact without fair investigation.

Controls:

- Corroboration
- due process
- proportional interim measures
- reasoned decision

61.29 Representation Inflation

Failure:

A contributor claims to speak for a government, institution, region, community, or Standards Body without mandate.

Controls:

- Capacity disclosure
- role records
- public correction
- removal

61.30 Participation as Endorsement

Failure:

The institution uses contributor names to imply support for the final outcome.

Controls:

- Nonendorsement statement
- dissent records
- consent for promotional use

61.31 Contribution Backlog

Failure:

Submissions remain unresolved for long periods and contributors receive no response.

Controls:

- Queue reporting
- closure policy
- scoped recruitment
- maintainer capacity

61.32 Project Abandonment

Failure:

A contributor community is recruited and the project closes without records, credit, or explanation.

Controls:

- Closure plan
- archive
- handoff
- status notice
- credit preservation

61.33 Single-Point Access

Failure:

One contributor controls critical credentials or task custody.

Controls:

- Institutional accounts
- backup custodians
- emergency access
- audit

61.34 Metric Gaming

Failure:

People optimize commits, comments, or attendance for status.

Controls:

- Quality-based advancement
- role-specific review
- anti-metric rule

61.35 Contributor Monoculture

Failure:

Most contributors share the same professional, national, organizational, or ideological background.

Controls:

- Gap analysis
- active recruitment
- regional programs
- public-interest pathways

61.36 Exit Punishment

Failure:

Departing contributors lose credit or face public disparagement.

Controls:

- Exit rights
- historical records
- communications rules

- appeal
-

62. Serious Objections and Responses

Objection 1: The framework is too formal for an early project

The mature framework is comprehensive.

Present-stage implementation should be proportionate.

Even an early project still needs:

- Clear roles
- contribution rights
- credit
- conduct
- conflicts
- security
- correction

Informality does not eliminate power.

It often makes power less visible.

Objection 2: Open contribution will reduce quality

Open contribution can increase volume and variance.

Quality remains protected through:

- Scope
- triage
- review
- evidence standards
- maintainers
- version control

Open input does not require automatic acceptance.

Objection 3: Contributor agreements discourage participation

Poorly designed agreements can.

Rights terms should be concise, necessary, understandable, and proportionate to the artifact.

Objection 4: Anonymous contribution undermines accountability

Some roles require verified identity.

Anonymous and pseudonymous pathways remain important for:

- Whistleblowing
- vulnerable contributors
- employer-sensitive dissent
- security reporting

Evidence and authority should determine how much anonymity is compatible with the role.

Objection 5: Compensation is impossible for every contributor

Not every contribution requires payment.

The institution should disclose status, fund high-burden and under-resourced participation where possible, and avoid building essential operations on invisible unpaid labor.

Objection 6: Meritocracy is enough

"Merit" can hide:

- Access advantage
- language
- free time
- employer support
- existing relationships
- subjective preference

The institution should define contribution quality and combine merit with conflict, balance, accountability, and inclusion.

Objection 7: Codes of conduct suppress frank debate

A well-designed code protects frank technical disagreement while prohibiting harassment, retaliation, and personal abuse.

Objection 8: Public credit creates security or employment risk

Credit may be:

- Delayed
- pseudonymous
- generalized
- confidentially recorded

Contributor safety may outweigh immediate public attribution.

Objection 9: Institutional representatives should vote according to their employer

Formal representation may involve an institutional mandate.

The role and conflict should be explicit.

The process should prevent any organization from multiplying control.

Objection 10: Contributors who do the work should control the project

Contributors should influence work and have transparent advancement pathways.

Some decisions require fiduciary, public-interest, security, or independent-review authority beyond contribution volume.

Objection 11: AI-assisted contributions are no different from other tools

AI systems can generate fluent but false content, reproduce protected information, and complicate provenance.

Material use deserves specific controls.

Objection 12: Credit disputes are too minor for formal process

Credit affects:

- Careers
- trust
- accountability
- institutional history
- incentives

A proportionate process reduces recurring harm.

Objection 13: Contributor turnover is healthy, so succession planning is unnecessary

Turnover can be healthy.

Critical functions still require handoff, access continuity, and institutional memory.

Objection 14: Public-interest participation makes technical work political

Technical standards and evaluations already distribute risk, cost, access, and authority.

Public-interest contribution makes those consequences reviewable.

Objection 15: Institutional contributor records create privacy risk

Only role-relevant information should be public.

Sensitive application, payment, security, and complaint records should remain protected.

63. Contributor Implementation Pathway

Phase 1: Basic Contribution Controls

- Publish contribution guide
- publish code of conduct
- establish issue and correction channels
- define accepted contribution types
- adopt initial attribution rules
- disclose current review capacity

Phase 2: Role and Rights Infrastructure

- Adopt role taxonomy
- create contributor register
- define public and protected roles
- establish onboarding
- establish conflict disclosure
- define access and exit

Phase 3: Intellectual Property and Security

- Adopt contribution agreement
- choose DCO, CLA, or project-specific models
- adopt software and data licenses
- establish security training
- establish protected-access process
- establish vulnerability reporting

Phase 4: Credit and Review

- Adopt authorship and acknowledgement criteria
- implement contributor-role statements
- establish credit-dispute process
- create reviewer pool
- establish review mandates

Phase 5: Maintainers and Working Groups

- Appoint maintainers
- define decision rights
- create working-group charters
- establish advancement pathways
- create succession plans

Phase 6: Participation Support

- Launch stipends or honoraria
- establish accessibility support
- establish translation pathways
- create international participation support
- create mentorship

Phase 7: Contributor Governance

- Launch Contributor and Community Assembly
- create nomination pathways
- publish participation metrics
- establish independent appeals
- conduct contributor audit

Phase 8: Mature Ecosystem

- Create machine-readable role records
- federate contributor identities where appropriate
- support regional contributor programs
- measure influence and sustainability
- conduct external review
- revise the framework

64. First Contributor Program Pilot

64.1 Pilot Title

Frontier AI Evaluation Reporting Specification Contributor Program

64.2 Purpose

Test the complete contributor framework while developing the first Standards Body standards pilot.

64.3 Contributor Roles

- Project chair
- technical editor
- evaluation scientist
- standards expert
- independent evaluator
- developer representative
- open-source representative
- public-interest contributor
- security reviewer
- international contributor
- translator
- implementation tester
- registry engineer
- public commenter

64.4 Pilot Controls

- Public charter
- role register
- conflicts
- contribution agreement
- code of conduct
- public issue tracker
- protected task channel
- contributor-role credit
- stipend support
- appeal
- exit survey

64.5 Outputs

- Contribution guide

- role matrix
- standards draft
- implementation artifacts
- public comment record
- contributor statement
- lessons report

64.6 Success Criteria

- Roles are understandable
- contributors know decision rights
- no single organization dominates
- credit records match work
- public-interest input changes the draft
- protected access is controlled
- review times are reasonable
- maintainers have backups
- contributors can exit safely
- disputes are resolved fairly

64.7 Pilot Review

Commission independent review after completion.

65. Contributor Framework Scorecard

Dimension	Core question
Purpose	Is contribution tied to a real institutional need?
Capacity	Can Standards Body review and support contributors responsibly?
Roles	Are contributor roles specific and current?
Authority	Are contribution and decision rights distinct?
Entry	Are pathways open, fair, and role-appropriate?
Eligibility	Are criteria necessary and nonexclusionary?
Selection	Are competence, independence, balance, and accessibility considered?
Onboarding	Do contributors understand mission, role, conduct, rights, and security?
Rights	Are credit, dissent, privacy, notice, appeal, and exit protected?
Responsibilities	Are accuracy, conflicts, conduct, security, and correction clear?
Workflow	Are submissions triaged, reviewed, decided, and maintained?
Review	Are review criteria and decision records available?
Attribution	Does credit reflect actual work?

Dimension	Core question
Authorship	Are authorship and acknowledgement distinct?
Maintenance	Are editors, maintainers, and stewards accountable?
Advancement	Are pathways transparent and not prestige-based?
Conduct	Is there a usable code and enforcement process?
Nonretaliation	Are reporting and dissent protected?
Conflicts	Are affiliations, mandates, and interests disclosed?
Confidentiality	Are protected contributions and records governed?
Security	Does access follow least privilege and role?
Intellectual property	Are rights and licenses clear?
Patents	Are standards-related patent interests governed?
Software	Are code review, licensing, security, and releases controlled?
Data	Are rights, provenance, privacy, quality, and retention addressed?
AI assistance	Is material use disclosed, verified, and secure?
Research	Are research roles, methods, and publication duties clear?
Standards	Are affiliation, balance, objections, and voting governed?
Evaluation	Are task, scoring, custody, and review roles separated?
Public interest	Are affected persons supported and influential?
Compensation	Is unpaid labor accurately classified and proportionate?
Well-being	Is workload sustainable?
Accessibility	Can diverse contributors participate?
International	Is cross-regional contribution meaningful?
Mentorship	Are new contributors supported without exploitation?
Representation	Are public titles and affiliations accurate?
Exit	Can contributors pause or leave while preserving credit?
Discipline	Are suspension and removal fair and appealable?
Privacy	Are contributor records minimized and protected?
Succession	Are critical roles and credentials transferable?
Recognition	Does prestige reward useful work without creating false authority?
Metrics	Are quality, fairness, influence, and sustainability measured?
Audit	Can the contributor system be independently reviewed?

65.1 Critical Failures

The following normally prevent a contributor program from being considered credible:

- No code of conduct or reporting channel

- no contribution-rights policy
- no conflict disclosure
- false or missing credit
- retaliation
- high-consequence access without authorization
- one person controlling critical repositories or task banks
- contributors presented as endorsers without basis
- essential continuing labor misclassified as unpaid volunteering
- no appeal for material discipline or credit disputes
- no public role and status distinction
- public-interest participation added only after decisions are fixed
- AI-generated factual content published without verification
- anonymous allegations treated as established fact without fair process
- no maintainer succession

65.2 No Composite Contributor Score

Do not reduce the scorecard to one overall number.

A critical rights, integrity, or security failure cannot be offset by high participation volume.

66. Contributor Role Charter Template

Role title:

Role family:

Project or body:

Version:

Term:

Status:

Purpose

Responsibilities

Authority

Limits

Expected Workload

Competence

Capacity and Representation

Access

Conflicts

Confidentiality

Intellectual Property

Compensation or Volunteer Status

Public Credit

Public Description

Supervision and Review

Complaints and Appeals

Exit and Handoff

67. Contributor Application Template

Applicant:

Preferred name:

Contact:

Location and time zone:

Affiliation:

Participation capacity:

Role Requested

Relevant Competence

Experience

Motivation

Expected Contribution

Availability

Conflicts and Interests

Institutional Authorization

Accessibility Needs

Compensation or Support Needs

Security Eligibility

References or Work Samples

Public Attribution Preference

Privacy Notes

68. Contributor Onboarding Checklist

Confirm completion of:

1. Mission and identity orientation
 2. authority boundaries
 3. role charter
 4. decision rights
 5. code of conduct
 6. complaint and nonretaliation process
 7. conflict disclosure
 8. contribution agreement
 9. intellectual-property and patent policy
 10. confidentiality
 11. security training
 12. access provisioning
 13. record and communication channels
 14. credit and authorship rules
 15. AI-assistance rules
 16. accessibility and support
 17. review and maintenance expectations
 18. exit and handoff
 19. responsible contact
 20. onboarding record
-

69. Contribution Submission Template

Contribution ID:

Contributor:

Affiliation and capacity:

Project:

Date:

Contribution type:

Summary

Proposed Use

Sources and Evidence

Original and Third-Party Material

Rights and License

Patent Interest

AI Assistance

Personal or Sensitive Data

Security Classification

Conflicts

Credit Preference

Maintenance Implication

Requested Decision

70. Contribution Review Record Template

Contribution ID:

Reviewer:

Date:

Scope

Relevance

Accuracy

Evidence

Rights

Security

Privacy

Public Interest

Compatibility

Maintenance

Conflicts

Decision

- Accept
- accept with changes
- partly accept
- revise
- defer
- reject
- archive

Reasons

Attribution

Integration

Appeal or Reconsideration

71. Contributor Role Statement Template

Output:

Version:

Contributor	Affiliation or capacity	Roles	Specific contribution	Public credit status

Institutional Contributions

Funding

Reviewers

Maintainers

Approval Authority

Conflicts

AI Assistance

Nonendorsement Notes

72. Authorship and Credit Review Template

Output:

Reviewer:

Date:

Proposed Authors

Contributor Roles

Authorship Criteria Applied

Contributors Not Listed as Authors

Acknowledgements

Institutional and Funding Credit

Anonymous or Protected Credit

Disputes

Contributor Confirmation

Decision

Correction Route

73. Maintainer Appointment Template

Project or artifact:

Candidate:

Term:

Appointing body:

Competence

Contribution History

Judgment and Conduct

Conflicts

Availability

Security

Authority

Release and Merge Rights

Required Second Review

Backup Maintainer

Succession

Performance Review

Public Status

74. Reviewer Appointment Template

Review:

Candidate:

Mandate:

Date:

Competence

Independence

Conflicts

Selection

Access

Confidentiality

Compensation

Output

Publication

Dissent

Withdrawal Conditions

75. Conduct Report Template

Report ID:

Reporter:

Confidentiality request:

Date:

Persons involved:

Context

Alleged Conduct

Evidence

Immediate Safety or Retaliation Risk

Requested Support

Conflict Screening

Interim Measures

Investigation

Response

Finding

Outcome

Appeal

Corrective and Restorative Action

Systemic Lessons

76. Contributor Exit and Handoff Template

Contributor:

Role:

Project:

Exit date:

Status:

Reason, Optional

Open Work

Decisions and Risks

Credentials and Access

Records

Protected Material Return or Deletion

Successor or Backup

Credit Confirmation

Continuing Duties

Unresolved Concerns

Exit Feedback

Public Status Update

77. Contributor Audit Template

Audit period:

Auditor:

Independence:

Contributor Register

Role Clarity

Entry and Selection

Onboarding

Rights and Responsibilities

Contribution Workflow

Credit and Authorship

Maintainers and Decision Rights

Conduct and Nonretaliation

Conflicts

Security and Access

Intellectual Property

Compensation and Volunteer Status

Accessibility and International Participation

AI-Assisted Contributions

Complaints and Appeals

Exit and Succession

Metrics

Findings

Corrective Actions

Public Summary

78. Canonical Standards Body Contributor Positions

Standards Body adopts the following working positions.

1. Contribution, authorship, credit, authority, access, employment, membership, and endorsement are distinct.
2. A contributor should know their role, authority, access, term, responsibilities, credit, and exit rights.
3. Contribution should be evaluated by quality, relevance, evidence, safety, rights, and institutional need.
4. Prestige should not substitute for contribution or competence.
5. Funding alone does not create authorship.
6. Seniority alone does not create authorship.
7. Resource provision should be credited separately from intellectual authorship.
8. Standards should ordinarily be attributed institutionally while preserving individual contribution records.
9. Research authorship should reflect substantial intellectual responsibility and accountability.
10. Contributor-role statements should be used for substantial outputs.
11. CRediT should be used where useful and extended for standards, evaluation, security, and institutional work.
12. Editing, maintenance, moderation, translation, accessibility, facilitation, and contributor support are substantive contributions.
13. Reasoned dissent and error correction are valuable contributions.
14. Contributors should not lose earned historical credit because they resign or disagree.
15. Contributors should be able to state that participation does not imply endorsement.
16. Contributor status does not create external authority.
17. Institutional representation requires an actual mandate.
18. Personal and institutional views should be distinguished.

19. Open contribution requires governed review.
20. Submission does not guarantee acceptance.
21. Rejected contributions should not be appropriated silently.
22. The institution should recruit only when it has capacity to review, support, secure, credit, and maintain contributions.
23. Contribution debt should be measured and disclosed internally.
24. Critical projects should have multiple maintainers.
25. Maintainer authority should be scoped, reviewed, and transferable.
26. Contribution volume alone should not create maintainer or governance authority.
27. Advancement should consider quality, judgment, reliability, maintenance, collaboration, security, and public-interest awareness.
28. Contributor pathways should be visible.
29. Codes of conduct should protect frank technical disagreement while prohibiting harassment, retaliation, and abuse.
30. Conduct rules should apply across official online, offline, and representational spaces.
31. A code of conduct without reporting, trained response, due process, and appeal is incomplete.
32. Prestigious contributors should not receive conduct exceptions.
33. Unsubstantiated complaints should not automatically be treated as false.
34. Anonymous allegations should receive fair, evidence-based handling.
35. Good-faith reporting, dissent, conflict disclosure, and appeals should be protected from retaliation.
36. Conflicts should include financial, employment, client, funding, intellectual, political, personal, reputational, and access dependencies.
37. Disclosure alone may not resolve a conflict.
38. Contributors should disclose the capacity in which they participate.
39. Organizations should not multiply influence through unlimited affiliated participants.
40. Access should follow role, need, competence, conflict, training, and least privilege.
41. Contribution does not justify access to protected evidence.
42. Prominent contributors remain subject to security controls.

43. Protected access should be logged, reviewed, and revoked after role change.
44. Confidentiality should not prevent lawful reporting of serious risk or wrongdoing.
45. Contributors should not use protected information for private, competitive, financial, or publication advantage.
46. Contribution rights should be clear before formal standards or software contributions are accepted.
47. Standards Body should use a DCO, CLA, or other appropriate agreement according to artifact and risk.
48. Contributors should submit only material they have the right to provide.
49. Employer, third-party, patent, code, data, and model-generated rights should be disclosed.
50. Patent interests relevant to standards implementation should be governed through a published policy.
51. Software contributions should receive code, license, test, dependency, and security review.
52. Critical software should not depend on one maintainer.
53. Data contributions should preserve provenance, rights, quality, privacy, sensitivity, and correction.
54. Synthetic data should be labeled and validated.
55. Human contributors remain accountable for AI-assisted submissions.
56. Material AI assistance should be recorded and disclosed appropriately.
57. AI-generated citations, facts, code, standards language, and translations should be verified.
58. Protected information should not be submitted to unauthorized AI systems.
59. AI systems should not be listed as accountable human authors.
60. Research contributors should preserve protocol, methods, deviations, data, code, uncertainty, and correction.
61. Research participants are not automatically contributors or authors.
62. Standards contributors should disclose affiliations, mandates, patents, and conflicts.
63. Public commenters should be included in the standards-process record.
64. A contributor who prevents a weak requirement through valid objection should be recognized where feasible.
65. Developer personnel may support evaluation but should not control independent conclusions.

66. Evaluation roles should distinguish task design, administration, scoring, interpretation, custody, and review.
67. Exact task authorship may remain protected during active held-out use.
68. Independent reviewers should have sufficient access and freedom to dissent.
69. Reviewers should be able to withdraw when access or independence becomes inadequate.
70. Good-faith incident and vulnerability reporting should receive safe, defined channels.
71. Payment should not purchase permanent silence concerning unresolved public harm.
72. Translation and localization are substantive contributions.
73. Normative translations require linguistic and domain review.
74. Public-interest and affected-party contributors should participate before decisions are fixed.
75. Lived experience should not be extracted without purpose, protection, support, and appropriate recognition.
76. One contributor should not be presented as representing an entire community without mandate.
77. Advisors should have defined mandates, terms, conflicts, and current status.
78. A prominent advisor list should not substitute for active governance or contribution.
79. Role descriptions should state compensation, stipend, expense support, volunteer status, or institutional funding.
80. Standards Body should not disguise essential continuing labor as volunteering.
81. Compensation should not depend on favorable conclusions.
82. Participation support should reduce financial, linguistic, disability, travel, and time-zone barriers.
83. Accessibility should be designed into contributor systems.
84. International contribution should involve influence, not symbolic inclusion.
85. Regional participants should not be treated as representing entire regions automatically.
86. Mentorship should build competence without exploiting trainees.
87. Mentors and maintainers should receive credit for contributor development.
88. Material decisions made informally should return to official records.
89. Public contributor titles should be accurate and scope-specific.

90. Contributors should not imply certification, accreditation, regulatory status, or spokesperson authority.
 91. Confidential and pseudonymous participation should be available where justified.
 92. Verified identity may remain necessary for voting, contracts, payment, protected access, and fiduciary roles.
 93. Contributors should be able to resign or pause.
 94. Exit should include handoff, access removal, record preservation, and credit confirmation.
 95. Suspension may precede final process when immediate security or safety risk exists.
 96. Material suspension, removal, credit, and retaliation decisions should support appeal.
 97. Contributor personal data should be minimized and protected.
 98. Critical assets and credentials should be institutionally controlled.
 99. Contributor recognition should reward maintenance, correction, support, and dissent, not only visible authorship.
 100. Awards and recognition should not create false authority.
 101. The Contributor and Community Assembly should create proposal and accountability pathways without replacing fiduciary or technical governance.
 102. Contributor metrics should measure quality, influence, equity, sustainability, and security.
 103. Low complaint volume should not automatically be interpreted as a healthy community.
 104. High retention should not be pursued at the expense of safe exit.
 105. A large contributor count does not establish meaningful participation.
 106. Contributor systems should receive internal and periodic external review.
 107. Critical contributor failures may require correction, access suspension, role change, governance reform, or public notice.
 108. Institutional growth should not outpace contributor support and security.
 109. Standards Body should publish material contributor-system lessons and corrections.
 110. The ultimate purpose of the contributor framework is to make expertise and participation institutionally usable without obscuring who did the work, who had authority, who bore risk, and who can be held accountable.
-

79. Relationship to Other Canonical Files

PROJECT_IDENTITY.md

Defines the project's mission, present stage, authority limits, public descriptions, and prohibited claims.

Contributor titles and public affiliation should remain consistent with it.

PROJECT_MANIFESTO.md

Defines the deeper purpose that contributor participation should serve.

INSTITUTION_DESIGN.md

Defines the institutional ecosystem, bodies, programs, and distributed roles in which contributors may participate.

GOVERNANCE_FRAMEWORK.md

Defines governing authority, decision rights, councils, committees, conflicts, appeals, and the Contributor and Community Assembly.

This framework defines who may enter those systems and under which terms.

STANDARDS_DEVELOPMENT_PROCESS.md

Defines working groups, participation, balance, comments, consensus, voting, editing, intellectual property, and maintenance.

This framework defines contributor-level rights and responsibilities across that process.

TRANSPARENCY_FRAMEWORK.md

Defines public and protected contributor records, funding, conflicts, attribution, status, and disclosure.

FOUNDATIONS.md

Defines the eight foundations to which contributors may contribute.

FOUNDATIONS_APPENDIX.md

Defines cross-foundation roles, workflows, evidence passports, reviews, pilots, and institutional interfaces.

TERMINOLOGY.md

Defines contributor, reviewer, evaluator, auditor, author, representative, conflict, independence, standards, certification, accreditation, and related terms.

EVIDENCE_STANDARDS.md

Defines source and evidence expectations contributors should follow.

RESEARCH_METHODOLOGY.md

Defines research roles, registration, methods, ethics, security, review, publication, and correction.

TAXONOMY.md

Classifies actors, roles, contributions, access, status, decisions, evidence, and institutional relationships.

EVALUATION_PHILOSOPHY.md

Defines the evaluation principles that evaluation contributors should preserve.

Foundation 1

Creates roles for protocol designers, maintainers, change reviewers, and bridge-study contributors.

Foundation 2

Creates roles for task authors, custodians, secure administrators, compromise investigators, and protected reviewers.

Foundation 3

Creates high-competence and high-independence roles for severe-risk evaluation.

Foundation 4

Defines independent reviewer selection, access, conflict, dissent, and publication responsibilities.

Foundation 5

Creates evaluator, auditor, certification, accreditation, proficiency, and quality-system contributor roles.

Foundation 6

Creates standards, implementation, procurement, legal-recognition, and enforcement-interface roles.

Foundation 7

Requires recognition and prestige systems to reward real contribution without creating gaming or capture.

Foundation 8

Creates international, regional, translation, localization, mapping, recognition, and capacity-building roles.

PARTNERSHIP_PRINCIPLES.md

Will define how partner organizations provide representatives, resources, funding, data, and access.

LONG_TERM_ROADMAP.md

Will sequence contributor-program maturity and staffing transitions.

WEBSITE_SOURCE_OF_TRUTH.md

Will define approved public contributor titles, biographies, project roles, and current-status pages.

VERSION_HISTORY.md

Will preserve contributor-framework changes and role-policy history.

80. Final Contributor Position

Standards Body will depend on contributors for much of its intellectual and institutional value.

That dependence creates responsibility.

The institution should not treat contributors as:

- Free labor
- decorative names
- implied endorsers
- sources of legitimacy without influence
- replaceable inputs without credit
- holders of permanent authority because they arrived early
- security exceptions because they are prominent
- representatives of communities they do not have a mandate to represent

It should treat contribution as a governed relationship.

That relationship should answer:

- What did the person contribute?
- In which capacity?
- Under which rights?
- With which conflicts?
- With which access?
- Who reviewed the work?
- Who decided whether to accept it?
- How was credit assigned?
- What authority did the contributor possess?
- What authority did they not possess?
- How can they dissent?
- How can they report harm?
- How can they appeal?
- How can they leave?
- Who maintains the contribution after they leave?

A credible contributor system should be open enough that Standards Body does not become an inward-looking institution.

It should be selective enough that contribution quality and safety remain high.

It should be transparent enough that credit, influence, and conflicts are visible.

It should be secure enough to protect people, systems, and held-out evidence.

It should be fair enough that people without institutional prestige or financial support can contribute meaningfully.

It should be durable enough that maintainers can hand off work and the institution can outlive its founding participants.

The defining contributor rule of Standards Body is:

Recognize the work, bound the authority, protect the contributor, govern the access, preserve the dissent, and maintain the contribution beyond the individual.

References and Research Basis

[^credit]: National Information Standards Organization, **CRedit Contributor Role Taxonomy**, a community-owned taxonomy of 14 contributor roles and ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022. <https://credit.niso.org/>

[^credit-roles]: National Information Standards Organization, **CRedit Role Descriptors**. <https://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles-defined/>

[^credit-implementation]: National Information Standards Organization, **How to Implement CRedit**. <https://credit.niso.org/implementing-credit/>

[^contributor-covenant]: Contributor Covenant, **Code of Conduct and Adoption Resources**, including Version 3.0 availability in 2026 and prior Version 2.1 resources. <https://www.contributor-covenant.org/adopt/> and <https://www.contributor-covenant.org/>

[^w3c-coc]: World Wide Web Consortium, **Positive Work Environment at W3C: Code of Conduct**, March 18, 2024. <https://www.w3.org/policies/code-of-conduct/>

[^w3c-process]: World Wide Web Consortium, **W3C Process Document**, August 18, 2025. <https://www.w3.org/policies/process/>

[^w3c-invited]: World Wide Web Consortium, **Invited Experts** and **Invited Expert Agreement**. <https://www.w3.org/invited-experts/> and <https://www.w3.org/invited-experts/agreement-2023/>

[^w3c-support]: World Wide Web Consortium, **Invited Experts Support Fund**. <https://www.w3.org/invited-experts/ie-support-fund/>

[^dco]: Developer Certificate of Origin, **Developer Certificate of Origin Version 1.1**, Linux Foundation and contributors. <https://developercertificate.org/>

[^ietf-rights]: Internet Engineering Task Force and RFC Editor, **RFC 5378, Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust**, BCP 78. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5378/> and <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp78/>

[^ietf-ipr]: Internet Engineering Task Force and RFC Editor, **RFC 8179, Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology**, BCP 79. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8179>

[^lf-maintainers]: Linux Foundation Research, **Open Source Maintainers: Motivation, Challenges and Opportunities**, 2023. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/hubfs/LF%20Research/Open%20Source%20Maintainers%202023%20-%20Report.pdf>

[^lf-participation]: Linux Foundation, **Participating in Open Source Communities**. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/resources/open-source-guides/participating-in-open-source-communities>

[^iso-directives]: International Organization for Standardization and International Electrotechnical Commission, **ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, Procedures for the Technical Work**. <https://www.iso.org/sites/directives/current/consolidated/index.html>

[^ansi-essential]: American National Standards Institute, **ANSI Essential Requirements: Due Process Requirements for American National Standards**. <https://www.ansi.org/american-national-standards/ans-introduction/essential-requirements>

[^nist-rmf]: National Institute of Standards and Technology, **Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)**. <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf>

[^orcid]: ORCID, **Contributor Identification and Researcher Records**. <https://info.orcid.org/>

[^creative-commons]: Creative Commons, **About CC Licenses**. <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/cclicenses/>

Revision Record

Version 1.0

Date: July 16, 2026

Change type: Complete foundational edition

Summary: Establishes the canonical Standards Body contributor-participation and accountability framework. Defines contributor families, role taxonomy, statuses, capacity, entry, eligibility, selection, onboarding, rights, responsibilities, contribution lifecycle, review, authorship, attribution, contributor records, editors, maintainers, stewards, chairs, reviewers, decision rights, advancement, code of conduct, enforcement, nonretaliation, conflicts, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, patents, software, data, AI-assisted contributions, research, standards, evaluation, independent review, incident reporting, translation, public-interest participation, institutional representation, fellowships, compensation, well-being, accessibility, international participation, mentorship, communications, public representation, anonymous contribution, exit, suspension, appeals, privacy, succession, recognition, contributor governance, metrics, audit, maturity, failure modes, objections, implementation, pilot design, scorecard, operational templates, canonical positions, cross-file relationships, and primary research basis.

Status: Approved foundational source.