

# Governing Generative Relational Public Knowledge: Provenance, Process Justice, and Institutional Authority

Wanhong HUANG  
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

## Abstract

Generative relational knowledge infrastructures preserve the contributions, evidence, interpretations, and decisions through which public accounts develop. Their governance consequently concerns relations and processes as well as final artifacts. This paper develops a jurisprudential framework that differentiates historical occurrence, evidentiary reconstruction, institutional recognition, legal consequence, and the powers exercised over their recorded representations. The method combines normative argument, a purposive scholarly review, scoped primary-law analysis, comparative institutional reasoning, and constructed case decisions. The framework connects authority to a specified source, operation, affected relationship, and reviewable mandate. It develops process justice, graduated permissions, prospective supervisory duties, distributed responsibility, and effective correction. Provenance supports recognition and accountability while requiring an independent justification for downstream control; conceptual priority, dependence, independent development, dissociation, and governing office retain distinct roles. Information-lifecycle analysis permits qualified disclosure and justified loss of historical completeness. A hypothetical EU-established nonprofit repository supplies a bounded legal stress test, with national-law and deployment-specific questions identified separately. Worked cases examine contested evidence, restricted sources, intellectual genealogy, AI-mediated reuse, community authority, and requests to retire identifying records. A proposed charter and decision structure make the institutional commitments concrete for further review. The contribution is a reasoned governance framework whose normative, legal, technical, and empirical claims remain distinct. Institutional legitimacy and corrective effectiveness require further participatory and comparative assessment; neither follows from the existence of an auditable record or a formally completed procedure.

**Keywords:** jurisprudence; public knowledge; process justice; provenance; attribution; relational permissions; institutional authority; distributed responsibility; information governance; remedies.

## Discussion Paper Note

This manuscript is a discussion paper circulated to support interdisciplinary inquiry into public knowledge. Its definitions, arguments, formal representations, and practical proposals remain open to revision. The paper provides a basis for scholarly exchange and further research; its circulation does not establish an adopted technical standard or an authoritative institutional position.

The author welcomes objections, discussion, corrections, alternative interpretations, counterexamples, and suggestions for further development. Contributions from different disciplines and from people whose knowledge or interests could be affected by the proposed infrastructure are especially valuable. Readers are invited to identify conceptual ambiguities, formal errors, omitted literature, relevant practices, and disagreements with the normative or institutional assumptions. Comments may be sent to [huangwanhong@serendip.ngo](mailto:huangwanhong@serendip.ngo). Identifying the paper, version, and relevant passage will assist review.

The author makes no claim to conceptual priority or first origination of the concepts discussed in this paper. Similar or equivalent concepts may already exist in other disciplines, intellectual traditions, languages, or bodies of practice, including under different terminology. The literature review is selective and remains open to correction and expansion. References to earlier, parallel, or independently developed work are welcome. The proposed vocabulary, connections, and applications should be assessed through their arguments and evidence. Attribution of this manuscript identifies its authorship and source; it does not establish priority for its underlying concepts.

## Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

This section records a request for responsible scholarly conduct and clarifies the scope of the author's rights reservation. The author encourages good-faith criticism, independent inquiry, and responsible application, and asks users to consider foreseeable harms when adapting or applying the proposals. These ethical requests add no conditions to the licence stated in the Notices and leave its permissions and otherwise lawful uses unchanged.

Any reservation is limited to rights the author actually retains under the licence and applicable law, consistently with the licence's grants, waivers, and nonassertion provisions. The author asserts no exclusive control over the underlying concepts through this notice. Attribution and reuse do not imply authorial endorsement of subsequent interpretations, applications, or institutional positions. Applicable copyright exceptions and limitations remain available, and third-party material retains its applicable conditions.

## Notices

These notices identify the manuscript’s discussion status, conditions of reuse, research context, and preparation process. They accompany the invitation to criticism and the statement on conceptual priority in the Discussion Paper Note.

**Publication status and revision.** This is a developing discussion paper. Its arguments, terminology, formal statements, organization, and numbering may change. Objections, discussion, corrections, and references to antecedent work are welcome. When citing or commenting on the paper, readers are asked to include its title, author, and any available version information so that later revisions can be distinguished.

**Licence.** Except where otherwise indicated, copyright 2026 Wanhong Huang. This manuscript is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC 4.0), subject to its official legal code. That legal code governs the permissions, conditions, disclaimers, and limitations of the licence. The responsible-use requests and rights reservation in this paper do not amend those terms. Third-party material remains subject to its applicable conditions.

**Research scope and evidence.** Constructed cases in this paper are analytical examples. The accompanying source audits record online verification and the limits of access. Formal results and bounded artifact checks are identified within their stated assumptions and scope. The project has no field deployment; institutional proposals remain proposals for discussion and evaluation.

**AI assistance and author responsibility.** The preparation of this manuscript involved OpenAI’s ChatGPT. AI assistance supported exploratory dialogue, source discovery and verification, argument criticism, conceptual and formal reconstruction, and manuscript preparation in L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X. The author retains responsibility for review and the final manuscript, including its arguments, representations, conclusions, and errors.

# 1 Introduction

Public knowledge infrastructures distribute opportunities to describe social life, obtain recognition, challenge an account, and influence institutional action. Their records can preserve a contribution while obscuring its conditions, make an allegation durable, or give a local finding the appearance of general authority. These effects create a jurisprudential problem: the capacity to record and circulate an account does not itself establish the right to do so, the competence to adjudicate it, or the responsibilities associated with its later use.

This paper develops a framework for governing generative relational public knowledge. The object of governance extends across the relations and transformations through which knowledge becomes publicly consequential. The central argument is that authority, permission, and responsibility should be specified for those relations and operations, justified by their sources and effects, and made subject to effective review. Preserving a history can support that arrangement, but a history alone cannot legitimate the institution that uses it.

## 1.1 Knowledge Trajectories and Jurisprudential Consequences

A knowledge trajectory is a purpose-bounded network of recorded accounts, contributions, evidence, transformations, disputes, and decisions selected to make a development intelligible. The concept directs attention to the genesis and continuing use of knowledge. It does not imply complete documentation of social life or an inevitable progression toward better knowledge. Selection and omission are themselves consequential decisions.

Consider a constructed environmental inquiry involving residents' accounts, scientific measurements, a community archive, and a public report. Some participants seek recognition for identifying a problem; others seek protection against disclosure of their locations. A later synthesis omits an uncertainty and is adopted by an institution. An affected person then challenges both the summary and the categories used to produce it. The repository can retain every version while still leaving that person without an effective remedy. Conversely, erasing every disputed record could impair the public's ability to understand how the institution acted.

A second constructed dispute concerns conceptual ancestry. An early contributor claims that later work depends on their idea; the later author claims independent development. A timestamp may help establish when one record entered a repository, while leaving conceptual equivalence, transmission, independent discovery, and prior unrecorded work unresolved. An institution that awards recognition must identify the question it has competence to decide. Recognition of a contribution also differs from authority to control future research or govern the infrastructure.

These cases expose the need to separate occurrence, evidence, representation, institutional recognition, and legal consequence. They also identify several relations that can matter independently: a person may contribute an idea, hold a licence concerning expression, be described in a record, maintain its custody, review its reliability, or publish a transformed account. Each position generates different possible claims and duties. Compressing them into a single designation such as owner would conceal the structure of the dispute.

## 1.2 Publicness, Generativity, and the Scope of Governance

Publicness concerns the purposes served by an infrastructure and the answerability of decisions affecting participation and knowledge use. It can require broad access, accessible criticism, and public reasons. It can also require protected custody and limited disclosure when exposure would undermine participation or violate an applicable duty. A public purpose therefore needs an institutional account of selection, representation, protection, and review. Neither a publicly accessible database nor a declaration of community control settles that account in advance.

Generativity introduces a temporal concern. An act of publication can affect future transformations, reputations, decisions, and opportunities for inquiry. An institution's responsibility may consequently

extend to maintaining interpretability, monitoring material changes, communicating corrections, and providing succession. The paper argues for prospective process and supervisory duties alongside retrospective inquiries into harmful conduct. The duties remain bounded by source, competence, capacity, proportionality, and the interests of affected persons.

Relational governance does not create authority wherever a graph contains an edge. A remote causal connection may justify inquiry without establishing control, legal liability, or a duty to supervise every downstream use. The relevant relationship must be identified and its normative significance argued. A custodian's practical ability to restrict access, a contributor's interest in recognition, and an affected person's claim to correction can support different powers and obligations. Their interaction requires a procedure with an intelligible scope.

### **1.3 Research Questions and Central Argument**

The inquiry addresses six questions. It examines the interests requiring protection along knowledge trajectories; the differentiation of provenance, recognition, entitlement, endorsement, and responsibility; the justification of process and supervisory duties; the design of permissions and corrective procedures; the sources and limits of institutional competence; and the framework's relationship to applicable legal orders. These questions provide the structure for assessing a governance proposal rather than assuming that technical representability establishes normative validity.

The argument has three parts. First, governance should distinguish relations whose grounds and consequences differ, including contribution, authorship, custody, representation, adoption, and public office. Second, consequential operations should identify a competent actor, a source and scope of authority, affected interests, reasons, continuing duties, and an effective review route. Third, institutions should preserve opportunities for correction and further inquiry while allowing justified protection, provisional action, and limits on retention. The proposal thereby joins historical intelligibility to revisable institutional power.

The framework resists two opposed failures in provenance governance. Erasure of ancestry can conceal dependence and deny recognition. Treating ancestry as an unlimited source of downstream control can obstruct inquiry and entrench a contributor's power. The proposed response preserves attributable relations while requiring an independent justification for each claimed permission, duty, or authority. The same discipline applies to responsibility: evidence of causal involvement supports investigation but does not complete an assessment of control, knowledge, role, or blame.

### **1.4 Method and Evidentiary Status**

The method combines jurisprudential argument, a purposive review of relevant scholarship, scoped analysis of primary legal authorities, institutional comparison, and constructed case adjudication. Normative propositions are examined through their premises, alternatives, counterexamples, and implications for actual procedures. The cases test whether those procedures can distinguish competing interests and support a reasoned remedy. They are not reports of fieldwork, judicial decisions, or community endorsement.

Four analytical statuses remain distinct. A jurisprudential proposal supplies reasons for recognizing an interest, duty, or power. A governance rule specifies a proposed institutional arrangement whose force depends on adoption and mandate. A positive-law proposition describes an identified legal source within its applicable scope. An empirical claim requires observations from an appropriate study. The manuscript's cases and charter are proposals and analytical constructions; no operational success or established justice outcome is inferred from their completeness on paper.

The principal statutory stress test concerns an expressly hypothetical EU-established nonprofit research repository. The legal section identifies the assumptions under which particular EU rules become relevant, while leaving questions requiring a selected Member State or adjudicative forum unresolved. Treaty provisions and other legal instruments are examined with their distinct forms of authority. The result is a scoped compatibility analysis, not a general compliance determination for an actual deployment.

Source audits record online verification before citation insertion and identify limits where full scholarly texts were unavailable.

The framework is tested against concrete operations of public knowledge governance. Records, assertions, workflow receipts, and current disclosure views have different meanings. This paper defines these objects where they affect its argument and examines the institutional decisions associated with each. The inquiry concerns the grounds, limits, procedures, and remedies of public knowledge governance.

## **1.5 Contributions and Paper Organization**

The paper contributes a differentiated jurisprudential object, an account of process justice and public knowledge interests, a framework for provenance and recognition without indefinite ancestral control, and operation-specific permissions and duties. It also develops a complete contestation procedure, an institutional allocation of authority, scoped legal analysis, and reasoned constructed cases. A proposed charter makes the governance commitments concrete enough to criticize without presenting them as already adopted.

Sections 2–5 establish the scholarship, conceptual distinctions, normative premises, and ancestry argument. Sections 6–10 develop duties, responsibility, review, information lifecycle, and institutional authority. Section 11 examines the legal interfaces. The cases and evaluation in Sections 12 and 13 test the proposal’s consequences, followed by discussion and conclusion. Appendix A sets out a proposed charter and decision structure for further institutional deliberation.

## **2 Related Jurisprudence and Knowledge Governance Research**

The jurisprudential problem concerns the grounds on which an institution may preserve, interpret, restrict, and act upon another person’s contribution or representation. This section locates that problem within research on knowledge commons, social ontology, legal relations, procedural and epistemic justice, privacy, and intellectual recognition. Its method is a selective comparison of primary arguments with the requirements of generative knowledge governance. The comparison identifies resources for the present proposal and the additional argument needed to apply them. It provides neither an exhaustive literature survey nor evidence that existing approaches lack the capacities described here.

### **2.1 Knowledge Commons and Institutional Constitution**

Hess and Ostrom’s framework connects knowledge resources to participants, action situations, and rules in use, distinguishing ideas, artifacts, and facilities and examining several levels of institutional choice [7]. This approach makes the stewardship of a repository an institutional problem even when its contents can be copied cheaply. The present paper takes a further question as its object: how should those institutions respond when the resource includes consequential descriptions of people who never joined the contributing community? A commons of contributors can generate benefits for its members while imposing exposure, misrecognition, or correction costs on others. Membership rules alone consequently provide an incomplete account of the population to whom governance is answerable.

The relevant extension concerns the public significance of institutional actions. A repository may preserve an annotation, display it prominently, incorporate it into an authoritative summary, and later distribute it through an automated service. These actions can successively change the interests at stake while leaving the original sentence intact. Their governance therefore requires an account of the relations between custody, publication, recognition, and consequential use. A generative history makes those relations inspectable; the justification of its selection and institutional effects remains a separate task. The commons framework supplies a setting for that task without predetermining an answer to every claim of affected-party standing.

Social ontology helps explain why an institutional description can have both evidentiary and constitutive functions. Searle distinguishes the dependence of institutional phenomena on human recognition

from the possibility of objective knowledge about them, emphasizing status functions and constitutive rules [18]. An appointment can depend on a practice while the question whether that practice appointed a particular person has determinate evidence. The proposed jurisprudence preserves this distinction while admitting accounts of exclusion and harm that the institution has yet to recognize. Its governance object includes challenges to established statuses and the conditions under which those challenges can become intelligible.

## 2.2 Legal Relations and the Procedural Exercise of Power

Hohfeld's analysis separates claims and duties, privileges and their correlatives, powers and liabilities, and immunities and disabilities [8]. The practical implication is that a statement such as *the contributor controls the record* leaves several different relations unresolved. It could describe freedom to reuse an expression, a claim against misattribution, a power to revise a publication, or protection against an administrator's unilateral removal of a hearing. Section 3 uses these distinctions to specify the object and counterpart of a proposed entitlement. The classification itself supplies no moral justification for granting the entitlement and no legal source that makes it enforceable.

Procedure also concerns the exercise of power under contested rules. Waldron argues that the procedural dimension of the rule of law includes opportunities to present evidence and argument, including argument about the bearing of law on a person's situation [20]. A repository is not thereby transformed into a court. The relevant analogy is narrower: installing a predictable decision rule leaves a further question about whether people can challenge its interpretation and application. An appeal that merely reruns the same classification can reproduce a disputed premise exactly. The proposal therefore differentiates review of execution from review of the governing classification, evidentiary standard, or delegation of authority.

This distinction limits the analogy with adjudication as well. A public knowledge institution must sometimes choose a collection strategy, a vocabulary, or a maintenance budget. Such choices affect many people prospectively and cannot be adequately justified as if they were individual priority disputes. The proposed framework connects case review to rule revision while preserving their different objects. It asks for reasons appropriate to the power exercised, including reasons for deciding a matter collectively or referring it elsewhere.

## 2.3 Epistemic Participation and the Distribution of Recognition

Fricker identifies testimonial and hermeneutical forms of injustice, locating ethical wrongs in practices of receiving testimony and making social experience intelligible [6]. The application to knowledge infrastructure concerns several stages before a published conclusion: the categories a form permits, the translation an intermediary supplies, the confidence a reviewer assigns, and the visibility a query produces. The paper's proposal extends the analysis into institutional design by treating these stages as separately challengeable decisions. It does not claim that recording disagreement removes the underlying prejudices or that every rejected assertion exemplifies epistemic injustice.

Recognition also has distributive conditions. Fraser's examination of recognition politics identifies the dangers of displacing redistribution and reifying group identities [5]. Those dangers matter when infrastructure offers symbolic credit while leaving the work of correction, translation, or secure custody unsupported. They also matter when a collective identifier conceals disagreement about who may speak for the group. The proposed response is to assess recognition together with practical capacity and representation. A richer attribution vocabulary can improve an account of contribution while leaving economic dependence or institutional exclusion substantially unchanged.

The sociology of scientific priority supplies another relevant distinction. Merton examines priority disputes in relation to the organization of scientific recognition and its honorific rewards [11]. His analysis provides an antecedent for treating credit as institutionally organized rather than a transparent reflection of chronology. Section 5 develops the additional jurisprudential issue: the evidence that supports an earlier contribution must be kept separate from the authority later claimed in its name. The

paper's rules for bounded priority findings, dissociation, and downstream freedom are proposals for that issue, with no claim that chronology exhausts the value of intellectual work.

## **2.4 Contextual Privacy, Plural Orders, and the Legal Interface**

Nissenbaum's contextual-integrity account evaluates information practices through norms concerning appropriate information and its distribution within social contexts [13]. This account explains why availability in one setting leaves the acceptability of aggregation and redistribution open to further judgment. The present proposal makes transformations between contexts addressable, including the move from a protected research record to a public profile. Its additional normative claim is that the institution responsible for such a transformation should explain its authority and the interests it considered. Established practice is relevant evidence of context; its mere existence does not settle whether an exclusionary or coercive practice deserves to continue.

Merry's account of legal pluralism directs attention to forms of social and legal ordering that exceed a single account of state law [10]. For a federated repository, several orders can shape the same relation: territorial law, professional rules, community authority, and institutional commitments. The proposed relational analysis identifies these claims and their affected parties. It cannot confer legal jurisdiction, authorize noncompliance with applicable law, or resolve every conflict among orders. This limit makes the distinction between legal authority and justified institutional recognition central to the research.

Positive-law sources perform a different role from these theoretical antecedents. GDPR provisions constrain specified processing relationships; copyright treaties distinguish protected expression and authorial rights; license text specifies conditions within its actual grant; and evidence rules operate within an applicable forum. Section 11 examines selected instruments under an explicit hypothetical and states what remains unresolved. The resulting contribution is an argued relationship among these domains: historical representation, normative standing, institutional competence, and operational remedy must remain distinguishable while decisions connect them. That relationship can be criticized through counterexamples without assuming that a new name supplies a new or complete jurisprudence.

## **3 Factual Representation and Governance Competence**

Governing a public knowledge record requires identifying what a proposed act can change and why the institution is entitled to change it. This section develops the jurisprudential object through distinctions among occurrences, evidence, attribution, recognition, institutional status, and legal relations. It then examines the conditions of generation and proposes a method for matching competence and remedy to the relation at issue. The method uses conceptual distinctions and counterexamples. Its categories describe roles within an inquiry, permitting several descriptions of one occurrence; they neither exhaust social reality nor duplicate the language's structural types.

### **3.1 Occurrences, Records, and Evidentiary Reconstruction**

Consider a hypothetical researcher whose working notes precede a later publication associated with another group. An archive possesses a file, a receipt records its deposit, an interpreter identifies a conceptual similarity, and a review body issues a priority finding. Each statement has a different object. File integrity concerns the retained representation. Deposit concerns an occurrence in the repository. Conceptual similarity concerns a comparative interpretation. Priority concerns an ordering among specified events. The finding concerns the institution's response to evidence under a procedure. Collapsing these objects would allow the repository's technical assurance to carry conclusions it never evaluated.

A later correction changes an account and its institutional consequences. It can establish that the earlier account was mistaken or inadequately qualified, without making the past depend on the reviser's present preference. Conversely, the fact that an occurrence cannot be undone supplies no general entitlement to preserve or disclose every representation of it. Erasing a controlled copy changes the surviving

evidence and opportunities for inquiry. Whether erasure is justified or required concerns interests and authority additional to the truth of the represented proposition. This separation is essential to avoiding a metaphysical argument for permanent exposure.

The same reasoning applies to assertions about institutional action. A receipt can establish that a review body recorded approval within a retained history. Whether that approval had the alleged effect depends on its mandate, procedure, and applicable rules. Hohfeld's distinction between operative and evidential facts supplies a useful antecedent: some circumstances change legal relations under an applicable rule, while others support an inference about relevant circumstances [8]. In the proposal, admission of a description ordinarily establishes a record of submission. Any constitutive effect requires a separately specified institutional operation and authority.

### 3.2 Attribution, Recognition, and Institutional Status

Provenance identifies an alleged generative relationship, such as translation, incorporation, criticism, or synthesis. Attribution identifies a person's or organization's contribution under a stated description. Recognition concerns the credit or standing accorded by a specified audience. Endorsement concerns approval of a particular claim, version, or use. Responsibility concerns an answerable role in an action or omission, with legal liability requiring its own applicable conditions. These relations can coincide, although none can safely serve as an unqualified substitute for the others.

A translator can contribute substantially to a work whose conclusions they reject. A named founder can lack current governing office. A laboratory can be responsible for a measurement process while an institution decides to publish an unsupported generalization from it. An infrastructure should be able to represent each relation, including disagreement about it, without forcing one actor into a universal *owner* or *author* position. The jurisprudential importance lies in the consequences: a remedy for false endorsement may require changing presentation and attribution scope even when the underlying derivational link is accurate.

Social stabilization differs from a discrete appointment. Repeated citation, teaching, and automated summarization can make one person appear to be the canonical originator of a concept. The existence of that public recognition can be investigated independently of its historical accuracy. Searle's distinction between institution-dependent status and objective inquiry into it helps preserve this separation [18]. The present account additionally treats informal recognition as a process whose boundaries may remain uncertain. A repository should report the relevant audience and evidence of recognition, avoiding an inference that widespread repetition constitutes a universally valid appointment or entitlement.

### 3.3 Claims, Liberties, Powers, and Immunities

The proposed rights vocabulary uses Hohfeld's distinctions analytically. A claim correlates with another party's duty; a privilege or liberty concerns the absence of a relevant duty to abstain; a power concerns alteration of a normative relation; an immunity concerns protection against another's power [8]. Applied to repository governance, each description must name its source, counterpart, object, scope, and conditions. Calling a technical capability a right would otherwise obscure who must act and what justifies requiring that action.

A charter could give a represented person a claim to a reasoned response from the repository. It could permit a reader to reuse an authorized public view. It could empower a review panel to correct the institution's metadata. It could reserve constitutional amendments to a representative body, placing routine administrators under a corresponding disability. These are different institutional arrangements. A person permitted to file a challenge lacks an effective claim to consideration if no recipient owes a response. Likewise, a reviewer entitled to inspect evidence may lack power to publish it. The proposed model requires those differences to remain explicit.

Hohfeldian liability requires terminological care in this setting. Susceptibility to a valid exercise of power, such as an institutional metadata correction, does not establish fault, compensatory responsibility, or civil liability. Using the same term without explanation could make every reviewed contributor appear

blameworthy. The paper therefore ordinarily describes the first relationship as exposure to a bounded institutional decision and reserves claims about legal liability for a specified source and set of conditions. This choice improves public intelligibility without changing the analytical distinction.

An objection is that this differentiation creates unnecessary administrative complexity. Small communities often operate through flexible understandings without enumerating every correlative relation. The response depends on consequence. Routine editorial collaboration can rely on lightweight records; public allegations, sensitive disclosure, exclusion from participation, and irreversible export justify more explicit allocation. The framework requires enough differentiation to prevent a material authority error. It does not require a complete legal ontology before every ordinary contribution.

### 3.4 Generative Conditions and Critical Transitions

A knowledge trajectory includes conditions that a sequence of recorded events can omit. A contributor may depend on a supervisor for employment; a community may depend on a single institution for archival access; a language may have little representation in indexing systems. These conditions can affect whether an apparently voluntary disclosure, silence, or agreement supports the inference an institution draws from it. Their relevance must be examined with appropriate evidence and privacy limits. The concept of *generative conditions* supplies a place for that inquiry without presuming that the infrastructure can comprehensively model a person's life.

Critical transitions are changes that materially alter those relationships. Examples include converting a tentative note into a public finding, linking a pseudonymous contribution to a civil identity, exporting evidence beyond a custodian's control, or using a research classification to assess an individual. The importance of a transition follows from its consequences, not its storage format. A new public index can create a larger exposure than a small change to the underlying file. The proposal therefore attaches renewed review to changes of audience, purpose, authority, or practical reversibility, as developed in Section 9.

This approach also limits demands for exhaustive provenance. Recording every conversation would increase the material available to an inquiry, while possibly suppressing exploratory thought or exposing vulnerable participants. The necessary judgment concerns which conditions materially affect the particular decision and what less intrusive evidence could establish them. A protected account of a dependency may be sufficient where the underlying conversation is unnecessary. The institution must state the resulting limits on reconstruction and resist converting an omitted relationship into evidence that the relationship never existed.

### 3.5 Competence, Findings, and Remedial Matching

The proposed governance-matching principle requires an institution to connect its action to the relation it can justifiably govern. A custodian can verify its receipt history; a domain panel can assess a specified conceptual comparison; a membership body can decide its own recognition practices; a competent legal authority can make determinations within its jurisdiction. No fixed hierarchy follows from these examples. A domain panel may possess superior expertise about conceptual similarity while lacking authority to compel disclosure or decide a legal claim. Expertise and jurisdiction answer different questions.

A finding should therefore identify the proposition decided, the available evidence, the applicable standard, the institution's competence, the operative consequence, and the conditions of review. A conclusion that a provenance claim remains unsubstantiated can justify qualifying a repository description. It cannot, without additional grounds, establish deliberate deception by its speaker. Similarly, correcting a public label need not invalidate an entire research trajectory. The connection between reason and remedy should explain why the chosen intervention addresses the demonstrated problem and how it affects people whose contributions remain uncontested.

Matching alone cannot legitimate an institution that assigned itself an excessive mandate. The principle therefore has two stages: justify the source and limits of the competence, then assess the exercise of that competence in the particular case. A voluntary charter supplies a basis for some relations among

members, while representations of nonmembers generate additional demands for standing, restraint, and external remedy. Territorial legal authority remains independently relevant. Sections 4 and 11 supply the normative and doctrinal constraints against which this institutional allocation must be assessed.

## **4 Process Justice and Public Knowledge Interests**

The normative assessment of a knowledge infrastructure concerns the conditions under which people can contribute, be represented, obtain protection, and challenge consequential uses. This section develops a bounded account of process justice through explicit premises and objections. It examines participation, interpretation, recognition, restraint, and revisability, then specifies how conflicts among them should be addressed. The account is a proposal for governing public knowledge processes. It does not equate a fair procedure with a true conclusion, infer justice from participant satisfaction, or claim to resolve every distributive conflict through institutional design.

### **4.1 Normative Premises and the Object of Justification**

Three premises organize the argument. First, people affected by consequential representations have an interest in receiving intelligible reasons and an opportunity to challenge errors or unjustified treatment. Second, public inquiry has value that extends beyond the preferences of present contributors, including the ability of later participants to criticize established accounts. Third, institutions exercising power over these activities should account for the burdens they impose and maintain a practical capacity to correct their own interventions. These premises justify both preservation and restraint: evidence can support challenge, while unnecessary exposure can undermine the conditions of participation that preservation is intended to serve.

The first premise is broader than an instrumental claim that consultation improves accuracy. A person can receive a substantively correct classification through a process that disregards their account or gives them no intelligible way to question its use. The proposal treats this exclusion as a distinct reason for criticism, while recognizing that the appropriate response depends on the consequences and available institutions. Waldron's emphasis on procedural opportunities to offer evidence and argue about the application of governing norms provides a relevant antecedent [20]. Extending that concern to a repository requires a separate institutional justification; the public consequences of its representations supply the reason offered here.

An outcome-focused objection holds that scarce resources should be devoted to better conclusions rather than additional procedure. The objection matters where elaborate hearings delay urgent correction or divert resources from evidence collection. The framework answers through proportionate procedures and preventive design. A simple clerical error may require immediate correction with notice; a consequential contested attribution requires a fuller response. Procedural value constrains the means of reaching an outcome without requiring identical institutional machinery for every difference. Its adequacy must still be tested against delay, cost, and actual corrective effect.

### **4.2 Standing, Interpretation, and Effective Voice**

Contribution access and representational standing protect different interests. A repository can reasonably limit deposits to a subject domain while providing a challenge route for people described in those deposits. Otherwise, an institution could exercise public representational power over a person and then deny standing because that person lacks membership. The proposed minimum is access to a process addressing a sufficiently identified consequential representation, restriction, or omission. It is a claim to consideration under a stated procedure, with the substantive result remaining dependent on evidence and reasons.

Meaningful voice also requires an account of translation. A complaint about misrecognition may challenge the available categories, so a form demanding selection from those same categories can prevent

the issue from being stated. Fricker’s distinction between injustice in receiving testimony and injustice in the resources for understanding social experience informs this concern [6]. The proposal permits narrative intake, assisted interpretation, and challenge to the resulting encoding. A reviewer should be able to distinguish what the participant said from what an intermediary inferred and from what the institution eventually accepted.

Assistance creates another possible concentration of power. Translators and community intermediaries can determine which concerns appear reasonable to reviewers. The design therefore requires opportunities to correct an assisted record, explain a disputed translation, or obtain an alternative intermediary where feasible. A participant’s assent to a summary also needs interpretation in light of dependency and comprehension. Formal assent is relevant evidence; its meaning cannot be settled solely by an authenticated click. These requirements aim to reduce avoidable barriers without making one expression of lived experience immune from evidentiary criticism.

### **4.3 Recognition, Distribution, and Concentrated Reuse**

Credit can support livelihood, credibility, and access to further inquiry. Misattribution therefore has consequences beyond an inaccurate historical label. At the same time, an institution can distribute elaborate recognition while leaving contributors without the resources needed to maintain their work or contest its misuse. Fraser’s warnings concerning the displacement of redistribution and the reification of collective identity identify relevant risks [5]. The proposed assessment accordingly asks who receives recognition, who supplies maintenance labor, who bears exposure, and who controls the benefits created through reuse.

Concentrated reuse illustrates a difficult case. A well-resourced organization may lawfully use public material at a scale unavailable to its contributors. Scale or commercial success alone does not establish exploitation, and a universal restriction on profitable reuse could reduce the usefulness of a commons. The stronger normative concern arises where that organization benefits from underfunded maintenance, strips qualifications, obstructs correction, or makes others dependent on its exclusive discovery service. The relevant response can concern contribution to shared maintenance, preservation of corrective channels, or limits on institutional capture. These proposals need evidence about the actual relationship rather than an assumption that payment automatically measures fair return.

Recognition should also remain differentiated by kind. Collecting observations, formulating a question, translating testimony, developing a method, and maintaining an archive can each be valuable without being interchangeable shares of one authorship score. A vocabulary allowing these distinctions supports a more accurate history. Allocation of funds or formal authorship still requires a separate rule and justification. Giving every ancestral contributor an indefinite veto over later inquiry would convert recognition into a new obstacle to participation by successors.

### **4.4 Protection, Dignity, and Restraint**

The interest in inquiry coexists with a person’s interest in avoiding unnecessary exposure and coerced explanation. A public contribution can contain personal context relevant to one interpretation without making every future profile or association justified. Nissenbaum’s contextual account directs attention to both the kind of information and its movement among settings [13]. The proposal uses that distinction to require reasons for a change of audience or purpose. The fact that a fragment is accessible supplies evidence about availability, leaving the permissibility of a new use to additional assessment.

Protection cannot be equated with acquiescence to whoever demands secrecy. An institution accused of misattribution may invoke confidentiality to prevent investigation of its own conduct. A powerful contributor may seek removal of accurate criticism while weaker participants remain exposed. The framework therefore treats protection claims as reasons requiring assessment by a competent and sufficiently independent process. Review can consider restricted inspection, a nonidentifying account, or a narrower finding. If adequate challenge remains impossible without prohibited disclosure, the limitation should constrain what the institution claims to have established.

Restraint can also serve future inquiry. Exploratory work often includes mistakes, tentative analogies, and discarded formulations. A design that turns every intermediate remark into a durable public reputation can discourage the experimentation whose history it seeks to preserve. The proposal therefore permits noncollection and protected working spaces, alongside selective preservation of material needed for accountability. Decisions about those boundaries should consider the power of custodians to conceal misconduct as well as the vulnerability of contributors. No single presumption of total recording or total confidentiality resolves both concerns.

#### **4.5 Revisability, Finality, and Justified Tradeoffs**

Revisability protects the possibility that later evidence, interpretation, or institutional criticism will improve the public record. It also creates costs: repeated challenges can prolong reputational uncertainty and exhaust review capacity. The proposed distinction is between closure of a particular proceeding and immunity of its conclusions from all future criticism. A procedure can close after a reasoned decision while identifying grounds for reopening, such as material new evidence, a serious procedural defect, or a changed use that creates a different dispute. Continued republication of an unresolved allegation also requires its own justification.

Conflicts among process-justice considerations should be resolved through publicly assessable reasons at the level of the operation concerned. A decision should identify the affected interests, credible alternatives, expected burdens, source of authority, and conditions for reassessment. Some legal rules establish constraints that institutional balancing cannot override. Within the remaining discretion, the proposal favors an intervention that addresses the demonstrated problem with a defensible burden on others. This is a requirement of reasoned comparison, not a formula that transforms incommensurable values into one numerical result.

The account remains open to criticism about its premises and practical distribution. A representative body may give reasons that an affected minority rejects; an independent review may remain inaccessible; a nominally reversible measure may have durable reputational effects. Recording the reasoning makes these failures available to evaluation without proving that the reasons were adequate. Process justice consequently requires a continuing relationship among understandable representation, effective voice, bounded authority, material support, protection, and repair. The later governance provisions specify arrangements through which those requirements can be attempted and their failures identified.

### **5 Provenance, Recognition, and Downstream Inquiry**

Conceptual ancestry becomes a jurisprudential problem when a contribution history is used to allocate credit, assert control, imply endorsement, or assign responsibility. This section develops a recognition framework through the separation of chronology, derivation, contribution, founderhood, and legal entitlement. It tests that framework against independent development, translation, collaborative synthesis, dissociation, and waiver. The proposed principles protect historically warranted recognition while preserving the conditions of further inquiry. Their force remains distinct from the actual rights created by applicable law or a particular license.

#### **5.1 Contribution Histories and Evidence of Derivation**

A contribution history should specify the activity attributed and the evidence supporting that attribution. A file can identify a passage; a receipt can establish possession by a custodian; correspondence can support an inference that an author encountered a source; a revision record can show incorporation or response. Each item supports a different inference. A documented encounter alone leaves open whether the later formulation depends on the earlier one. Similar wording may support a comparison without settling which person created it, when it was created, or which common sources shaped both works.

The distinction becomes especially significant when conceptual ancestry is inferred from an AI-assisted output. A retrieval log can identify documents supplied to a particular generation call. It does

not establish that every passage in the output came from those documents, and an absent retrieval record cannot settle the model’s training history. A self-generated list of sources is itself a claim requiring verification. The proposed recognition record therefore distinguishes observed inputs, acknowledged influence, inferred dependence, and unresolved genealogy. Each label needs an issuer and scope so that later summaries preserve the original evidentiary limits.

An exhaustive reconstruction of mental influence is ordinarily unavailable. The institution should consequently decide the narrower question necessary for the remedy sought. Correcting a statement that no earlier formulation exists may require establishing one qualifying earlier record. Accusing a later contributor of deliberate concealment requires additional evidence about their conduct and knowledge. A repository can repair an inaccurate origin narrative without resolving every possible allegation concerning intention. This restriction makes a useful remedy available while reducing the risk that a provenance review becomes an unsupported judgment of character.

## **5.2 Priority, Search Scope, and Independent Development**

Priority concerns a specified ordering among specified events. Private formulation, communication to collaborators, public presentation, repository deposit, and formal publication are different event classes. A comparison should identify which class matters and what the dates establish. The earliest retained document may show that an idea existed by a particular date while leaving its precise moment of origination uncertain. A finding that one qualifying record precedes another also differs from a finding about every possible antecedent in the history of a field.

The proposed priority finding therefore includes the conceptual feature compared, event type, investigated corpus, languages and repositories searched, inaccessible material where disclosure permits, and date of assessment. These boundaries are epistemic qualifications rather than administrative decoration. Two identical terms can describe different problems, while related ideas can appear in different languages and traditions. The comparison should state which resemblance is material and allow that interpretation to be challenged. A timestamp orders records under its technical assumptions; it cannot perform the conceptual comparison.

Independent development concerns the relationship between generative processes. It can coexist with an earlier qualifying contribution elsewhere. Evidence of drafts, separate experiments, contemporaneous communication, and plausible development can support a bounded finding of independence. Absence of an identified citation or dependency edge supports a narrower statement about the available record. Treating that absence as proof of independence would reward incomplete documentation; treating every similarity as proof of dependence would penalize convergent inquiry. Both inferences require a stated evidentiary basis and appropriate uncertainty.

The resulting public description may recognize an earlier formulation and a later independently developed one, while separately crediting later validation, translation, or systematization. Such an account can preserve multiple valuable contributions without inventing a single global winner. Where uncertainty remains material, a limited or indeterminate finding is an appropriate institutional outcome. Its usefulness lies in correcting the scope of public claims and specifying the evidence needed for a more confident conclusion.

## **5.3 Founderhood and the Allocation of Authority**

Founderhood is treated here as a thick recognition status that can combine origination, organization, systematization, institutional establishment, and public association. The relevant mixture varies with the institution and audience. Merton’s examination of scientific priority and honorific reward helps explain why recognition has a social organization beyond the dates of documents [11]. The present proposal requires a founder description to identify its intended sense. A person who established a research organization can be its institutional founder even when the ideas it studies have a longer and distributed history.

An accurate founder description can still produce an unjustified authority claim. Recognition of early contribution provides reasons for acknowledgment and may support respect for relevant experience. It does not by itself justify a permanent governing office, authority to approve every interpretation, or a power to silence criticism. Those arrangements need independent grounds, procedures, and limits. A charter that assigns an initial convening role should state its duration and succession conditions. Historical priority and present governing power should remain separately revisable relations.

A possible objection invokes incentives: enduring control might encourage the costly work of establishing a field or institution. That possibility requires evaluation of the actual incentive and its burdens. Unlimited control can also discourage participation, prevent correction, and make successors dependent on personal approval. The proposed default for a public knowledge commons is bounded office and continued recognition, with any additional exclusive right grounded separately in applicable law or a defensible agreement. The argument limits the conversion of ancestry into power without denying that institutions need leadership or that some investments warrant compensation.

#### **5.4 Provenance Erasure, Appropriation, and Collective Work**

Provenance erasure concerns the loss or distortion of a materially relevant generative relationship. The wrong can involve deliberate removal of a contributor, negligent context stripping, or a schema that repeatedly makes certain work invisible. Different causes justify different responses. Restoring a source relation may correct a metadata omission, while a claim of deliberate appropriation requires additional evidence. Lawful deletion, protective restriction, unavailable evidence, and a disputed interpretation of influence should not automatically receive the accusatory description of erasure. The institution must identify the actual conduct and affected interest before assigning blame.

Collective work makes the limits of individual attribution particularly clear. A method can depend on an enduring practice without having a single identifiable inventor. Translation can alter concepts enough to constitute a substantive contribution while retaining an ancestry relation. Maintenance can preserve the conditions through which an idea becomes usable long after its initial articulation. The proposed contribution record permits collective, role-specific, and qualified descriptions, including uncertainty about individual participation. It should avoid attributing an entire community's knowledge to the person who supplied a repository file.

An anti-enclosure principle follows from the public purposes of the commons: the historical significance of a source should not automatically create new exclusive control over ideas, facts, or criticism. This principle concerns institutional governance. Existing copyright, confidentiality, privacy, contractual, or collective interests require separate assessment. A commitment to further inquiry cannot justify obtaining protected knowledge through misrepresentation or disregarding valid conditions of custody. Equally, an institution should scrutinize an asserted restriction that merely redescribes historical participation as universal ownership. Section 11 develops the relevant legal separations.

#### **5.5 Dissociation, Modification, and Public Presentation**

Relational dissociation permits a contributor to distinguish an accurate historical connection from present authorship, approval, affiliation, or control. A later work can acknowledge a source while identifying the changes made by later participants. A contributor can state that they reject the adaptation or have left the institution. The public record should preserve the relevant object and time of that dissociation. Approval of one version does not establish approval of all later versions, and departure does not by itself make the earlier contribution fictitious.

Presentation can undermine this distinction even when metadata remains accurate. Prominent use of an upstream contributor's name beside a contested application can imply sponsorship that a buried disclaimer does little to correct. A remedy should therefore examine headings, summaries, illustrations, search snippets, and attribution placement as well as the underlying relation. The proposed response may reduce prominence, add a usable dissociation, identify modification, or remove an unsupported

endorsement claim. It should address the misleading effect while respecting any independently justified need for source identification.

CC BY 4.0 provides a concrete, scoped antecedent. Its legal code separates licensed reuse from implied endorsement, requires modification indications under its sharing conditions, and requires removal of specified attribution information at the licensor's request to the extent reasonably practicable [2]. These provisions do not establish a general law of historical memory. They demonstrate why a repository cannot infer that provenance integrity always requires unchanged personal attribution in every downstream display. The applicable license, rights, evidence needs, and protection interests must be considered together.

## 5.6 Waiver, Renunciation, and the Scope of Disposition

Statements that a contributor has *waived priority* require interpretation. The person might decline an award, relinquish a contractual demand, grant reuse permissions, resign an office, request less public credit, or cease to endorse a claim. These acts concern different relationships and may have different conditions of effectiveness. Waiver of an enforceable entitlement depends on whether the applicable law permits it and whether the person can dispose of that entitlement. A personal request also cannot automatically dispose of another contributor's rights or a community's protected interest.

The proposal records the object, issuer, scope, effective time, and asserted basis of a relinquishment. It also distinguishes legal effect from a person's desire to discourage social recognition. Declining the description of founder can guide an institution's present representation while leaving the occurrence of earlier organizational work open to historical inquiry. A request to remove identifying attribution can affect publication or custody when the relevant rights and purposes justify that result. Historical persistence supplies no categorical exemption from those decisions.

This qualification addresses a central objection to strong provenance protection: a person should not become permanently trapped within every descendant of their earlier work. The framework protects both historically relevant interpretation and the possibility of changing present relations. It permits departure, disagreement, de-identification, qualified anonymity, and erasure where warranted, while requiring the institution to state the effect on available evidence. Recognition compatible with a commons is thus an arrangement of differentiated and revisable relationships, with neither unconditional historical exposure nor permanent ancestral sovereignty.

## 6 Graduated Permissions and Continuing Process Duties

This section translates the paper's account of public knowledge interests into a proposed framework for authorizing operations and sustaining obligations over time. Its method distinguishes the justification of a permission from its technical expression, then examines operation families, conflicting grounds, and continuing duties. The resulting profile is a governance proposal for institutions that validly adopt it. The legal conditions examined in Section 11 remain independently applicable. A service's ability to execute an instruction supplies evidence of capability; the permission to execute it requires a competent decision under the relevant normative order.

### 6.1 The Relational Object of Permission

A permission should identify the relationship altered by an operation. Access to an artifact, extraction of statements about people, linkage to another collection, publication of an assessment, and transfer of custody affect different interests. Describing a collection as open leaves these differences under-specified. The proposal therefore requires an operation profile naming the actor, resource, action, purpose, affected persons, relevant context, duration, decision authority, permitted output, and conditions of review. Each field has an institutional role. Purpose identifies the activity for which a use is justified; affected persons identify whose interests require consideration; authority identifies who may decide within the specified scope.

Table 1: Proposed operation profile for public knowledge governance

| Operation family          | Justification to establish                                 | Continuing responsibility                                                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Inspect and query         | Purpose, authorized audience, necessity of access          | Maintain access limits and examine disclosed metadata                      |
| Derive and link           | Permitted inputs, context change, inferential consequences | Retain bounded method provenance and review output use                     |
| Publish and export        | Release authority, audience, material qualifications       | Provide correction contact and manage known recipient notices              |
| Annotate and contest      | Standing, intelligible target, relevant grounds            | Give reasons and protect participation during review                       |
| Adopt and resolve         | Institutional competence, evidence, fair procedure         | Preserve dissent, implement the finding, and provide appeal                |
| Seal, erase, and transfer | Protection, retention purpose, custody authority           | Verify controlled effects and disclose reconstruction limits appropriately |

The profile extends the analytical discipline developed in Section 3. Hohfeld’s distinctions among claims, privileges, and powers clarify why liberty to use material and authority to change another person’s institutional position require different accounts [8]. An archive may permit a researcher to inspect a restricted record while retaining responsibility for deciding whether an identifying extract may be published. An affected person may have standing to demand a reasoned correction process while lacking editorial authority over the entire collection. A single ownership field would make these relationships difficult to distinguish and could transfer powers that their justification never established.

Context specification must remain proportionate. Recording every attribute of a requester would turn authorization into an additional source of exposure. The relevant context comprises factors capable of changing the decision: the proposed audience, the material’s sensitivity, the user’s entrusted role, the consequences of linkage, and applicable institutional or legal constraints. A decision-maker should explain why additional identity evidence is necessary when requesting it. Anonymous or assisted participation can remain appropriate for some operations, even where a custodian must privately establish a reliable contact for a protected process. Authorization design thereby shares the paper’s broader commitment to collecting enough information for accountable action while limiting unnecessary surveillance.

## 6.2 Operation Families and Graduated Consequences

Graduation concerns the expected consequences and control requirements of an operation. Local inspection can leave information within a protected boundary; publication changes who can encounter it; aggregation and linkage can alter what recipients learn; institutional adoption can confer a status beyond the source’s original assertion. These differences justify distinct decision procedures. They do not establish a universal ladder of risk: a sensitive local query may be more consequential than publishing an already authorized summary. The classification in Table 1 organizes relevant questions while leaving the final assessment sensitive to the actual case.

Publication deserves separate attention because later recipients may encounter a statement without the conditions under which it was produced. A permitted release should preserve qualifications material to its purpose, including the difference between a contributor’s account and an institutional finding. The recipient’s ability to quote a public document does not settle every question about constructing a new profile, exposing protected relationships, or representing the source as an endorsement. These further operations require their own analysis under the relevant rules. The infrastructure should make that analysis possible without asserting a universal power to control every later interpretation of public material.

Correction also changes more than bytes. A correction can affect an attributed statement, its prominence, a ranking that relied on it, or a current institutional classification. The remedy profile should identify which of these effects is required and which institution controls it. A source author’s withdrawal changes that author’s recorded commitment. An archive’s correction of its own summary changes an

institutional representation. A panel's directive can require a member to perform the latter only within an accepted mandate. Keeping these operations distinct avoids treating every challenge as a demand to erase history or every preserved history as a reason to refuse correction.

### **6.3 Permission Sources, Conflicts, and Installation**

An operation can involve several sources of permission or restraint: applicable law, a licence, a research undertaking, a custodial agreement, a community mandate, and a repository's charter. Their compatibility must be assessed according to their sources and scope. Counting permits and prohibitions cannot determine which body has authority over the contested relation. Equally, a blanket rule giving every asserted restriction priority would allow an unverified claimant to suppress inquiry. The system should distinguish an established operational constraint from a disputed claim that a constraint ought to apply, with a protected interim procedure where credible harm warrants temporary action.

The proposed sequence begins with identifying applicable sources and the institution competent to interpret them. The institution then decides the requested operation, records the reasons and unresolved questions, and delegates a bounded enforcement action to the service. Policy installation is itself a governed operation. A submitted record stating that its author has permission cannot establish the authority needed to admit or disclose that record. The control process must examine credentials and delegations against previously recognized authority, whose own legitimacy remains open to review. This separation prevents the formal representation of a claim from creating the power it asserts.

Indeterminacy requires a responsible response. An unresolved release request can be deferred while a competent institution investigates, but continuing indefinitely in that state would give uncertainty the effect of an unreviewable denial. The receipt should identify a responsible role, the missing determination, a review interval, and available alternatives such as a less revealing output. An immediate denial may be justified where the request falls outside the institution's powers. Its explanation should still distinguish lack of authority from a finding that the underlying inquiry is illegitimate. This difference matters for referral to an appropriate forum.

### **6.4 Duty Formation, Discharge, and Breach**

A continuing duty requires more structure than a condition attached to an initial permit. The proposed duty record identifies a trigger, duty bearer, beneficiary or protected interest, required action, authority source, due time or review condition, completion evidence, oversight forum, and remedy for failure. These elements explain why the duty exists and whether it can be performed. For example, accepting custody of identifying testimony can trigger an agreed duty to maintain protected access for the speaker's benefit. Publication of a material correction can trigger a duty to notify known recipient services, benefiting affected persons and readers. A charter adopting those duties must allocate resources and define the extent of expected effort.

Discharge requires evidence fitted to the duty. A sent notification establishes transmission to an address; acknowledgment establishes receipt; a checked revision establishes implementation in a controlled representation. These events support different conclusions. Where recipients are independent, the issuing institution may fulfill a reasonable notification duty while the broader harm remains unresolved. Its report should preserve that difference. Otherwise, an institution could label a remedy complete merely because it performed the easiest step within a longer causal chain. An enforceable commitment must therefore specify whether it concerns an attempt, a particular action, or an outcome within the bearer's control.

Duties also require revision when circumstances change. Loss of funding, custodial transfer, or discovery of a serious disclosure risk can make the original mode of performance inadequate. Such changes justify an application to vary the duty or transfer it under an accepted succession procedure. They do not authorize the bearer to extinguish the beneficiary's interest unilaterally. Review should examine prior planning, alternatives, and burdens on affected persons. Remedies can include assisted transfer, corrected notices, restored access, temporary suspension of new admissions, or membership consequences

within the charter. Compensation or coercive relief requires an independently established legal or institutional basis. The profile thus connects permissions to enduring answerability while keeping its sources and practical limits visible.

## **7 Distributed Responsibility and Stewardship**

This section develops an allocation of responsibility suited to knowledge trajectories involving contributors, custodians, reviewers, platforms, and AI services. Its method separates involvement, prospective obligation, answerability, blame, and remedial responsibility, then tests their allocation against divided control and incomplete knowledge. The objective is to identify actors capable of responding to a consequential representation without converting every provenance relation into responsibility for its effects. The account is a jurisprudential and institutional proposal. Findings of legal liability require the applicable rules and evidence considered within the scope of Section 11.

### **7.1 Involvement, Answerability, and Fault**

A provenance graph establishes a candidate route of involvement. It can show that an artifact was consulted, a person contributed a passage, an operator transformed a dataset, or an institution adopted a summary. Each relationship can matter to an investigation while supplying incomplete grounds for blame. A researcher whose observation is later distorted may be a necessary witness to the history without controlling the distortion. An institution may control an inaccurate public record despite having received it in good faith. These differences support a division between an obligation to explain conduct, a judgment about fault, and a responsibility to take remedial action.

Bovens describes accountability as a relationship in which an actor explains and justifies conduct to a forum capable of questioning, judging, and attaching consequences [1]. This account helps identify what a public knowledge institution must supply beyond a log: a responsible actor, a forum, a question that actor can answer, and an institutional response. The present proposal further distinguishes being answerable from being culpable. A custodian can explain the limits of its collection and assist correction even when review finds that its original conduct was reasonable. Assistance need not wait for a final determination of blame.

Nissenbaum's analysis identifies the distribution of contributions and decisions among many hands, and the displacement of responsibility onto computers, among obstacles to accountability [12]. The problem for this infrastructure appears when a source custodian, retrieval provider, model vendor, editor, and publisher each control one part of the trajectory. An investigation seeking a single originator can miss the decision that made a representation consequential. The proposed response assigns bounded responsibilities to the relevant interventions and establishes a coordination duty at the institution presenting the consequential result.

### **7.2 Control, Knowledge, Benefit, and Capacity**

Four considerations help justify prospective responsibilities, although none is a complete allocation rule. Control concerns which actor can prevent, alter, or discontinue the operation. Knowledge concerns what the actor knew, could reasonably investigate, or was specifically notified about. Benefit concerns the advantages obtained from the shared activity and the fairness of supporting its maintenance. Capacity concerns the resources and competence available to perform a response. The inquiry should explain how these factors interact in the particular relationship. Counting them or assigning universal weights would conceal the reasons for the resulting obligation.

Control provides a strong reason to require an institution to correct a representation it maintains. Its scope is bounded by effective powers: a repository can change its own metadata and send notices, while independent recipients decide their own publications under their respective mandates. Knowledge shapes supervision. A credible, sufficiently specific notice can justify investigation that would have been

unreasonable before the problem became apparent. The duty to investigate is then supported by notice and control together. Receipt of an allegation alone supplies limited grounds for publicly declaring a person responsible or suppressing a disputed account.

Benefit can justify contribution to common remedial capacity even where a beneficiary did not cause a particular error. An institution performing extensive reuse may appropriately fund preservation, translation, or shared review through an adopted membership arrangement. That distributive rationale differs from a finding that the institution caused a harm and owes a particular claimant compensation. Keeping them distinct permits sustainable stewardship without treating every successful user as presumptively culpable. It also prevents a wealthy participant from buying freedom from scrutiny by making general contributions to the commons.

Capacity constrains the form and timing of duties but requires scrutiny of how the incapacity arose. A volunteer archive may need referral and assistance to handle a complex dispute. An institution that expands ingestion while deliberately underfunding correction has a weaker reason to rely on its own backlog as a complete excuse. The proposed framework therefore examines foreseeable obligations when admission or service expansion is authorized. Appropriate consequences may involve limiting new work, funding assistance, or transferring custody. An obligation that remains impossible after such assessment must be revised honestly, with the unresolved interests retained in the decision record.

### **7.3 Consequential Adoption and AI Service Roles**

Adoption is the transition through which an institution makes an account its own public representation. A generated draft can contain unresolved suggestions, whereas its publication as an institutional summary invites a different form of reliance. The adopter should therefore identify the purpose, relevant evidence, review performed, limitations accepted, and actor empowered to correct the adopted account. A human signature alone establishes little about the quality of review. The reviewer needs time, competence, access to relevant material, and authority to reject or qualify the output.

Raji and colleagues propose internal algorithmic auditing through successive development stages, with documentation supporting an overall assessment [17]. The institutional inference advanced here concerns the relationships across organizations: procurement and service agreements should preserve access to evidence necessary for the adopter's declared public function. When a vendor cannot supply that access, the adopter must narrow the function, provide other adequate checks, or select a different arrangement. Describing a service as externally supplied does not resolve whether using it for a consequential publication was reasonable.

The model provider and deployer can hold different prospective duties. The provider can explain supplied documentation, communicate material changes, and cooperate with agreed incident inquiries within its control. The deployer can assess suitability, configure retrieval and release, and monitor particular uses. The publishing institution can correct its own claims and offer an accessible point of contact. These proposed roles require specific allocation in the deployment. They make no assumptions about AI legal personhood, authorship, or settled liability for model outputs. The institutional record attributes the relevant acts to people and organizations without pretending that complete model ancestry is available.

A service chain also needs a rule against losing a grievance through repeated referral. The first responsible institution receiving a sufficient complaint should explain its competence, retain a case contact, and coordinate referral where another participant controls necessary evidence or action. This coordination commitment does not make the contact institution the sole author of every upstream act. It protects the claimant from having to reverse-engineer the entire service chain before obtaining a response. A refusal by another participant becomes a documented limitation relevant to continued reliance on that service.

### **7.4 Causal Inquiry and Proportionate Supervision**

Retrospective inquiry should distinguish the stages at which a harmful representation acquired its meaning and reach. Source selection can omit counterevidence; a transformation can remove qualification;

an editor can misclassify a suggestion as a finding; a publisher can give that finding undue prominence. An account of causal involvement should identify evidence for each link and alternative explanations. Temporal precedence or graph distance provides an inadequate substitute for this inquiry. Multiple interventions may jointly explain the result while calling for different remedies.

The framework accordingly resists mechanical apportionment of responsibility from contribution percentages. A person making a small final edit may introduce the decisive misrepresentation, while an extensive upstream contribution may remain accurately attributed and reasonably made. Equally, concentrating blame on the last editor can conceal an institutional policy that made substantive review impossible. Review must examine both the local intervention and the conditions under which it occurred. Statements of individual fault and institutional deficiency should remain separately supported and separately contestable.

Prospective supervision should follow foreseeable consequences at a justified cost. The proposal does not require continuous monitoring of every downstream reader or all private communications. Such surveillance could create greater harm than the uncertainty it removes. Institutions should instead identify consequential uses within their service, retain appropriately bounded transformation records, respond to credible notices, and examine recurrent failure patterns. The rationale for each monitoring practice should identify its benefit, burden, protected information, and review condition. More intensive scrutiny may be justified for an institutional decision affecting a person's standing than for an unadopted exploratory draft.

## **7.5 Continuing Stewardship and Remedial Cooperation**

Stewardship links responsibility to the duration of an institution's undertaking. A custodian accepting records with specified correction and confidentiality arrangements should maintain the capacities those arrangements require, subject to an explicit succession process. Personnel changes can transfer duties to a successor role without erasing the history of earlier acts. Institutional retirement calls for a decision about pending cases, protected evidence, keys, schema interpretation, and the public notice of unavailable services. The end of operational capacity changes feasible remedies, while the record should retain an accurate account of that change.

Remedial cooperation can therefore precede final blame allocation. Institutions can restore a qualification, pause a disputed dissemination, secure exposed material, or notify known recipients while preserving disagreement over how the problem arose. Any provisional action needs a competent basis and review, since the remedy can itself affect reputation and access. The final decision should distinguish the assistance provided, the finding of responsibility, and the remaining consequences beyond institutional control. This allocation permits coordinated repair while maintaining fair treatment of contributors whose involvement has yet to be assessed.

## **8 Contestation, Review, and Corrective Procedure**

This section develops a complete proposed procedure for consequential disputes about public knowledge representations. It proceeds from standing and intake through evidence, provisional protection, reasoned findings, implementation, and appeal. Its method evaluates each stage against two competing risks: leaving affected persons without effective response and allowing review powers to suppress inquiry or impose unsupported reputational judgments. The procedure gives institutional form to the process-justice argument in Section 4. Its authority depends on the charter and other applicable sources; its outcome remains a scoped institutional finding.

### **8.1 Standing, Intake, and Definition of the Dispute**

Standing should track a material connection to the representation or its consequences. It includes the person described, an identifiable contributor, a custodian responsible for relevant evidence, and a person

or group plausibly affected by an institutional use. Public-interest submissions can also identify systemic errors without establishing a personal injury. These categories give reasons to receive and assess a request. They leave the scope of participation and the remedy to further determination. A person seeking review should not have to accept every aspect of federation membership or learn the DSL.

The receiving institution should acknowledge the request, explain its proposed route, and provide assistance sufficient to identify the contested object. A contributor may initially describe a harm in terms that do not match the repository's schema. Assisted intake should preserve that account and record how staff translated it into reviewable issues. The claimant can confirm or challenge the translation. A rejection for want of an intelligible target should ordinarily follow a reasonable opportunity to clarify, with allowances for safety, language, disability, and incomplete access to the disputed record.

Intake also identifies statutory rights requests and promptly routes them to the legally responsible body. The ordinary institutional-review schedule does not suspend applicable deadlines, fee rules, or external remedies; the proposed charter makes this separation explicit.

The first substantive determination separates the issues. A complaint about an inaccurate biography can contain questions of chronology, contribution, wording, prominence, permission, and institutional authority. A panel may have competence over some of these while others require referral. A scope notice should identify the propositions and operations under review, the source of the panel's powers, the available remedies, the evidence sought, and the questions outside its mandate. Parties should have an opportunity to identify material omissions before the proceeding becomes fixed. This step restrains authority expansion while protecting against an institution defining the case so narrowly that the alleged wrong disappears.

The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights identify legitimacy, accessibility, predictable procedure, equitable participation, transparency, rights-compatible outcomes, and learning among criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms; operational mechanisms additionally emphasize engagement and dialogue [14]. These criteria supply a relevant benchmark within that instrument's field. The proposed knowledge-review procedure adapts them through its own argument about representations, evidence, and authority. It leaves access to competent external remedies available.

## **8.2 Reviewer Competence and Procedural Equality**

Reviewer competence has epistemic and institutional components. A panel needs knowledge of the subject, ability to assess the kinds of evidence offered, and understanding of the institution's powers. A technical expert may assess a transformation accurately while lacking competence to interpret a contested historical tradition. A community representative may identify an omitted meaning while lacking independence in a dispute about that representative's own conduct. Panel composition should therefore fit the questions, with access to additional expertise whose role and influence are disclosed appropriately.

Independence requires scrutiny of appointment, resources, and case relationships. Parties should receive relevant conflict disclosures and a route to challenge an appointment. A mere disagreement with a reviewer's published scholarship provides insufficient reason for recusal; a material personal interest, dependence on a party, or prior decisive involvement can justify replacement or a limited role. The reasons should be recorded. For a small field, complete social distance may be impossible. An external procedural member, written scrutiny of expert assumptions, and explicit disclosure can provide partial safeguards, with their limits reflected in the confidence of the result.

Procedural equality concerns an effective opportunity to address the case. Identical page limits or deadlines can have unequal effects when one party controls a prepared archive and another relies on translation or reconstructing dispersed records. The panel should make proportionate adjustments and explain them to the parties. Assistance can support understanding and access without turning the institution into an advocate for a predetermined outcome. Confidential consultations concerning protection or accessibility should be distinguished from undisclosed substantive evidence, which requires its own handling procedure.

### **8.3 Evidence, Burdens, and Protected Response**

The proponent of a consequential finding should identify its evidentiary grounds. The institution also has a proposed duty to disclose or investigate material records within its control where a claimant could not reasonably obtain them. This division avoids demanding impossible proof of an internal decision before permitting review of it. An allegation can justify inquiry when sufficiently specific and plausible, even where it cannot yet justify publication as a supported conclusion. Inferences from nonproduction require notice and attention to the actual reason evidence is missing.

The proposed evidentiary record separates authentication, relevance, inference, and uncertainty. Authentication concerns what the material is and its integrity. Relevance concerns its bearing on the specified question. Inference connects the evidence to a conclusion under stated assumptions. Uncertainty records alternative explanations, missing material, and limitations of the method. A collection of authenticated documents can still support several historical interpretations. Repetition across dependent publications should be identified where possible, and absence from an archive should be assessed in light of its collection practices.

The burden appropriate to a remedy should account for its consequences. A reversible qualification pending further inquiry can be justified on a less complete record than a public finding of deliberate appropriation. An affirmative allegation of culpable conduct requires evidence concerning the conduct and the relevant knowledge or intention, with an opportunity to answer the allegation. The proposal uses reasoned evidentiary standards specified in advance for the proceeding; it makes no claim that one numerical probability threshold can govern every institutional context. The selected standard should explain how the risks of erroneous action and erroneous inaction bear on the decision.

Protected evidence presents a difficult limit. A source may face retaliation if identified, while the respondent needs enough information to challenge the inference. The panel should first examine whether redaction, an agreed summary, independent inspection, or a more limited proposition permits a fair response. It should record which safeguard was adopted and how the remaining limitation affects the finding. Where decisive evidence cannot be exposed sufficiently for meaningful challenge, a narrow protective measure may remain justified while a definitive adverse finding must await other support. Confidential custody alone supplies no reason to treat evidence as conclusive.

### **8.4 Interim Measures and Reasoned Findings**

Interim action requires a distinct decision about urgency, consequences, and reversibility. The decision should identify a plausible material risk within the institution's control, explain why ordinary scheduling is inadequate, consider less burdensome alternatives, and set a review or expiry condition. Temporary sealing may protect an exposed source; a qualified notice may protect readers relying on a misleading status; preserving relevant evidence may protect a future inquiry. The measure should avoid implying that its factual premise has already been finally determined.

Notice should precede interim action when feasible. Where prior notice would increase the relevant exposure or defeat necessary containment, prompt later notice and independent reconsideration become especially important. An officer issuing emergency measures should lack unilateral power to continue them indefinitely. Affected persons should be able to request modification on changed circumstances, including the burdens the measure has created. The panel must consider those effects as part of the case, even when the original intervention was reasonable.

A final decision should separately state its factual findings, interpretive assessments, authority conclusions, remedies, and unresolved issues. Outcomes can include a supported narrower account, a finding of material uncertainty, a corrected representation, or dismissal within the defined scope. Labels such as contested or indeterminate need explanations of what remains contested and why. The decision should also identify the evidence and standard applied, material responses, reasons for rejecting alternatives, implementation responsibilities, and appeal conditions. A majority finding and a reasoned dissent can coexist, with the operative institutional action clearly identified.

Dissent should address the record or reasons without creating an alternative means of publishing

excluded sensitive information. A panel can summarize a protected disagreement at an appropriate level and retain its fuller reasoning for authorized review. The majority should answer substantial objections, especially where they reveal uncertainty that changes the remedy's proportionality. Recording dissent gives subsequent inquiry a route to examine the decision's limits while permitting the institution to act within its competence.

## **8.5 Implementation, Appeal, and Reconsideration**

A finding requires an implementation phase. The designated operator should identify changes to controlled records, associated indexes, current summaries, and known recipient notices. The claimant and respondent should receive an appropriately disclosed account of what was completed and what remains unresolved. Review should distinguish disagreement with the merits from a failure to implement the operative remedy. A source correction can be complete within one node while the broader public representation remains unchanged.

Appeal concerns material error in the original decision or its procedure. It should be heard by a body independent of the original panel and capable of changing the outcome within the charter's scope. Its powers can include affirming, varying, reversing, or remitting the decision, with reasons. A requirement to exhaust internal appeal must not displace independently available external remedies. Appeal does not automatically suspend every measure; a separate stay decision should assess the consequences of continuing or interrupting implementation.

Reconsideration concerns materially new evidence or changed circumstances. An applicant should explain how the material could affect a specified finding or remedy. The institution should avoid asking for a repetition of the entire case when a narrower question suffices. Closure of an earlier proceeding remains a fact about that proceeding, even when a later finding changes the public account. The record must preserve the distinction between an earlier reasonable decision on incomplete evidence and an earlier decision subsequently found procedurally defective.

## **8.6 Abuse Controls and Review of the Reviewing Institution**

Procedural capacity requires protection against repetitive obstruction, fabricated submissions, and targeted harassment. Consolidating duplicate issues, directing communications through a supported channel, or restricting a proven abusive submission practice can be justified under published rules. A restriction should identify the conduct, duration, effect on legitimate participation, and route to independent challenge. A claimant's anger, unfamiliar vocabulary, or criticism of the institution supplies inadequate grounds for equating the request with abuse. Repeated submissions can also signal that an institution never implemented the first remedy.

The review institution itself can be challenged for bias, delay, conflicts, or manipulation of appointments. Complaints of systemic failure require a forum outside the implicated panel and, where necessary, outside its immediate administrative chain. Aggregate reporting should permit examination of admissibility, waiting time, assistance, reversals, and implementation while protecting sensitive cases. These records are evidence for institutional assessment rather than automatic measures of fairness. A complete procedure remains credible only if participants can contest the exercise of its powers and obtain an answer with practical consequences.

## **9 Confidentiality, Retention, and Historical Integrity**

Lifecycle governance determines which evidence remains available, to whom, for which purposes, and with which limitations on future use. This section examines those decisions through conflicts involving sensitive sources, public findings, community authority, correction, and replicated records. Its method compares the interests protected by available operations and the losses each operation can create. The resulting framework is a jurisprudential proposal linked to technical capabilities; the separate statutory

analysis in Section 11 identifies selected legal constraints. A justified loss of reconstructability remains a possible outcome.

## **9.1 Custody, Context, and Minimum Necessary Exposure**

The scope of preservation should begin with the inquiry or accountability purpose that makes information worth retaining. A custodian investigating whether a method changed may need source versions and transformation records. It may have little reason to retain unrelated personal exchanges. A priority review may need a document's reliable custody history while a public summary needs only a qualified description of the reviewed evidence. The proposal therefore separates the information needed for custody, investigation, decision, and public explanation. Treating these audiences as identical would make the most expansive disclosure the default for every purpose.

Local custody can preserve contextual expertise and reduce unnecessary movement of sensitive material. It can also concentrate discretion in an institution that controls the only surviving evidence. The relevant justification must therefore address access to review, resilience, and succession as well as physical location. A local custodian's refusal to provide an appropriate confidential review route can weaken the public claim made from its material. Federation does not remove that problem: several institutions can repeat the same unsupported assurance without creating independent evidence.

The minimum necessary exposure depends on foreseeable interpretation. A pseudonym, rare role, small geographic area, or sequence of participation can identify a person through combination. Query counts or a distinctive absence can reveal a protected record even when its payload remains sealed. The proposed review therefore includes identifiers, links, explanations, aggregations, and repeated queries. A change of audience can require renewed assessment without any alteration to the source bytes. Technical disclosure tests contribute evidence to that assessment, while its acceptance criteria require an account of the people and purposes involved.

## **9.2 Restricted Evidence and the Scope of Public Findings**

A public finding supported by restricted evidence presents a conflict between protection and contestability. Publishing the evidence can expose a source; withholding it can prevent an affected party from challenging the inference. The proposed institution should first separate propositions that require the protected material from those supported by independently available evidence. A narrower finding may be defensible on public grounds, while a more serious allegation remains unresolved. Confidentiality should constrain the claim's scope when adequate review cannot be achieved.

Where protected inspection is warranted and authorized, an independent reviewer can assess specified material, document the questions answered, and prepare an appropriately limited explanation. The affected party needs a meaningful opportunity to address the inference through available evidence or a permitted summary. This arrangement transfers some trust to the reviewer; it does not make the public account fully reproducible. The decision should state that limitation and explain the safeguards supporting reliance. Stronger public consequences require stronger justification for any remaining inability to challenge material evidence.

A custodian may object that explaining omissions itself exposes the source. That objection can justify a more general scope statement, a protected audit, or withholding a finding whose very existence would reveal participation. It cannot justify an unqualified claim that all evidence was publicly examined. The governing principle is truthful limitation of the public account within justified disclosure boundaries. Where neither adequate protection nor a defensible limited finding is possible, abstention from publication can be the appropriate exercise of responsibility.

## **9.3 Community Authority and Internal Disagreement**

Community knowledge can involve collective interests that an individual uploader cannot exhaustively represent. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples recognizes interests

in maintaining, controlling, protecting, and developing traditional knowledge and cultural expressions, together with peoples' institutional and membership authority [19]. The Declaration supplies a normative anchor here. Its particular legal effects require applicable-law analysis; the presence of its text in a national statute elsewhere cannot establish universal enforceability for the hypothetical repository.

The proposed custody procedure asks which institutions are relevant to the knowledge concerned, how their representatives obtain authority, which restrictions govern the particular practice, and how members can raise disagreement. A single *community consent* field would conceal these questions. Consultation should be appropriate to the community's procedures and permit protected individual accounts where representation is contested. The repository must also avoid appointing the most convenient interlocutor as the definitive representative simply because that person can supply a signed digital form.

Internal disagreement creates a serious limit on administrative convenience. Respect for collective authority can conflict with an individual's claim to report harm or contest exclusion. Unrestricted publication can likewise destroy a collective interest that the individual could not legitimately dispose of alone. The framework requires a situated decision with relevant representation, legal assessment, and protection against retaliation. Pending that decision, a narrow temporary restriction may be justified, provided its duration and review do not allow indefinite suppression by inaction. A generic federated policy engine cannot settle these questions by ranking all collective or individual claims first.

#### 9.4 Correction, Restriction, Sealing, and Erasure

Lifecycle remedies operate on different relationships. Correction revises an inaccurate or incomplete representation. Withdrawal changes an actor's recorded commitment. Restriction limits specified processing. Sealing retains material under protected custody. Erasure removes specified controlled material. De-identification changes the possibility of connecting information to a person, subject to evidence about the actual transformation and context. The remedy should identify its target and expected effect rather than compress these operations into one status called *removed*.

Consider a repository that accurately records an allegation whose substance is later rejected. Appending the decision can improve historical interpretation while leaving search snippets dominated by the original accusation. A response confined to append-only correction would leave the mechanism of harm active. The institution should assess present descriptions, ranking, summaries, and permitted access to the historical allegation. A restricted historical record may preserve evidence of the institution's conduct; continued public indexing requires a separate purpose and justification. Applicable rights may require more extensive removal.

Sealing also has costs. It preserves evidence for future authorized review while creating an ongoing security and administrative burden. If the custodian cannot maintain protected access or has no remaining justified purpose, sealing can defer a necessary erasure decision. Conversely, automatic deletion on request can deprive another affected person of evidence needed to challenge institutional wrongdoing. The proposed assessment considers both effects, identifies any binding retention or deletion requirement, and records reasons for the chosen scope. A technical preference for immutable storage cannot decide the conflict.

#### 9.5 Historical Views, Replication, and Revocation Limits

Historical interpretation and current disclosure use different coordinates. A person may need to understand what the institution recorded at an earlier date, while current authority determines what material that person can now receive. The system should preserve the distinction between reconstructing an earlier support state and restoring earlier permissions. A hidden withdrawal reason must not make a withdrawn assertion active again. Unavailable lifecycle information may require an indeterminate or incomplete result rather than a misleading reconstruction.

Replication makes remedy a coordinated institutional process. A custodian should identify controlled copies, known recipients, relevant caches and derived artifacts, the requests sent, and the evidence of implementation. An instruction sent, an acknowledgment received, and a verified change are different

outcomes. Unknown independent copies and material outside the operator’s control require honest limitation of a completion claim. The existence of these limits also bears on initial release: an institution should assess whether the expected public benefit warrants the difficulty of later correction or recall.

AI-mediated reuse creates further dependencies. Correcting a retrieval collection can change future answers while leaving earlier outputs available. Removing a source from an index does not establish its removal from a model’s parameters or from another organization’s training collection. The institution should identify the processing it controls and the evidence needed to assess any claimed model intervention. It should also correct its own public descriptions of the response. A promise of comprehensive forgetting would conceal uncertainty about both technical effects and independent recipients.

## **9.6 Protected Audit and Responsible Loss**

The audit of a lifecycle decision should preserve sufficient evidence for review without reproducing the original exposure. Relevant information can include the authority, target class, grounds, implementation scope, outstanding dependencies, and review conditions. The reason may itself be sensitive, and even a public tombstone may identify a protected participant. A differentiated audit can provide a general public account alongside more detailed authorized evidence. Each retained part requires an appropriate purpose and retention condition of its own.

Responsible preservation includes acknowledging when evidence has lawfully or justifiably been lost. A retained digest can support integrity comparison if a candidate copy is available; it cannot recreate erased content or independently establish what the content meant. The public record should describe the resulting reconstruction limit at a permitted level of detail. The institution can remain answerable for the decision and its implementation without claiming permanent recoverability. Historical integrity, in this framework, concerns the accuracy and accountability of the surviving account, including its stated limits, alongside the justified protection of affected persons and future inquiry.

# **10 Institutional Authority and Multi-Party Governance**

This section examines institutions capable of exercising the proposed review and stewardship powers across heterogeneous custodians. The method compares alternative governance arrangements, develops a limited allocation principle called relational jurisdiction, and tests the preferred arrangement against capture, conflicting authority, and institutional failure. The objective is a defensible distribution of competence, not an organization presumed capable of governing every public knowledge dispute. Appendix A provides a concrete charter proposal whose powers remain dependent on valid adoption and applicable law.

## **10.1 Alternative Sources and Forms of Governance**

Three arrangements clarify the institutional choice. In a custodian-centered model, each repository determines its own standards, hears requests, and corrects records under its control. This concentrates relevant operational knowledge and can reduce coordination costs. Its weakness appears when the custodian is implicated in the dispute or when a correction requires action across several institutions. The model therefore needs an external review or referral arrangement for complaints concerning its own conduct. Technical transparency alone leaves that conflict unresolved.

A centralized adjudicative body can supply common standards and an identifiable appeal structure. It can also accumulate disproportionate power over classification, reviewer appointment, and public recognition. An apparently uniform evidentiary standard may privilege the fields or languages in which the center possesses expertise. Concentrating all cases in one organization also creates a common failure point for finance, access, and capture. These are design risks whose importance depends on the institution’s actual reach and governance, rather than necessary properties of every centralized arrangement.

A federated model shares procedural commitments and review resources while retaining local custody and implementation. It can allocate substantive review to panels selected for the question and require

members to recognize findings within an agreed scope. Its costs include inconsistent interpretations, coordination delay, and dependence on reliable membership commitments. Ostrom's work on polycentric governance supports attention to multiple decision centers, local institutional fit, and nested coordination [15]. The present proposal adopts those concerns as reasons to investigate a federation, with no inference that decentralization automatically produces fairness.

Klonick's study of major platforms describes content moderation as organized governance involving rules and human decisions, with limited direct accountability to users [9]. Its relevance is that private infrastructural discretion can become consequential public power. The case does not establish that the proposed federation would reproduce any particular platform practice. It strengthens the reason to examine appointment, publication, and correction authority as institutional functions whose accountability must be specified.

## **10.2 Relational Jurisdiction as an Allocation Proposal**

Relational jurisdiction names a proposed method for allocating responsibility for a public knowledge proceeding. The inquiry identifies the contested relationship, affected persons, relevant records, institutions with effective control, and authority each institution can legitimately exercise. The resulting allocation identifies a lead forum and cooperating roles. It is distinct from territorial jurisdiction, choice of law, or the legal authority of a court. An institution cannot acquire legal competence merely by demonstrating that its records are related to the dispute.

The proposal rests on three considerations. A forum should have a material connection to the representation or action at issue. It should possess or be able to obtain the competence and evidence needed for the assigned question. It should offer adequate independence and a practical prospect of remedy. These considerations can point to different institutions. The repository controlling a misleading biography may be the right implementer, while an external panel is the appropriate reviewer of its editorial conduct. The institution retaining sensitive evidence may provide protected inspection without becoming the forum deciding every related claim.

Selection should be reasoned and contestable. A claimant can identify the institution whose representation causes concern without first resolving all interinstitutional relationships. The receiving body then determines whether it can decide the issue, should refer it, or should request a joint procedure. The parties should receive the proposed allocation and grounds for challenging it, especially where the chosen forum is funded by an implicated organization. Shared proceedings should identify which conclusions each institution will recognize and which questions remain subject to separate determination.

A lead forum needs limited powers. It can coordinate evidence requests under existing authority, manage the agreed proceeding, and issue findings within its mandate. It cannot compel unrestricted disclosure by nonmembers or dictate what independent institutions must believe. Membership can create commitments to implement certain corrections within controlled records, subject to applicable law and review. Nonmembers can be invited to participate and have their response recorded appropriately. Their refusal alone supplies limited grounds for adverse historical inference, since the body may lack legitimacy or safe procedures from their perspective.

## **10.3 Representation, Rulemaking, and Institutional Independence**

The federation's charter should distinguish constituent decisions from routine administration and individual adjudication. Constituent decisions define its purpose, membership, represented interests, reserved powers, and amendment. Administration manages resources and service commitments. Panels decide specified disputes. The separation protects against two transfers of power: administrators expanding their mandate through technical settings and adjudicators changing the constitution through an individual finding. A substantive change in access or appeal should receive scrutiny even if it is implemented as a software update.

Representation should include contributors, custodians, and materially affected persons, with mechanisms to challenge a representative's mandate. Elections among prolific contributors alone can privilege

those with the greatest time or institutional support. Reserved representation may assist excluded groups, but permanent spokespersons can entrench internal hierarchy. The proposed charter therefore combines representation with terms, disclosure, removal procedures, and periodic review of constituency boundaries. The adequacy of those arrangements requires participation by the people concerned.

Case independence requires separate appointment and review mechanisms. A publicly described pool can provide expertise, while case-specific selection examines conflicts and allows reasoned challenges. Appeals should be heard by members uninvolved in the original decision, with an external referral route when the institution itself is implicated. Appointment powers and budgets must be constrained so that an administration cannot indirectly reverse an unwelcome finding by withholding publication or future work. Any confidentiality necessary to protect persons should preserve enough procedural information for scrutiny of those decisions.

An independent panel can itself become an insulated professional group. Review of its appointments, recurring interpretive exclusions, and remedial practice therefore belongs to a different oversight function. Such oversight should assess systemic conduct while respecting the separation between institutional review and a disguised appeal of a single case. The charter can commission external examination and permit affected persons to submit evidence. The resulting recommendations, responses, and implementation should be publicly intelligible within appropriate disclosure limits.

#### **10.4 Conflicting Directions, Recognition, and Enforcement**

Participating institutions can receive incompatible directions. A contributor may demand public correction, a custodian may assert confidentiality, and an institution may identify an applicable legal restriction. A federation should record the source, scope, requested operation, and affected interests of each direction before deciding what its own mandate permits. A technical deny-overrides policy can constrain execution under a specified profile; it cannot determine the validity of competing normative claims or settle a conflict of laws.

Where a conflict remains unresolved, a temporary measure can preserve options: restricted custody, a qualified public account, or suspension of a particular export. The decision requires reasons, an accountable role, review conditions, and a route to the legally or institutionally competent body. The federation should avoid making inability to agree a permanent veto over every form of inquiry. It should consider whether a narrower operation can proceed while protecting the interest that justified the restriction. Such differentiation supports institutional restraint without making action impossible.

Recognition of a finding should preserve its precise status. A member receiving a conclusion that a chronology claim is better supported should retain its scope and uncertainty in local implementation. It may use a metadata revision, a correction notice, or a contextual explanation suited to its service. The federation can examine substantive fidelity under membership commitments while leaving implementation choices local. Persistence in materially misrepresenting an operative finding can justify proportionate membership consequences after notice and response. Suspension changes membership privileges; it does not create a general power to command persons.

#### **10.5 Finance, Capture, Exit, and Succession**

Funding is part of the allocation of public power. If review depends on a party's fees or a sponsor's annual discretion, formal panel independence may be fragile. The proposed model combines recurring support with protected review and accessibility resources, transparent conditions, and reserves for continuity. POSI's provisions on sustainable operating support, reserves, volunteer labor, and institutional succession offer relevant organizational guidance [16]. The case for the present arrangement additionally requires scrutiny of whether financial contributors can shape the questions that receive attention.

The obligation to fund common capacity should fit membership roles and means. Extensive consumers of the infrastructure can support maintenance without buying adjudicative votes. Case fees require waivers or alternatives where they would exclude affected persons, and financial incentives should avoid rewarding case acceptance independently of merit. Reviewers and translators need compensation

arrangements that protect professional judgment. Volunteer participation can supplement that work, with its limits reflected in service commitments.

Exit should remain practically usable while preserving legitimate pending interests. A member can withdraw prospectively under agreed terms and export permitted records with their schemas and qualifications. Withdrawal should neither erase the history of earlier membership nor imply acceptance of a contested finding. Pending duties require a reasoned succession or retirement arrangement. A successor must possess adequate custody authority, interpretive capacity, and resources; acquiring hardware or data is insufficient. Where safe transfer is unavailable, controlled retirement and an accurate account of lost capabilities may better serve public knowledge than nominal institutional survival.

## **11 Positive Law and the Governance Interface**

The legal analysis tests which proposed operations require qualifications beyond institutional authorization. This section specifies a hypothetical repository, examines the relevant EU data-protection layer, then considers copyright, licensing, electronic evidence, and plural authority. Its method is a bounded reading of primary instruments verified on 11 September 2026. The conclusions concern the identified provisions under the stated assumptions. They establish neither a complete comparative legal analysis nor compliance of an actual deployment. Member State implementing law, applicable case law, contract formation, and forum-specific remedies require further examination before a concrete institutional decision.

### **11.1 Hypothetical Repository and Doctrinal Scope**

Assume a nonprofit research repository established in one EU Member State. It determines the purposes and means of its own contribution index, public summaries, and voluntary correction procedure; it uses a separate hosting provider acting on documented instructions. Contributors deposit research materials and provenance descriptions, including personal data about contributors and other identifiable people. Some proposed deposits concern health or other special categories of personal data. A contemplated federation transfer would provide identifiable evidence to a recipient in a third country. No transfer, research study, or institutional pilot is reported as having occurred.

The repository is assumed to lack statutory adjudicative or public-archive powers merely by virtue of its mission. The inquiry examines Union-level provisions relevant to these facts; it does not select or infer a particular Member State's rules on archives, expression, defamation, evidence, or private associations. This choice permits concrete analysis of the common regulatory layer while identifying points at which national law is indispensable. The voluntary charter remains a proposed institutional instrument whose formation and enforceability would require applicable-law review.

Under GDPR Article 3(1), processing in the context of an establishment's activities in the Union falls within the stated territorial rule regardless of whether processing takes place in the Union. Article 2 supplies material scope and exclusions. An unrelated repository elsewhere would require its own scope assessment, including Article 3(2) where relevant [4]. A public website's reach therefore cannot serve as the universal jurisdictional premise of the entire federation.

### **11.2 Processing Roles, Purposes, and Lawful Bases**

The assumed allocation distinguishes a controller determining purposes and means from processing performed on its behalf under Article 4. Article 28 governs processor arrangements, including documented instructions, confidentiality, assistance, and the end of services. If organizations jointly determine purposes and means, Article 26 requires a transparent allocation of responsibilities and preserves the data subject's ability to exercise rights against each joint controller [4]. The institutional implication is that a federation register should reflect actual processing decisions. Labels such as custodian or peer cannot settle the role, and a convenient contact point cannot extinguish the responsibilities identified by law.

Articles 5 and 6 connect processing to principles and a lawful basis. For the hypothetical nonprofit, a public-interest mission statement is insufficient to establish a task under Article 6(1)(e), which must be read with Article 6(3). Reliance on Article 6(1)(f) would require the actual legitimate interest, necessity, and assessment against affected persons' interests and rights; the provision contains a separate limit for public authorities performing their tasks. Consent-based processing requires the conditions in Article 7. Where Article 9 applies, an additional relevant condition is necessary; research under Article 9(2)(j) requires its specified legal basis and safeguards [4].

The proposed architecture should consequently distinguish deposit, indexing, public attribution, protected review, automated synthesis, and external export in its purpose assessment. These operations need not share an identical legal basis or necessity analysis. A contributor's agreement cannot automatically authorize processing of every other person named in their account. Nor does an open license establish a data-protection basis. Article 6(4)'s compatibility inquiry and the research-related provisions require examination of actual circumstances; a reusable *research* label cannot substitute for that inquiry. A deployment may need narrower collection or a different public representation before an operation is justified.

### 11.3 Accuracy, Contestation, and Qualified Erasure

Accuracy under Article 5(1)(d) is assessed in relation to processing purposes; Article 16 addresses rectification and completion. Articles 18 and 19 provide restriction and recipient-notification rules under their specified conditions. In particular, Article 18 addresses contested accuracy during verification. Article 17 requires erasure when an applicable ground is met, subject to paragraph 3's qualifications, including necessary processing for expression and information, legal obligations or public tasks, qualifying research or archiving, and legal claims [4]. The existence of an earlier valid receipt does not decide whether continued processing meets these provisions.

The hypothetical repository's priority record illustrates the interpretive problem. Evidence may accurately show that an allegation was deposited while the public summary inaccurately presents the allegation as established conduct. The system can separate these propositions, yet the continued retention and visibility of each still require a purpose and lawful basis. Adding a correction can improve the account while failing to address an unlawful public profile or unnecessary identifying payload. A lifecycle decision should therefore identify the current representations, restricted source material, derivatives, and disclosures it affects.

Article 17(2) addresses reasonable steps to inform other controllers when the controller made data public and is obliged to erase it; Article 19 contains qualifications for recipient notification where communication is impossible or involves disproportionate effort [4]. The governance proposal's distinction among notification, acknowledgment, and verified implementation supports an accurate account of remedial scope. It does not reduce a statutory obligation to a best-effort software message or guarantee recall of every independent copy. The relevant institution must assess what the law requires and what further steps remain available.

### 11.4 Research, Retention, and Disclosure Safeguards

Articles 5(1)(b) and 5(1)(e) provide qualified treatment of further processing and longer retention for specified research, statistical, and public-interest archival purposes. Article 89(1) requires safeguards, particularly minimization. Paragraphs 2 and 3 permit specified derogations through Union or Member State law subject to necessity and the risk of making the purposes impossible or seriously impairing them. Paragraph 4 confines those derogations to the relevant processing purposes [4]. Article 89 supplies no blanket research exemption, and the repository's charter cannot create a derogation that the applicable law has not provided.

The resulting legal interface requires a preservation profile specifying which identified purpose warrants which retained relationships, for what duration or review criteria, and under which access conditions. The profile must distinguish the archive's research use from subsequent public indexing or

individual evaluation. Articles 85 and 86 expressly involve Member State or Union law in reconciling expression and official-document access with data protection [4]. Describing the hypothetical repository as public does not establish the national legal status or reconciliation required for a particular disclosure.

Articles 25 and 32 concern design, defaults, and security appropriate to risk. Article 35 requires an impact assessment where the relevant processing is likely to result in high risk, with its specified circumstances and criteria. Article 4(5) and Recital 26 also require care concerning pseudonymization and identifiability [4]. Removing names cannot automatically establish anonymity for linked contribution histories. The proposal calls for assessment of the recipient, reasonably available identifying means, relational combinations, and changed processing conditions. These are design questions for a situated legal assessment, without a claim to resolve every judicial issue concerning pseudonymous data.

## **11.5 Portability, Cross-Border Custody, and Transfer Conditions**

Article 20's portability right concerns qualifying personal data provided by the data subject, under its consent-or-contract and automated-processing conditions, with protection for others' rights. It is narrower than the paper's proposed institutional commitment to export an intelligible knowledge trajectory [4]. A wider export therefore needs separate authority for confidential evidence, other contributors' material, and protected relationships. Maintaining usable schema and provenance context can make an authorized export more intelligible while creating no independent entitlement to receive every linked record.

For the contemplated identifiable transfer to a third-country recipient, Chapter V adds requirements to the other GDPR conditions. Article 44 includes onward transfers; Article 45 concerns adequacy decisions; Article 46 concerns appropriate safeguards with enforceable rights and effective remedies; Article 49 specifies derogations for particular situations [4]. No destination's adequacy or proposed contractual arrangement is assumed here. Federation membership and a transport permission do not themselves establish a valid transfer route. The concrete recipient, access arrangements, destination law, safeguards, and relevant authoritative interpretation would require examination before transfer.

The analysis also constrains instructions arriving from other jurisdictions. Article 48 specifically addresses recognition or enforcement of certain third-country court or administrative demands through an international agreement, without prejudice to other transfer grounds under Chapter V [4]. A remote instruction should therefore enter an appropriate legal review process rather than acquire authority merely because a node authenticated it. The paper's relational-jurisdiction proposal identifies the affected relationship and competent participants; it supplies no exception from the applicable transfer rules.

## **11.6 Expression, Attribution, Licensing, and Waiver**

WIPO Copyright Treaty Article 2 distinguishes protected expression from ideas, procedures, methods of operation, and mathematical concepts as such. Article 5 addresses qualifying selection or arrangement in compilations while limiting extension of that protection to the underlying data. Berne Article 6bis distinguishes specified authorship and integrity interests from economic rights, including after transfer of those economic rights [21]. These provisions support the separation of conceptual ancestry from exclusive control. They do not resolve ownership, exceptions, database rights under other rules, patents, confidentiality, or the availability of a particular national remedy.

The repository should consequently record the protected object and actual grant when it describes a license. Permission to reproduce a particular text leaves questions about personal data, protected testimony, and other contributors' rights unresolved. CC BY 4.0 makes its grant dependent on rights the licensor has authority to license, separates specified other rights, and qualifies its treatment of waiver; its conditions also distinguish attribution, modification, and endorsement [2]. The proposed ancestry policy must respect those actual terms rather than invent an unlimited duty of personal identification or a universal ability to waive moral rights.

Waiver and dissociation should therefore be represented as scoped acts. A contributor can request removal of attribution information under an applicable license or decline institutional recognition with-

out necessarily revoking an existing reuse grant. Conversely, an institution cannot treat a copyright permission as consent to every use of identity or as release from every possible duty. The legal effect of a particular act depends on the relevant instrument and law. The normative proposal adds a reason to make those distinctions publicly intelligible where disclosure is justified.

## **11.7 Electronic Evidence, Public Findings, and Plural Authority**

The eIDAS Regulation supplies an EU-specific boundary for claims about electronic proof. Article 25 prevents denial of an electronic signature's legal effect or admissibility solely because of electronic form or absence of qualified-signature status, and gives a qualified electronic signature the equivalent legal effect of a handwritten signature. Article 46 addresses electronic documents and rejection solely for electronic form [3]. These rules do not make every signed assertion true or settle other grounds of evidentiary assessment. The hypothetical infrastructure makes no claim that its ordinary signatures satisfy the requirements of a qualified trust service.

A repository finding can support an evidentiary inquiry while remaining distinct from a court's determination. Its record should preserve the question, standard, evidence scope, issuer, competence, and review state. The publication of an allegation or adverse finding may implicate national rules governing reputation, confidentiality, and procedure; those rules have not been resolved by this Union-level analysis. Accordingly, the voluntary charter can specify internal correction powers and review commitments while leaving legal liability and compulsory remedies to the relevant authority. A legally final disposition and a later scholarly reassessment can have different objects and effects.

Plural authority remains consequential within that boundary. UNDRIP Articles 31 and 33 supply relevant normative commitments concerning traditional knowledge and Indigenous institutions, while Article 46 addresses interpretation and limitations within its stated framework [19]. Their treatment here neither converts every community request into directly enforceable law nor subordinates collective interests to a repository membership contract. A concrete deployment must investigate applicable legal recognition and engage the relevant institutions. The jurisprudential contribution is a disciplined interface: identify the relationship, distinguish each source of authority, preserve the scope of findings, and adapt operations to justified and legally applicable limits.

## **12 Worked Governance Cases**

This section applies the proposed framework through three extended constructed decisions. Together they cover the shared fixtures of scientific disagreement, sensitive local research, contested priority, AI synthesis, community authority, and correction with retirement of identifying records. Each case states its assumed record, competence, reasons, disposition, dissent, and conditions for further review. The decisions illustrate jurisprudential reasoning under a proposed charter; they are neither reports of adjudicated disputes nor evidence that the institutions would perform as intended. All persons and organizations are hypothetical. The assumed coordinating repository is an EU-established nonprofit participating in the voluntary federation, with actual legal conditions requiring the scoped analysis in Section 11.

### **12.1 Environmental Evidence, Provisional Action, and AI Correction**

The first decision concerns the scope of a scientific conclusion and the representation of criticism in a public summary. A laboratory's scheduled daytime measurements support comparisons at specified sites. Residents submit accounts of intermittent changes outside the sampling schedule. The public repository initially classifies those accounts as unsupported allegations of a particular source of pollution. Its AI-assisted summary states that the study resolved the residents' concerns. A local inquiry board funds the collaboration and controls the map displaying that summary. The board's charter authorizes review of its representations and expenditure on additional monitoring; it supplies no authority to determine environmental liability.

**Record and competence.** The panel receives the sampling schedule, measurement records, resident accounts, intake mappings, summary versions, and the editor's adoption record. Protected testimony identifies a credible risk of retaliation within the constructed facts. An independent member inspects that material, and the laboratory receives an agreed summary sufficient to address the alleged sampling gap. The panel separates three propositions: what the measurements show within their scope; whether they justify a broader conclusion about unobserved periods; and whether the published summary fairly describes the residents' submissions. Each party accepts the panel's authority over the board's publication while reserving its position on any legal consequences.

**Reasons and disposition.** The majority finds the measurements usable for their stated comparison and the broader conclusion insufficiently supported on the identified record. The residents' accounts justify investigating omitted periods, with causal attribution unresolved. The number of positive submissions has no decisive role: their independence and relevance must be examined, and the sampling schedule itself establishes a material limit. The summary also misstates the character of the accounts by treating reported experience as a specific causal allegation and treating an unanswered question as resolved.

The panel directs the repository to correct its summary, distinguish the measurement finding from the coverage dispute, and restore the residents' contribution in an appropriately disclosed form. Pending completion, the map must replace its unqualified assurance with a notice describing the limited scope of the finding. The board may fund additional monitoring under its existing mandate. The remedy addresses the representation and the investigation; it declares neither a cause of pollution nor culpability for it. The operator must provide implementation evidence for the map and summary and issue qualified notices to known recipient services. Sensitive testimony remains restricted under the reviewed custody arrangement.

A separately authorized local comparison of the reported time windows with the sampling schedule also produces a narrow derived finding: some reported episodes fall outside the measured intervals. The panel approves release of that finding after examining its purpose, release authority, and inference risk. The custodian supplies the comparison method, a bounded account of its inputs, and the independent inspection status, while withholding identifying episode details. Readers can challenge the method and seek further protected review. The public result thereby remains usable despite limits on public reproduction of the underlying comparison. Its approved scope concerns coverage, leaving the accuracy of each account and the cause of the reported episodes open.

**Dissent and response.** One member agrees that the summary requires correction but opposes an immediate change to the map's assurance, reasoning that readers may infer a new finding of danger. The majority accepts that this risk constrains wording and rejects an alarm-oriented notice. It nevertheless concludes that continued unqualified presentation perpetuates a broader inference than the evidence supports. The operative notice therefore states the comparison's scope and the pending coverage inquiry. Both opinions become available without identifying protected sources. The dissent records a disagreement about proportional communication, rather than opposition to the residents' standing.

**Temporal revision and implementation.** Later monitoring expands coverage from July, and a community reviewer withdraws a denial of coverage adequacy for July onward while retaining the denial for June. The present view consequently changes without establishing that the earlier criticism was unfounded. A later panel can revise the institutional assessment for the new period while preserving its June finding. A downstream AI service that describes the withdrawal as proof that residents admitted their accounts were false makes a further inference beyond the record. Its adopting institution must review that representation under its own responsibility. Notice transmission, recipient response, and checked correction remain distinct completion events.

## 12.2 Intellectual Priority, Independent Development, and Recognition

The second decision concerns an archive's description of a university team as the sole originator of a conceptual distinction. A small workshop group submits earlier notes, independently held meeting records, and testimony about its use of a related distinction. The university team provides a later research history and a retained AI interaction, asserting independent development. The panel's mandate concerns the archive's metadata and any correction that member publications have agreed to recognize. Questions concerning ownership of protected expression or legal liability remain outside this proceeding.

**Record and evidentiary questions.** The stipulated independent custody and associated records support the notes' existence before the university publication. They do not establish that the notes are the earliest formulation anywhere. The search record identifies the collections and languages examined. Reviewers compare the conceptual roles of the two formulations, separating similar wording from similarity in the distinction's explanatory function. The university's retained invocation contains no workshop note among its identified retrieval inputs. The record remains incomplete concerning other encounters and model training influences.

The panel treats the group's earlier formulation, the university's possible dependence, and the archive's exclusive origin description as separate issues. Evidence that the notes predate the university publication supports the first inquiry but cannot by itself resolve the second. Absence from a retained invocation supplies limited evidence about that invocation. The record permits the university to explain its process without making it prove the absence of every possible influence. Equally, its statement of independent development remains an attributed account whose support can be examined.

**Reasons and disposition.** The majority finds that the workshop articulated an earlier related distinction within the investigated record and that exclusive origination language is unjustified. It finds direct dependence unestablished. The archive must replace the exclusive description with a qualified account identifying the earlier formulation and the university's later systematization, with the evidentiary scope available through a linked finding. Several workshop participants have supported roles in discussion and documentation; the correction therefore avoids turning their collective contribution into an exclusive founder title for the person who filed the complaint.

The archive must correct its controlled metadata and notify participating services that reproduced its exclusive attribution. The workshop can provide an attributed statement distinguishing its interpretation from the later work. The university can retain a statement of its documented development process. Neither party receives editorial authority over subsequent scholarship. A requested blanket veto over future uses is declined because the panel has established a historical relation, while the asserted power requires a separate source and justification under Sections 5 and 6.

**Dissent and response.** A dissenting member finds the notes too underdeveloped to support the same conceptual classification as the university's published framework. That member would correct the exclusive wording only by acknowledging a related precursor. The majority agrees that conceptual identity is unestablished and adopts the narrower phrase *earlier related distinction* in its operative text. The remaining disagreement concerns how strongly that relationship should feature in the archive's narrative. The dissent is preserved, and the decision requires an attributed mapping through which later scholars can examine the comparison rather than encountering an unqualified equivalence assertion.

**Reconsideration and limits.** A participant in the earlier group subsequently produces material suggesting that a university researcher received a workshop note. The panel reopens the dependence question only if the submission supplies material grounds to assess that connection. Establishing receipt would still leave the role of the note in the final argument to examination. Pending review, the archive avoids a public accusation of appropriation unsupported by a finding. A revised decision can alter the account of dependence and extend the remedy while preserving what the earlier panel reasonably concluded on its

limited record. The case illustrates recognition through differentiated correction, with continued inquiry protected for all participants.

### 12.3 Community Custody, Derived Disclosure, and Retirement

The third decision combines an unauthorized repository upload, a proposed public derived result, and a later request to retire identifying evidence. A community archive holds interviews and practice descriptions under an assumed custodial agreement limiting disclosure. One participant uploads a copy to the federation, claiming authority to release the collection. Another participant supports wider access, while the archive's governing group objects and seeks removal. The repository has also generated a proposed summary through local analysis, and an independent recipient has copied the upload. The case assumes no settled conclusion about the governing group's representativeness.

**Record and authority inquiry.** The receiving institution establishes that possession of the copy and the uploader's assertion of permission were treated as sufficient for release. That admission practice failed the adopted authorization profile: the source of custodial authority and the scope of any release permission required independent examination. The panel's immediate competence concerns the repository's own disclosure and its membership commitments. It invites the community's governing group, uploader, interview participants, and dissenting member to participate through protected channels. It leaves broader questions of community representation open to an appropriately constituted process.

The governing group's objection identifies a protected interest but supplies no automatic permanent veto over every member's account of personal experience. The uploader's interest in dissemination likewise does not establish power to release other people's interviews. The panel separates individual testimony, collectively entrusted material, descriptive metadata, and the proposed derived output. This division permits decisions addressed to particular operations while preserving the dispute about representative authority.

**Interim and final disposition.** An emergency officer temporarily disables the repository's public payload, index entries that disclose protected relationships, and the proposed summary. Prompt independent review finds that the measure is justified by the specific exposure and available alternatives. The panel orders a controlled-copy inventory and a request to the known recipient to restrict its copy. The recipient's independent status limits compulsory consequences under the charter; the repository must record the request and response accurately.

After review, the panel concludes that the original upload lacked the authority required by the repository's adopted rules. Controlled public copies must be removed, with any necessary protected retention separately justified under the applicable legal and custodial conditions. The proposed summary receives a distinct decision. In the constructed facts, combining its small-area descriptions with public contextual material could reveal participating households. The panel therefore declines that version and permits consideration of a less specific account describing the inquiry's method and unresolved issues. Any later release requires reviewed authority and disclosure conditions. No statistical anonymity guarantee is inferred from aggregation alone.

**Retirement, dissent, and residual harm.** One interview participant then seeks retirement of identifying records, including the protected review copy. The panel requires an individual lifecycle determination concerning the purpose and authority for continued retention, with minimized interim access. In the stipulated outcome of that separate legal and custodial assessment, no established purpose requires continued retention of this participant's identifying material: the authorization failure can be documented adequately through a less revealing record. The panel grants retirement for the identified controlled copies and the linking records that would reconstruct the participant's identity. The custodian must verify those changes, disclose any residual controlled backup limitation, and give a date for its resolution. The decision declines to promise erasure from independent recipients. A permitted public notice can

describe correction of an unauthorized release without identifying the archive members; even that notice is reviewed for inference risk. The retained decision records which evidentiary materials are unavailable for future reconstruction and limits later inferences accordingly.

A dissenting member would publish a richer explanation immediately to expose the repository's failure and avoid concealing internal community disagreement. The majority accepts that accountability requires public reasons but finds the proposed detail unnecessarily identifying. It directs publication of the authorization failure, remedial scope, and remaining uncertainty in a protected form, with independent inspection of the fuller record. The dissent is published at the same level of protection. The arrangement leaves a substantive tension between public verification and confidentiality, whose costs appear in the finding instead of disappearing behind a generic privacy label.

## **12.4 Comparative Implications of the Decisions**

The cases establish different grounds for superficially similar interventions. A qualified notice responds to insufficient evidentiary scope in the first case, an attribution correction responds to overstated historical exclusivity in the second, and restriction responds to defective release authority in the third. None supplies a general remedy for every knowledge dispute. Each decision identifies the institution's competence, the proposition established, the action required, and the interests left unresolved.

The decisions also preserve disagreement without suspending institutional action indefinitely. Minority reasons can alter remedy wording, inform appeal, and guide future inquiry while one operative direction governs a member's controlled record. Implementation evidence remains necessary after the reasoning is complete. These cases provide concrete objects for evaluating the framework's coherence and for later institutional exercises; their outcomes remain proposals to be challenged by participants, legal assessment, and experience.

## **13 Normative and Institutional Evaluation**

This section evaluates the framework at the level warranted by its current evidence and specifies the research needed to assess its institutional effects. The method separates argument analysis, comparison of governance arrangements, operational exercises, and participatory inquiry. The objective is to identify what would support, narrow, or defeat the proposed commitments. The worked decisions in Section 12 provide analytical tests. They supply no observations of actual adjudicative performance, legal compliance, participant satisfaction, or corrective effectiveness.

### **13.1 Argument Reconstruction and Counterexamples**

The framework's first evaluable claim is that differentiated relationships support better-matched governance. The cases identify what changes when a distinction is removed. Treating chronology as ownership would let an earlier formulation acquire downstream control without an independent justification. Treating institutional admission as truth would allow a technically accepted record to defeat its own evidentiary challenge. Treating withdrawal as negation would misrepresent a contributor who ceased endorsing a proposition without asserting its opposite. These counterexamples support the need to preserve the distinctions; they leave open whether the proposed representation is the simplest adequate way to do so.

The claim for broad standing requires a limiting argument. A person materially affected by a record can have reasons to demand review despite contributing nothing to the system. Unlimited compulsory adjudication of every submission, however, would permit strategic exhaustion. The proposed response distinguishes intake, admissibility, substantive review, and repetitive conduct, with reasons and independent scrutiny of exclusions. A counterexample would defeat the response if an institution could repeatedly dismiss legitimate criticism as abuse while formally satisfying its own rules. Evaluation must therefore examine whether the second-order review actually reaches the disputed exercise of power.

The permission framework faces similar tests. Giving every asserted restriction priority could allow strategic enclosure; permitting every technically derivable output could expose protected relationships. The proposed operation-specific determination avoids those universal rules, but discretion can become unpredictable. The remedy is a requirement to state applicable sources, material interests, alternatives, and reasons in a reviewable form. The argument would need revision if these requirements generated unmanageable cost without improving the ability of affected persons to understand and challenge outcomes. Procedural elaboration is therefore a hypothesis about responsible judgment, not an end in itself.

### **13.2 Comparison of Institutional Arrangements**

Institutional comparison should consider a well-supported local custodian, a central review body, and a federation with shared panels. Each needs comparable resources appropriate to its scale. A richer technical system with an unfunded appeal process provides a weak comparator to an accessible archive whose staff can correct errors effectively. The investigation should examine independence, evidence access, interpretive competence, cost, delay, implementation reach, and the practical availability of exit. Its conclusions may favor different arrangements for different domains.

Bovens distinguishes democratic, constitutional, and learning perspectives on accountability assessment [1]. Their plurality supports examining representation, control of power, and institutional responsiveness separately. A panel may improve consistency while making local participation harder; a highly participatory process may remain ineffective at implementing its findings. The proposed evaluation should retain such mixed outcomes. Agreement on a result and adoption of a common charter provide evidence of particular institutional acts, rather than proof of justice.

A useful comparison also varies the distribution of power within an arrangement. Removing an appeal route, funding guarantee, translation service, or correction contact should change specified capabilities. These changes can initially be examined through constructed exercises. Later observation must investigate whether the expected mechanism occurs in practice, including adaptation, informal work, and resistance. The adequacy of a safeguard depends on how participants use it and how the institution responds when challenged.

### **13.3 Governance Exercises and Technical Realizability**

An institutional exercise can follow a synthetic file through notice, scope definition, protected evidence, interim measures, findings, dissent, appeal, and implementation. Evaluators should introduce a conflict of interest, a missing authority record, a late correction, and a recipient refusing to act. The exercise tests whether the procedure identifies a responsible decision at each stage and produces an intelligible account of unfinished work. It should include challenges to the review body itself, since ordinary cases can conceal dependence on administrators' goodwill.

Technical realizability requires a separate assessment. The language package can represent attributed assertions, temporal applicability, controlled transitions, and authority interfaces. It does not establish that a competent reviewer exists, that an institution will respond, or that a permitted explanation is adequate. Each proposed duty should therefore map to a capable actor, a technical operation where relevant, and an implementation or explicit gap. An operation recorded as executed should be distinguished from evidence that its intended remedy took effect.

Governance exercises must report their status accurately. A tabletop decision can demonstrate a plausible route through a procedure while leaving actual implementation untested. A semantic fixture can expose an invalid workflow transition while leaving the underlying mandate unexamined. Recording those limits makes the results useful to subsequent research instead of allowing successful simulation to stand in for institutional readiness.

### **13.4 Participation, Burdens, and Corrective Effects**

Participatory assessment should involve people who contribute to records, people represented by them, custodians, reviewers, and downstream users. Recruitment through institutional leadership alone could miss dissenters, nonusers, or persons excluded by current categories. Appropriate research review, consent, confidentiality, and support arrangements should precede work with participants. The present paper supplies a proposed protocol scope without claiming that such research has occurred.

Evidence should include comprehension of notices, ability to challenge a mapping, access to assistance, time to response, time to implemented remedy, cost, exposure, and the fate of dissent. Quantitative indicators need interpretation. Few appeals can reflect satisfaction or exclusion; rapid closure can reflect efficient correction or cursory dismissal. Follow-up should examine whether a correction changes later summaries and institutional uses, who performs the work, and whether the remedy creates fresh exposure. A single justice score would conceal the conflicts the framework seeks to make answerable.

### **13.5 Legal Compatibility and Conditions for Revision**

The doctrinal analysis supplies bounded constraints whose relevance depends on the deployment's actors, operations, and legal setting. Evaluation must check the actual allocation of authority, retention bases, information rights, and available remedies before presenting an institution as compliant. A proposed charter can strengthen participation but cannot resolve every conflict of law or substitute for external legal powers. Uncertainty should identify its source and practical consequence for the operation under examination.

The framework should be narrowed when its procedures exceed sustainable capacity, when affected persons cannot challenge operative classifications, or when a shared institution concentrates the power it was intended to control. Appropriate revisions can include simpler records, stronger external review, limited collection, a different forum, or refusal of a proposed use. Such findings would be substantive research results. The present contribution is the argued framework, concrete proposed instruments, and assessable cases; institutional effectiveness remains an open empirical and normative inquiry.

## **14 Discussion of Normative Tensions and Institutional Limits**

The proposed framework connects differentiated authority to continuing duties and effective review. This section examines objections that remain after those distinctions and procedures are specified. It considers the basis of public authority, the competing risks of appropriation and enclosure, procedural burdens, protection and historical integrity, and limits of institutional and legal reach. The discussion identifies conditions under which an apparently complete governance process could frustrate its own public purposes.

### **14.1 Public Interests and the Justification of Authority**

An appeal to public knowledge can justify preserving consequential records and making institutional conduct answerable. It can also become a broad formula for overriding the interests of the people represented. The framework therefore requires specification of the public interest served by a particular operation. Preservation for an evidentiary inquiry, disclosure for public scrutiny, and reuse for a new research purpose need not entail identical access or retention conditions.

The difficulty extends to institutional representation. A custodian may possess expertise and resources without a mandate to speak for everyone affected by its collection. A community body may have a legitimate role while its membership or particular decision remains internally contested. An independent panel may improve review while introducing new questions about appointment, accountability, and authority. Institutional differentiation must therefore be accompanied by reasons for each allocation of power. Independence from the original decision-maker is valuable, but it cannot replace a legitimate basis for the reviewing body's competence.

The proposal leaves room for several institutional arrangements. A small archive can use a shared external review service; a larger federation may support its own panel under a bounded charter. Their adequacy depends on the affected relationships, available resources, and external avenues of redress. A universal organizational blueprint would obscure those conditions. The common commitment is that power over a consequential representation must remain identifiable, limited, and open to effective challenge.

## **14.2 Recognition, Appropriation, and Freedom of Inquiry**

The distinction between recognition and control creates a possible objection from contributors whose work becomes economically or institutionally valuable to later actors. A mere acknowledgement may offer little remedy where dependence was concealed, labor was exploited, or a community's knowledge was detached from the conditions of its authorized use. Protecting freedom of inquiry does not settle those distributive questions. The institution must examine the particular relationship, commitments, protected subject matter, and benefits at issue.

Conversely, a broad authority attached to conceptual ancestry can burden every later interpretation with an expanding chain of approvals. Such a system could empower early or well-documented contributors to decide which criticisms or developments become possible. Historical contribution then acquires an institutional force that exceeds the grounds established by the provenance record. The framework requires a separate justification for each downstream restriction, including a defined object, duty bearer, scope, and review route.

Several remedies can consequently be appropriate without converging on one status hierarchy. A record may correct an attribution, qualify an exclusive priority claim, identify dependence, acknowledge uncertain ancestry, or distinguish a contributor's dissociation from a later endorsement. A separate inquiry may address compensation or a breach of a governing agreement. The choice depends on the established relation and relevant authority. An undifferentiated founder designation would provide less information and could intensify disputes over future control.

Independent development remains particularly difficult to assess. Absence of a recorded transmission path cannot prove absence of influence, while similarity cannot alone establish appropriation. A finding should identify the search scope, evidence examined, alternative explanations, and residual uncertainty. Later discoveries may justify revision. The infrastructure can support this inquiry while retaining the possibility that historical origins remain plural or partly unknowable.

## **14.3 Procedural Rights and the Burden of Administration**

Procedural opportunities require resources. Notice, translation, protected evidence, reviewer time, reasoned decisions, and implementation of remedies can impose substantial work. If access to the process depends on a participant's ability to supply technical records or sustained argument, formal standing can coexist with practical exclusion. Equally, an institution that promises unlimited review without resources may deliver long delays and inconsistent treatment.

The framework therefore permits proportionate intake, prioritization, and closure rules while requiring reasons and an independent route for challenging their application. Prioritization should consider consequence, urgency, and access barriers, with safeguards against treating frequent institutional users as inherently more credible. Repeated submissions can be abusive, yet repetition can also reflect a failure to respond to an unresolved harm. A numeric quota alone cannot distinguish those cases.

Another objection concerns the administrative expansion of ordinary inquiry. Exploratory disagreement should not always become an adjudicative proceeding. Institutions can offer informal correction, mediated clarification, and low-burden annotation when these fit the consequences and participants' interests. Formal review becomes necessary where power, exposure, or a materially adverse representation requires a stronger safeguard. The framework should preserve a range of responses and make escalation possible.

Procedure also risks becoming a substitute for substantive judgment. A panel can follow every documented step while applying an exclusionary category, accepting a distorted account of public benefit, or refusing a proportionate remedy. Evaluation must examine the underlying reasons, distribution of burdens, and practical effects. A completed workflow records that the process reached a status; it cannot establish that justice was done.

#### **14.4 Historical Integrity, Protection, and Responsible Loss**

Generative preservation can make omissions visible and help explain the conditions of a decision. Its value may therefore appear to support keeping every version indefinitely. Yet detailed histories can expose people long after their participation, make experimentation risky, or retain harmful classifications after their public use has been rejected. The claim to historical integrity requires a purpose and scope that can be assessed against these effects and applicable duties.

The proposal distinguishes several possible responses: correction of an operative representation, restricted custody of evidence, qualified public explanation, de-identification where effective, and justified erasure or retirement. Each can preserve some interests while limiting others. A public tombstone may protect accountability in one setting and reveal the existence of a sensitive record in another. The appropriate explanation therefore depends on its audience and the information it exposes.

Loss of replay completeness can be a responsible outcome. A repository may be unable to reproduce an earlier view after protected material is lawfully or justifiably removed. It should describe the available scope without pretending that a retained digest recreates the missing content. Some reasons may remain available only to a protected reviewer. Public accountability then depends partly on the credibility and contestability of the oversight arrangement rather than universal inspection of the source.

These choices also distribute trust. A restricted evidentiary review can support a bounded institutional finding while leaving outsiders unable to repeat the analysis. The institution should explain what assurance the review provides and which uses would exceed it. Confidentiality cannot justify an unrestricted demand that the public accept every conclusion. Where sufficient grounds cannot be disclosed or independently assessed, the appropriate consequence may be a narrower finding or limitation on use.

#### **14.5 Relational Competence and External Legal Orders**

The proposed relational approach identifies which institution has a relevant connection, mandate, and capacity to address an operation. It does not create territorial jurisdiction or displace applicable law. A federation's power to correct its own metadata can be clear while its power to compel an external publisher remains absent. A participant's agreement can allocate obligations among members without binding every person described in their records.

Conflicting directions may therefore remain unresolved within the infrastructure. A contributor, custodian, community institution, regulator, or court can assert different grounds concerning the same material. The system should preserve their sources and scopes and identify when competent external advice or adjudication is needed. An interim restriction may protect against further exposure while a conflict is assessed, but it requires limited duration and review. Treating every asserted restriction as decisive could facilitate censorship; treating every public-interest claim as decisive could facilitate appropriation.

The legal stress test in this paper is deliberately narrower than a complete deployment analysis. A selected Member State, legal form, contracts, record categories, and cross-border operations can introduce additional rules or alter the application of those examined here. The jurisprudential proposal can criticize a legal minimum or argue for stronger charter commitments, but it must identify that argument as normative. Legal validity, institutional legitimacy, and ethical adequacy retain different conditions of assessment.

## 14.6 Institutional Capture and Conditions of Revision

An institution can formally distribute power while concentrating effective control through funding, expertise, appointments, or ownership of essential services. A review panel with a protected mandate may still depend on a single sponsor for its staff and access to evidence. An export right may offer little practical exit when participants cannot preserve schemas, interpretive context, or continuing care for affected people.

The framework addresses these risks through transparent resource allocation, bounded delegation, conflict disclosures, review of appointments and rules, usable portability, and succession arrangements. Their effectiveness remains an empirical question. The charter is a proposal for deliberation, and the constructed cases establish analytical consequences under stated assumptions. They supply no evidence that a particular community would endorse the framework or that an implemented institution would resist capture.

Revision should follow evidence about whose claims become intelligible, whose burdens increase, which remedies take effect, and where authority escapes scrutiny. A feature may need to be simplified, a power reassigned, a preservation practice narrowed, or an institutional arrangement abandoned. Maintaining that possibility is part of the proposal's account of public knowledge governance. The institution's own rules and histories must remain objects of justified criticism and change.

## 15 Conclusion

This paper has developed a jurisprudential framework for public knowledge infrastructure organized around relations, transformations, and continuing institutional responsibilities. Its argument connects the preservation of knowledge trajectories to the powers through which representations become credible, consequential, restricted, corrected, or retired. The resulting framework treats authority as a matter of source, scope, competence, and review, and treats provenance as evidence requiring interpretation.

The first conclusion concerns differentiation. Historical occurrence, evidentiary reconstruction, institutional recognition, and legal consequence have distinct conditions of assessment. Contribution, authorship, custody, endorsement, public office, and exposure likewise support different possible claims and duties. A governance process should identify the relation at issue before assigning control or responsibility. The mere presence of a person in a provenance graph cannot complete that assignment.

The second conclusion concerns public process. Meaningful participation requires more than the ability to store a challenge. Affected persons need accessible standing, an appropriately competent reviewer, reasons, protected handling of evidence, proportionate interim measures, and a route to effective correction or other remedy. These requirements extend to the institution's classifications and governing rules. Technical completion of a review workflow supplies relevant evidence of action while leaving the justice of the procedure open to assessment.

The third conclusion concerns temporality. Responsibilities can arise at collection, translation, synthesis, adoption, publication, and later reuse. Prospective supervision, dependency review, correction propagation, and succession therefore belong beside retrospective accountability. Their scope must remain proportionate to the actor's role, knowledge, capacity, control, and applicable commitments. Historical integrity can support these duties while also yielding to justified protection and responsible loss of replay completeness.

The ancestry analysis joins recognition to freedom of further inquiry. Preserving contribution histories can counter erasure and misleading appropriation. Downstream control nevertheless requires a separately justified basis. Accurate recognition can coexist with independent development, uncertain priority, dissociation from later endorsement, and plural accounts of origination. Institutions should preserve those distinctions rather than converting complex histories into permanent hierarchies of authority.

The scoped legal analysis and constructed decisions identify compatibility conditions and unresolved questions for institutional design. They do not establish a universal legal regime, a deployment-wide compliance result, or measured effectiveness. The proposed charter and procedures make the framework

concrete enough for further deliberation, comparative exercises, and appropriately designed participatory research.

The framework's public value will depend on whether people can use it to obtain intelligible reasons, contest consequential representations, protect legitimate interests, and sustain further inquiry. Its own allocation of authority must remain revisable under the same demands. Generative public knowledge governance consequently includes both the histories of knowledge and the accountable institutions through which those histories are used.

## **A Proposed Stewardship Charter and Decision Record**

This appendix supplies a concrete institutional instrument for criticism and adaptation. Its clauses express the proposal developed in Sections 6–10; they have not been adopted by an operating federation. The schedule is a proposed baseline whose feasibility requires assessment before accession. Applicable law, valid custodial commitments, and independently available remedies remain relevant. The instrument proceeds from purpose and powers to participation, review, implementation, and succession, followed by a template for reasoned decisions.

### **A.1 Constitution, Purpose, and Reserved Powers**

**Article 1. Public purpose.** The proposed association exists to support responsible preservation, interpretation, contestation, correction, and continued development of public knowledge. Members identify the collections and services brought within the charter. Its purpose creates no authority to settle every historical, political, or legal dispute. Operations require a stated institutional mandate and consideration of affected persons.

**Article 2. Accession and competence.** An accession schedule names the member, covered resources, custodial roles, accepted review powers, implementation responsibilities, contact, and applicable limitations. The association may issue scoped findings and require corrective action within accepted powers. Authority over nonmembers requires an independent basis. Participation in a case alone creates no general membership obligation or waiver of external remedies.

**Article 3. Representation and amendment.** The constituent assembly includes contributor, custodian, and affected-public representation under published selection and challenge procedures. Financial contribution confers no additional case vote. Representatives disclose material interests and serve defined, reviewable terms. Changes to purpose, membership, appeal, disclosure powers, or asset succession require prior notice, responses from affected constituencies, and the amendment majority specified in the accession schedule. Administrators cannot adopt such changes through technical configuration alone.

### **A.2 Operations, Duties, and Review**

**Article 4. Permission and stewardship.** Each protected operation identifies actor, resource, purpose, authority, affected interests, permitted output, conditions, and review route. Describing permission in a submitted record cannot authorize that submission. Continuing duties identify trigger, bearer, beneficiary, action, due condition, evidence of completion, oversight, and remedy. Members resource accepted duties and seek a reasoned variation when material difficulty becomes foreseeable.

**Article 5. Standing and assistance.** A person materially affected by a covered representation may seek review without becoming a member or using a formal language. The institution provides accessible intake, reasonable assistance, and a means to contest staff interpretation of the request. Public-interest

submissions concerning systemic errors receive an identified route. A rejection states reasons and an independent challenge process.

**Article 6. Procedure and schedule.** The proposed baseline acknowledges intake within five working days and issues an initial scope or clarification notice within twenty working days. Parties ordinarily receive thirty calendar days to respond to a settled scope and disclosed evidence. A reasoned decision is due within sixty calendar days after the evidentiary record closes. Extensions require reasons, revised dates, and consideration of affected persons. Material prejudice caused by delay can be referred independently; elapsed time alone never decides the merits.

These are general institutional-review targets. Intake separately identifies statutory rights requests and routes them promptly to the responsible body. For the EU repository considered here, requests under the GDPR retain the controller's applicable Article 12 duties concerning timely action and information, qualified extensions, and fees [4]. Pending charter proceedings never suspend applicable statutory deadlines, substantive duties, or external remedies. Ordinary case fees and discretionary waivers under this charter cannot replace the statutory treatment of rights requests.

**Article 7. Independence and protection.** Panel selection assesses competence and conflicts, with reasoned appointment challenges. Protected evidence receives separate access and disclosure decisions, sufficient response opportunities, and an account of unresolved fairness limits. Emergency action requires specified harm, competence, necessity, alternatives, and expiry conditions. An independent reviewer examines it within five working days; continued restriction requires renewed reasons. Public notices receive their own disclosure assessment.

**Article 8. Findings, appeal, and conduct.** Findings distinguish evidence, interpretation, authority, remedies, dissent, and uncertainty. An appeal may be filed within thirty calendar days of a reasoned decision, with justified extensions for inaccessible notice or other material barriers. The appeal body excludes original decision-makers. Reconsideration remains available for materially new evidence or changed circumstances. Conduct restrictions address specified abuse, preserve legitimate participation, and carry reasons, scope, duration, and independent review.

### **A.3 Implementation and Institutional Continuity**

**Article 9. Correction and accountability.** Members implement operative remedies within the decision's specified period, preserving its scope and evidentiary status. They distinguish changed controlled records, notices sent, responses received, verified implementation, and unresolved consequences. Material inability to comply requires an explanation and proposed alternative. Persistent unjustified nonperformance can trigger proportionate membership consequences after notice and response.

**Article 10. Finance, oversight, and succession.** The association publishes funding conditions and protects resources for review, assistance, maintenance, and orderly transition. Complaints about institutional capture receive a forum outside the implicated body. Withdrawal acts prospectively under the accession terms and preserves an accurate, appropriately disclosed membership history. Pending obligations receive explicit disposition. Transfer requires adequate successor authority and capacity; otherwise, controlled retirement governs protected records and the explanation of unavailable services.

### **A.4 Template for a Reasoned Decision**

A decision under the proposed charter should use the following headings as an institutional writing template. The template is a record of reasoning and responsibility; completing its fields supplies no independent proof that a procedure was fair.

1. **Identity and competence.** Case identifier, issuing body, members, declared conflicts, authority source, covered resources, parties, and matters outside competence.
2. **Issues and procedure.** Exact propositions and operations, requested remedies, notice, assistance, opportunities to respond, interim measures, and material procedural objections.
3. **Record and assessment.** Evidence considered, access limitations, authentication, relevance, inferential assumptions, standard applied, missing material, and alternative accounts.
4. **Findings and reasons.** Conclusions for each issue, their scope, material responses, rejected alternatives, uncertainties, and the distinction between institutional status and any separate legal question.
5. **Disposition and implementation.** Authorized operations, responsible bearers, beneficiaries, deadlines or review conditions, completion evidence, recipient notices, and remaining control limits.
6. **Dissent, disclosure, and further review.** Minority reasons, approved public account, protected record conditions, appeal body and period, reconsideration grounds, and the status of any stay.

Implementation receipts and later decisions should link to this record while retaining their own dates and authority. A revised finding changes the current institutional account and leaves earlier reasoning available only under appropriately justified retention and access conditions.

## References

- [1] Mark Bovens. Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4):447–468, 2007. Publisher abstract accessed 11 September 2026.
- [2] Creative Commons. Attribution 4.0 international: Legal code, 2013. Version 4.0 published 25 November 2013; official legal code inspected 11 September 2026.
- [3] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) no 910/2014 on electronic identification and trust services. Consolidated text of 18 October 2024, CELEX 02014R0910-20241018, 2014. Articles 25 and 46 inspected in official English text, 11 September 2026.
- [4] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation). Official Journal of the European Union, L 119, 4 May 2016, pp. 1–88, 2016. Selected provisions inspected through CNIL’s official republication of the French text, including indicated 2018 corrigendum, 11 September 2026.
- [5] Nancy Fraser. Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 2000. Issue 3, May–June; accessible publisher introduction inspected.
- [6] Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- [7] Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom. A framework for analyzing the knowledge commons. December 2005 chapter draft; author order differs in the published chapter, 2005.
- [8] Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld. Some fundamental legal conceptions as applied in judicial reasoning. *The Yale Law Journal*, 23:16–59, 1913. Original article text reproduced by Wabash College.
- [9] Kate Klonick. The new governors: The people, rules, and processes governing online speech. *Harvard Law Review*, 131(6):1598–1670, 2018. Publisher text accessed 11 September 2026.

- [10] Sally Engle Merry. Legal pluralism. *Law & Society Review*, 22(5):869–896, 1988.
- [11] Robert K. Merton. Priorities in scientific discovery: A chapter in the sociology of science. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6):635–659, 1957. Original article reproduced in a teaching collection; JSTOR stable identifier 2089193.
- [12] Helen Nissenbaum. Accountability in a computerized society. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 2:25–42, 1996. Publisher record and author-hosted text accessed 11 September 2026.
- [13] Helen Nissenbaum. Privacy as contextual integrity. *Washington Law Review*, 79(1):119, 2004. Starting page follows the publisher’s recommended legal citation.
- [14] Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Guiding principles on business and human rights: Implementing the united nations Protect, Respect and Remedy framework. Technical Report HR/PUB/11/04, United Nations, 2011. Principles 29–31 consulted; accessed 11 September 2026.
- [15] Elinor Ostrom. Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. Prize Lecture, 8 December 2009. The Nobel Foundation, 2009. Accessed 11 September 2026.
- [16] POSI Adopters. The principles of open scholarly infrastructure. Version 2.0, released October 2025, 2025. Accessed 11 September 2026.
- [17] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Andrew Smart, Rebecca N. White, Margaret Mitchell, Timnit Gebru, Ben Hutchinson, Jamila Smith-Loud, Daniel Theron, and Parker Barnes. Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020. Author manuscript accessed 11 September 2026.
- [18] John R. Searle. Social ontology: Some basic principles. *Anthropological Theory*, 6(1):12–29, 2006.
- [19] United Nations General Assembly. United nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. Resolution 61/295, 13 September 2007, 2007. Declaration inspected in the official schedule to Canada’s implementing Act; no generalization of the Act’s national legal effects.
- [20] Jeremy Waldron. The rule of law and the importance of procedure. In *Getting to the Rule of Law: NOMOS L*, pages 3–31. New York University Press, 2011.
- [21] World Intellectual Property Organization. WIPO copyright treaty and referenced provisions of the berne convention. Treaty adopted 20 December 1996; WIPO Publication No. 226, 1996. WCT Articles 2 and 5 and Berne Article 6bis inspected.