

Continuing Responsibilities after the Closure of Community Workshops

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

Community workshops can change participants' practical options through access to equipment, acquired skills, shared projects and relationships. Their closure can therefore leave morally relevant questions after the organized activity has ended. This paper develops a conditional account of continuing responsibility in that setting. It distinguishes historical contribution, an interest setback, wrongdoing, blame and responsibility for a response. A preliminary multidimensional responsibility profile is revised into arguments indexed to a particular bearer, participant, response and horizon. Induced reliance, surviving commitments, present control, institutional role and remedial capacity can support different grounds; their relevance requires explicit normative premises and evidence. The analysis uses hypothetical workshop cases and a bounded comparison with research on foundation funding. It examines notice, project completion, transfer, participant organization, compensation and acknowledgment, including circumstances in which closure is justified or continued involvement would renew unwanted control. The central proposal is that ending a programme and discharging its actors' responsibilities are distinct assessments whose connection depends on the grounds of the specific claim. The resulting framework preserves legitimate finite commitments and mutual benefit while making continuing effects, practical alternatives and fair allocation available for scrutiny. Empirical application, competing moral foundations and the resolution of difficult distributive conflicts remain open.

Keywords: community workshops; programme closure; continuing responsibility; induced reliance; participant capabilities; remedial obligations

Research Purpose and Scope

This note states the purpose of circulation, the status of the argument, and the role of research assistance. The paper presents current insights for criticism and wider discussion in public and scholarly settings. It makes no claim to conceptual priority. Similar concepts and arguments may already exist in other disciplines, languages, and intellectual traditions; further comparison may alter the terminology, scope, or contribution.

Definitions organize a bounded inquiry. Conditional formal results carry their stated assumptions, and illustrative cases support conceptual analysis. Empirical validation, wider applicability, and the adequacy of proposed normative premises remain open where the main text identifies those obligations. Relational analysis supplies a method of investigation while stronger ontological questions remain suspended.

AI assistance contributed to source discovery and pre-use verification, argumentative development, formal checking, organization, and drafting. The accompanying project records distinguish retained research insights, newly proposed analysis, and verified literature. The manuscript is prepared for the author's review; circulation and submission decisions remain with the author. Critical responses concerning antecedents, assumptions, counterexamples, and alternative formulations are welcome.

DRAFT

1 Introduction

This paper examines moral responsibility for adults' practical options after the closure of community workshops devoted to making, repair or the development of participant projects. It first identifies the object of evaluation and relevant philosophical antecedents, then develops ground-specific arguments for continuing action. Temporal analysis and hypothetical comparisons test the proposed account against legitimate closure, limited resources, participant disagreement and renewed control. The method combines conceptual distinctions, expressly stated normative premises and conditional derivations. Its objective is to make particular responsibility claims assessable without treating a workshop's influence over a person's life as a standing entitlement to direct that life.

A shared workshop can supply more than a sequence of completed sessions. A participant may acquire a technique, begin a project requiring particular equipment, find collaborators or discover an activity worth pursuing. These changes can be valuable even when the programme has a known end date. They can also create dependence on conditions that the organizer continues to control. A closure announcement therefore concerns both a bounded organizational activity and a history through which later options have developed. The two objects overlap, while their boundaries can differ.

Consider an expressly hypothetical participant who develops a weaving project using a community workshop's loom. The programme has fulfilled its scheduled teaching sessions, yet an agreed collection arrangement, access to the participant's own design notes and the practical possibility of moving unfinished work may remain relevant. A conclusion about completed teaching addresses a particular undertaking. A conclusion about the remaining arrangements requires attention to their own grounds. The example leaves open whether the organizer owes extra loom time, help finding a successor or any financial support. Those responses differ in cost, authority, justification and effect.

The motivating research insight is that termination can leave consequences of a relationship in place. Its normative interpretation needs care. Almost every meaningful association changes those who participate in it. A rule assigning indefinite responsibility for every subsequent change would make ordinary commitment difficult to justify and could give earlier supporters an excessive place in later lives. Conversely, a rule treating administrative completion as sufficient discharge would overlook commitments and controllable obstacles whose relevance continues beyond that event. The present account develops a more specified inquiry.

The paper's central proposal concerns the grounds of a particular response. Historical contribution may matter to a corrective claim. A justified expectation may matter to reliance. Control over an unfinished transfer may identify an actor capable of completing it. A separately defended institutional role may justify assistance even when that actor caused none of the original difficulty. These routes can converge, conflict or remain unresolved. Their relationship supplies a substantial part of the analysis.

The scope is moral philosophy. References to organizers, funders and successor bodies identify possible institutional actors whose actual authority requires investigation. Existing legal duties depend on the applicable jurisdiction and facts and remain outside the paper's conclusions. The hypothetical workshops are analytical constructions, with no claim to report an observed organization. A selected study of voluntary-sector funding provides a limited practical comparison, preserving the difference between participants' reported concerns, the researchers' recommendations and this paper's normative argument.

The contribution is a method of distinguishing and developing continuing responsibilities within a concrete relational setting. It preserves the value of finite programmes, shared aims and legitimate reciprocity. It also makes room for participant projects whose continuation requires a different institution, an altered practice or a deliberate ending. The success of a response is assessed through its justified target and conditions, leaving organizational survival one possible means among several.

2 Workshop Closure and the Object of Evaluation

This section defines the practical setting and the interests to which the responsibility inquiry applies. It distinguishes the workshop organization, participant activities and the conditions through which those activities remain possible. The discussion then specifies the people, temporal horizons and evaluative judgments that a later responsibility claim must identify. These definitions are working instruments for a bounded analysis.

2.1 The shared workshop arrangement

A community workshop combines some organized access to space, equipment, instruction or cooperation for adult participants engaged in making, repair or related projects. The arrangement can be publicly funded, charitable, member-supported or mixed. The inquiry concerns functions performed within the arrangement, so its moral assessment remains sensitive to differences among those forms.

Definition 2.1 (Workshop arrangement). A workshop arrangement is an organized provision through which specified participants can undertake practical projects using shared conditions under identifiable terms of access, participation and control.

The definition leaves the extent of the undertaking open. A single demonstration and a year-long shared facility establish different expectations and practical dependencies. A workshop can also be one activity within a continuing organization. Closing that activity need not dissolve the body that controls its records or equipment. Conversely, the body itself may become unable to act. Responsibility analysis should therefore locate the relevant actor and function before using the general term “closure.”

2.2 Practical options and developing activities

A practical option concerns an activity available to a person under specified conditions. Permission, equipment ownership and learned skill can contribute to that option, while each can remain insufficient in a particular arrangement. A transferred tool may require a suitable place, instruction, transport or an acceptable schedule. The adequacy of a response depends on those connections.

Definition 2.2 (Practical option). A practical option is a specified activity that a participant can feasibly undertake within a declared horizon and under the relevant material, informational, relational and institutional conditions.

The generative dimension concerns activities that can sustain, develop or change later possibilities. Learning a technique may enable another project; shared work may create a continuing association. This dimension gives future conditions a place in evaluation. It leaves the value of a particular trajectory open to argument and to the participant’s interpretation. Greater output, more projects or a larger count of nominal options supplies an incomplete measure of that value.

2.3 Participants and other affected people

The focal participant may have interests in completing work, retaining access to personal materials, continuing a valued practice or leaving the relationship. Other participants can have incompatible preferences. Staff, volunteers, funders, neighbours and people awaiting access elsewhere also have relevant interests. Identifying a continuing responsibility therefore requires both a directed claim and a view of the burdens imposed on others.

Adult participants retain a distinct place in interpreting the activities at issue. An organizer may understand the equipment better while understanding the personal significance of a project less well. A participant may understand that significance while lacking information about feasible transfer. Practical judgment can require both kinds of knowledge. Participation in the assessment supplies a means of bringing them together; it leaves disagreement and unequal influence open to scrutiny.

2.4 Continuation, change and termination

The target of a response can be the same activity, a modified activity or a protected decision to stop. A former participant might prefer a smaller practice at home, a different medium or an unrelated pursuit. The workshop's earlier aim gives historical context, while the person's present judgment helps specify the future target. Retaining the previous institution can sometimes obstruct that change.

A time horizon must also be stated. Safe collection of unfinished work within a month differs from a five-year opportunity to use specialist equipment. Immediate assistance can preserve a later route without guaranteeing its success. Conversely, a short-lived substitute can leave the important interruption untouched. Temporal specificity prevents an apparently modest act from standing in for a much broader promise.

2.5 The evaluative sequence

An observed change first requires description. Its connection to the workshop then requires historical or causal support. A disadvantage requires a defended comparison and a reason to value the affected interest. Wrongfulness and responsibility introduce further questions about justification, authority, commitments, competing interests and feasible responses. The sequence organizes inquiry; evidence and evaluation can require repeated revision.

The resulting distinctions permit a programme to have benefited a participant overall while leaving an avoidable closure burden. They also permit a participant to experience a real loss through a justified ending. These possibilities explain the need for a responsibility account that neither infers every verdict from historical benefit nor treats every disappointment as an institutional wrong.

3 Antecedents in Responsibility and Reliance

This section locates the inquiry among selected accounts of remedial responsibility, vulnerability, structural participation and assurance. Each comparison identifies the verified source position, its relevance and the additional argument required in the workshop setting. The purpose is to establish an intelligible philosophical foundation while preserving differences among theories. The comparisons provide antecedents and objections; they leave a comprehensive genealogy open.

3.1 Remedial responsibility and its allocation

In *National Responsibility and Global Justice*, Miller distinguishes responsibility for remedying a morally concerning condition from causal, moral and outcome responsibility for its production. His selected discussion considers six connections: moral responsibility, outcome responsibility, causal responsibility, benefit, capacity and community. Capacity itself involves both effectiveness and the costs of acting. The discussion also examines conflict among grounds and resists a simple general ranking [4].

This analysis bears directly on the question of allocation. An organizer may have contributed to a difficulty while a successor has the equipment and premises needed to address it. The present paper retains the question of historical responsibility while separately examining who can perform the required act. An allocation that only identifies the earlier contributor may leave the participant without a workable response.

The workshop inquiry nevertheless needs an independent account of the condition that merits attention. A lost leisure option, an unfulfilled undertaking and severe deprivation differ in moral importance. Transferring a remedial vocabulary from urgent rescue to every programme closure would conceal that difference. The present proposal therefore specifies the interest, materiality and comparative burden before developing an allocation. It uses the distinction among grounds without adopting a single complete theory of their priority.

3.2 Vulnerability and the terms of dependence

Goodin's published abstract for "Vulnerabilities and Responsibilities" grounds special responsibilities in the beneficiary's vulnerability, extending their basis beyond voluntarily assumed obligations. It also presents the welfare state as an institutional means of discharging some such responsibilities through acceptable dependency relations. The present reference is limited to that abstract-level position [2].

The relevance lies in the limits of an inquiry confined to explicit undertakings. An organizer may control a condition on which a participant has become practically dependent without having promised permanent provision. That situation merits examination even while the content of any duty remains unsettled. The history of dependence, available alternatives and costs of action are therefore important to the proposed account.

Dependence also requires a qualitative assessment. A stable shared workshop can be more enabling than isolated ownership of inadequate equipment. A participant may reasonably choose continuing support. The question concerns the relationship's terms, including access, voice, revision and the distribution of burdens. Treating independence from every other actor as the universal objective would conflict with the very value of a shared facility.

3.3 Structural participation and collective action

Young's published abstract presents a social connection model of responsibility for agents participating in structural processes that produce injustice. It emphasizes shared, forward-looking responsibility, attention to background conditions and collective action. Its motivating example concerns transnational clothing production. These are the source claims used here; the article's detailed later parameters remain outside the present attribution [5].

This comparison raises a question that an organizer-centred account can miss. A workshop may close within a wider pattern of resource decisions involving funders, property owners and public institutions. Identifying the immediate closer may be insufficient to understand the conditions or organize a response. The possibility of a shared responsibility therefore remains part of the inquiry.

The possibility supplies an investigative direction, leaving the actual classification open. A particular closure requires evidence before it can be described as a consequence of structural injustice. Moreover, a collective response can coexist with a specific undertaking owed by one actor to one participant. A broad appeal to shared responsibility should preserve those directed claims and the practical tasks that can already be completed.

3.4 Assurance, reliance and fulfillment

Kolodny and Wallace's "Promises and Practices Revisited" examines the relation between assurance and the social practice of promising. In discussing Scanlon, the authors distinguish preventing loss from reliance from fulfilling a promise's specific content. Their own account gives a role to both directed assurance and the practice of promising. The distinction matters because warning or compensation can address some reliance losses while leaving a promise's fulfillment requirement unresolved [3].

For a workshop, repeated renewal, an encouraging remark, a scheduled course and an explicit completion undertaking can create different expectations. A participant's confidence that provision will continue is evidence about belief; its justification requires attention to the organizer's words, conduct and circumstances. A claim grounded in a valid promise additionally needs its content, conditions and authority to be established.

This paper's reliance argument therefore leaves the stronger commitment question intact. A proposed transition package may be a proportionate response to avoidable loss while falling short of an existing undertaking. Conversely, a finite undertaking may be fully performed while another controllable obstacle remains. The analytical benefit is the capacity to identify these separate grounds and avoid substituting one response standard for another.

3.5 The scope of the present reconstruction

The selected antecedents support different questions: the allocation of remedial tasks, vulnerability beyond explicit agreement, shared participation in wider processes, and the specific force of assurance. Their conjunction supplies neither a unified moral theory nor an automatic verdict. The present account uses them to construct explicit alternatives and identify the premises on which a responsibility claim depends.

The proposed contribution concerns the temporal and practical organization of those claims at workshop closure. A response must have a target, an actor capable and appropriately placed to act, a justification for the burden and a way to assess completion. This organization can help identify disagreement between theories. Two accounts may support the same short transition act for different reasons while disagreeing sharply about longer assistance or compensation.

Philosophical comparison should preserve that disagreement. A framework that hides it inside an apparently comprehensive score would make the result less assessable. The following sections state the proposed grounds and their limits in forms that permit a reader to reject, revise or supplement them without losing the underlying practical question.

4 The Structure of a Continuing Responsibility Claim

This section specifies the unit of normative assessment and revises the preliminary responsibility profile. It separates questions about an earlier event from questions about a present response, then explains the different roles of evidence, moral grounds and practical feasibility. The result is a reporting structure for particular arguments, with explicit limits on aggregation.

4.1 The directed and specified claim

A continuing-responsibility claim should identify its bearer, the person or group to whom the response is directed, the required act, its horizon and its asserted ground. “The funder remains responsible” leaves each of these elements uncertain. It can refer to answering questions, completing a transfer, providing money, supporting coordination or accepting blame. Those claims may have different truth conditions.

Definition 4.1 (Continuing responsibility). A continuing responsibility is a morally justified requirement for a specified actor to perform, arrange or refrain from a specified response whose relevant performance extends beyond the closure of the focal workshop activity.

The definition includes completing a bounded act after closure. It also includes refraining from obstructing a justified transfer or protecting information still held. Continuing physical presence, renewed teaching and organizational survival are possible contents of particular duties, each requiring its own justification. The definition also leaves room for several actors to hold distinct responsibilities concerning one participant’s situation.

4.2 The separate responsibility questions

Causal responsibility concerns contribution to the relevant change. An evaluative judgment identifies an interest setback under a defended comparison. Wrongfulness concerns the permissibility of conduct; blame additionally concerns conditions under which an actor is appropriately held culpable. A remedial question concerns the response now required. A legal claim requires the relevant legal basis. These questions can share facts while differing in their governing standards.

For example, an unexpected loss of premises might produce a serious interruption despite prudent planning. The absence of supported blame would leave open whether the organizer can complete a low-cost transfer of participant materials. Conversely, an earlier wrong might persist as a matter requiring acknowledgment even after the original actor loses the practical capacity to provide equipment. The relevant response can change without rewriting the past assessment.

Table 1: Roles of information in a continuing-responsibility assessment. The fields organize a particular claim and supply no numerical duty score.

Analytical role	Relevant content	Interpretive requirement
Claim specification	Bearer, participant, response and horizon	Identify the actual normative proposition
Historical evidence	Contribution, communications, reliance and wider causes	Separate temporal sequence from supported connection
Affected interests	Activity, standing, materiality and comparison	Defend the interest and the evaluative baseline
Grounding argument	Commitment, corrective reason, reliance, role or assistance	State the premise connecting facts to a requirement
Response conditions	Control, capacity, reversibility and feasible alternatives	Establish effective and appropriately authorized action
Burden assessment	Costs, protected interests and competing claims	Assess proportionality and allocation
Review conditions	Evidence gaps, changed circumstances and discharge	Preserve revision and a justified stopping point

4.3 The preliminary profile and its revision

The preliminary research profile identified causal connection, control, standing, materiality, foreseeability, reversibility, mitigation, proportionality and countervailing considerations. The list preserves useful questions. Its elements have different logical roles, however, and acquire different importance under different accounts of responsibility.

Table 1 reorganizes the profile around those roles. The first part concerns the facts and interests relevant to a particular claim. The second concerns the argument that connects them to a responsibility. The third concerns the response's practical and moral conditions. This organization permits several arguments to use the same fact differently.

4.4 Ground-specific relevance

Foreseeability illustrates the need for the revision. What an organizer could reasonably anticipate when encouraging a project can bear on blame for a later interruption. What the organizer can now recognize and remedy concerns a different time and question. A present assistance claim may therefore remain intelligible when past foreseeability is absent. Treating every original coordinate as a necessary condition of every responsibility would exclude that possibility by definition.

Reversibility likewise requires a target. Reversing the participant's acquired skill would be an unusual and often objectionable response. Reversing an access restriction could be useful. An irreversible loss may require acknowledgment, compensation or support for a different route. The impossibility of literal restoration therefore changes the remedial inquiry without automatically settling it.

4.5 Evidence, uncertainty and aggregation

The profile should record whether a relevant proposition is supported, challenged or unresolved, together with its evidence. Uncertainty about a causal pathway differs from disagreement about a normative premise. Treating both as a low numerical value would conceal the work needed to improve the assessment.

A weighted sum would require commensurable scales, justified weights and an account of compensation among dimensions. A product would require a reason to make every component necessary. The present argument supplies neither structure. It preserves several ground-specific arguments and reports where they converge or conflict. This is a deliberate epistemic choice: the record should reveal the reasoning that a final responsibility judgment needs.

5 Relational Change and the Choice of Comparison

This section examines the evidence connecting workshop participation and closure to a person's later options. It distinguishes historical contribution from a simple before-and-after observation, then develops several comparison points for different normative questions. The method uses conditional cases to identify inferential limits before drawing conclusions about responsibility.

5.1 The history of changed conditions

Participation can change skill, confidence, access to equipment, project commitments and relations with others. The resulting practice may depend on several conditions developed at different times. A closure can remove one condition while leaving others in place. Describing the history requires attention to both the contribution of the workshop and the participant's own activity.

A historical sequence provides an initial record. The participant joined, developed a project and later lost access. That sequence leaves several explanations possible. The workshop may have encouraged reliance on unusually specialized equipment. The participant may have independently chosen that specialization with adequate alternatives. A wider change may have removed all comparable premises. The appropriate inquiry identifies the proposed mechanism and the evidence distinguishing it from these rivals.

An institutional or constitutive connection can also matter. An organizer may have accepted responsibility for storing a participant's materials or for certifying completed work. The connection then concerns the terms and performance of a role, alongside any causal effects. Its existence requires evidence about the arrangement and its authority. A statement that the institution "shaped the landscape" is too general to establish either type of connection.

5.2 Comparison with an absent workshop

The history in which the workshop was never offered can help assess whether participation conferred benefits. It may also reveal dependence introduced through a chosen specialization. That comparison requires a plausible alternative history, including what the participant could have done with the time and resources involved.

The comparison has limited force for evaluating closure. A participant may be better off than in the absent-workshop history while facing an avoidable loss caused by the manner of ending. Earlier benefit therefore leaves a question about a currently feasible response. Conversely, the existence of a closure loss does not erase the benefits of participation. The two evaluations can coexist because they compare different arrangements.

5.3 Comparison with continuation

Continued provision is relevant when a valid undertaking or a defended practical target makes it an appropriate comparison. Its feasibility and cost must be stated. An imagined indefinitely funded workshop can exaggerate what any actor could reasonably supply. A time-limited completion period can be a more relevant alternative for an unfinished project.

A promise of continuation, where established, adds a normative basis distinct from mere practical desirability. Its scope and conditions determine the relevant comparison. A clause about funding, a stated cancellation condition or a later authorized revision may affect that scope. These features require interpretation; a general preference for continuity cannot replace it.

5.4 Comparison with a feasible closure arrangement

The most useful comparison for many transition questions preserves the decision to close while changing a particular aspect of implementation. An alternative might provide earlier usable notice, return materials,

coordinate a limited completion session or transfer information with permission. The comparison isolates a proposed response without assuming that the old organization must survive.

Claim 5.1 (Benefit and avoidable closure burden). A participant's benefit from attending a workshop can coexist with a material disadvantage relative to a feasible alternative manner of closing it. Evidence for the former comparison leaves the latter comparison open.

The argument has four steps. First, identify the participant's position under the absent-workshop history. Second, assess the position after the actual programme and closure. Third, identify a feasible alternative closure that retains the earlier programme. Fourth, compare the actual and alternative closure outcomes using the same defended interest and horizon. Improvement over the first history is compatible with disadvantage against the third. The claim concerns the compatibility of evaluations; actual causal attribution requires support for the alternative's effects.

5.5 Comparison with fairer background provision

A further comparison asks whether the broader distribution of workshops, premises or funding is defensible. This can identify a structural concern that a local transition response leaves unresolved. It can also reveal that saving one familiar institution would consume resources needed by people who have had little access at all.

The broader inquiry should remain visible without absorbing every immediate claim. Returning a participant's materials may be justified while fair regional provision remains contested. Conversely, completing local transfers may leave a serious distributive pattern unchanged. A responsible assessment therefore identifies the comparison appropriate to each claim and records the outstanding question at the other scale.

6 Grounds for Continuing Action

This section states the proposed normative premises and derives limited conclusions from them. It distinguishes commitments, institution-supported reliance and independently grounded remedial roles. The derivations specify the additional evidence and countervailing considerations needed before a pro tanto reason becomes a particular all-things-considered duty. Their purpose is to make the moral bridge explicit.

6.1 Surviving commitments and protected interests

A valid commitment can specify performance after the workshop's ordinary activity ends. An agreement to store work for collection is a simple hypothetical example. Whether the commitment survives depends on its actual scope, conditions, authority and any justified modification. Closure is relevant to that interpretation, while supplying no universal answer.

Claim 6.1 (Scope of termination). Closure supports treating a specified responsibility as discharged or expired only when the valid scope or justified ending conditions of that responsibility connect closure to its discharge or expiry.

The argument begins by specifying the claimed requirement. It then identifies the event described as closure. Next, it examines the rule, commitment or moral ground connecting that event to the requirement's duration. Finally, it infers discharge, expiry or persistence only within that connection. A requirement expressly limited to scheduled teaching may end with those sessions; a separately established collection undertaking may remain. The conceptual result clarifies the scope of an inference and leaves its normative premises substantive.

Protected interests can also require particular conduct after ordinary interaction has ceased. Holding personal information or another person's materials can make confidentiality, preservation or return

relevant. The applicable moral and legal grounds need separate specification. A general ending should therefore trigger an inventory of continuing functions and the particular duration of their associated responsibilities.

6.2 The proposed reliance premises

The reliance argument concerns a participant who has organized a valued activity partly through the workshop's conduct. The relevant belief must have a defensible basis; the interest and prospective loss must also be sufficiently important. These conditions distinguish the claim from a demand that an organizer secure every hope associated with participation.

Assumption 6.2 (Defensible practical interests). Participants can have morally relevant interests in pursuing specified practical activities and in avoiding material, preventable losses to those activities, subject to the legitimate interests and claims of others.

Assumption 6.3 (Responsiveness to induced reliance). When an institution has supported a justified reliance through its communications or conduct, that relationship supplies a moral reason to consider the material losses that a change under its control would impose on the relying participant.

Assumption 6.4 (Proportionate and respectful response). A feasible response gains moral force when it materially addresses the relevant loss, lies within appropriate authority, respects the participant's agency and protected third-party interests, and imposes a proportionate burden under a defensible allocation.

These premises are proposed commitments of the account. Their adequacy remains open to criticism. In particular, reasonable reliance can be disputed, institutional responsibility can be distributed, and proportionality requires comparison with actual competing claims. The premises do not define reliance as whatever generates a duty; they identify independent facts and evaluative judgments that need support.

6.3 The reliance argument

The conclusion concerns a reason for a specified response. It remains narrower than a universal obligation to continue the programme or reproduce every former opportunity.

Claim 6.5 (Reliance-sensitive response). Under the three proposed premises, supported justified reliance and a material prospective loss give the appropriately placed institution a pro tanto reason to undertake a feasible, proportionate and respectful response that addresses that loss.

The derivation has five steps. First, identify the participant's activity and defend the interest at stake. Second, establish the institution's contribution to a justified reliance, distinguishing that contribution from mere temporal association. Third, show how the contemplated change exposes the interest to a material loss. Fourth, identify a response whose effectiveness, authority and burden satisfy the stated conditions. Fifth, apply the reliance and response premises to infer a reason for that particular act. The inference leaves rival claims and the final allocation available for further assessment.

An overall duty requires more. The relevant opposing considerations must be examined, including stronger commitments, burdens on others, alternative responsible actors and the participant's permissible choices. A finding that the specified reason remains undefeated under an adequate assessment can support a limited duty. A record containing unresolved serious conflicts should retain a qualified conclusion. Calling the reason pro tanto acknowledges this argumentative state without making the initial reason empty.

6.4 Role and remedial capacity

An assistance claim can begin from a different ground. Suppose a community body has an independently justified role in helping displaced participants find an accessible alternative. If that role extends to the

relevant circumstance, appropriate capacity and a proportionate effective response can support action even when the body caused none of the closure. The claim depends on the role's justification and scope, not on rewriting the body's causal history.

Claim 6.6 (Role-based remedial action). An independently defended assistance requirement, a justified allocation to an actor, and an effective, proportionate response within that actor's authority can support remedial responsibility while blame for producing the original difficulty remains unsupported.

The steps are to establish the assistance requirement, justify the actor's allocation, assess effective and appropriately authorized performance, examine competing claims, and state the resulting requirement within its scope. The first two steps carry substantial normative work. Capacity alone supplies a possibility of action; it requires an additional reason to become a duty borne by that actor. Greater capability can matter while leaving relative burdens and a fair division of work unresolved.

6.5 Multiple grounds and response content

Several grounds can support one response. An organizer may have promised to return materials, control the storage location and possess the practical capacity to arrange collection. Convergence can strengthen the case while leaving the grounds analytically distinct. If one premise fails, another argument may still support the act.

The grounds can also support different acts. An earlier wrong can justify acknowledgment, while present capacity supports coordination by a successor. Benefit from the arrangement may be relevant to contribution, but its character requires examination: receiving an ordinary justified benefit differs from retaining an advantage connected to an unjust loss. The framework therefore preserves a reasoned allocation by response, avoiding a single undifferentiated verdict about who "owns" the whole problem.

7 Responsibility across the Closure Process

This section develops the temporal structure of the account. It considers entry, ordinary participation, preparation for closure, the period after closure and the conditions of discharge or revision. The phases identify changes in available knowledge, control and practical options. They can overlap, and their boundaries require evidence in an actual programme.

7.1 Entry and the design of finite provision

Entry establishes the declared scope of the programme and the conditions under which participants begin to rely on it. A finite workshop can be valuable and legitimate. Clarity about duration, equipment access, project ownership and the limits of follow-on support helps participants assess that opportunity. The relevant information concerns foreseeable mechanisms and terms; complete knowledge of future outcomes is rarely available.

Design choices can also affect the cost of eventual transition. Portable project files, accessible instructions and clear arrangements for unfinished materials may preserve useful options. These are proposed possibilities whose costs and effects need assessment. Some practices require specialist equipment that cannot sensibly be individualized. Choosing such a practice can remain justified when its limitations are intelligible and the resulting value warrants the commitment.

7.2 Participation and changing reliance

Reliance can change while the workshop operates. A short demonstration may develop into a substantial project, or repeated renewals may alter expectations about continuity. The inquiry should examine what the organizer encouraged, what the participant understood and which alternatives remained adequate. A fixed entry document provides evidence of initial terms while leaving later communications relevant.

Monitoring can be proportionate to the foreseeable risks. An organizer may need a workable way to identify projects that would be difficult to move or participants for whom ordinary collection procedures are inaccessible. That inquiry should seek information relevant to a response while respecting privacy. An intrusive biography of every participant would create a different burden and could discourage participation.

7.3 Preparation for closure

Once closure becomes a live possibility, the available information and feasible responses can change. Earlier communication may allow participants to alter projects or seek alternatives. Premature certainty about an unresolved funding decision can also mislead. The appropriate practice is to communicate the status of the decision, the limits of current knowledge and the point at which further information will be provided.

Notice has a practical purpose. A message can arrive early yet be incomprehensible, inaccessible or too indefinite to support action. A useful notice therefore requires attention to audience, content and the response time available. Its adequacy depends on the task. Moving a small personal object and relocating a collaborative installation may require different preparation.

The organizer should also distinguish decisions already made from matters on which participants can influence the outcome. Inviting suggestions about an irreversible decision while implying that it remains open can distort the process. A limited consultation can still be useful when its actual scope is clear, such as choosing among feasible collection arrangements or identifying overlooked burdens.

7.4 The period after closure

After organized activity ends, records, equipment, permissions and information may remain under identifiable control. Some responsibilities can be completed through a bounded act during this period. Others may require a different actor, particularly if the original organization is winding down. The relevant inquiry concerns the function still being performed and the ground of the associated requirement.

Claim 7.1 (Ground persistence). A justified responsibility can continue after closure when its relevant grounding conditions continue and its valid scope includes the remaining response. The persistence of some effect alone leaves the duration of other responsibilities open.

The derivation identifies the original ground, establishes the facts on which its present application depends, checks whether closure changes those facts or its scope, and reassesses the response under current feasibility and competing claims. The conclusion follows for the specified requirement. An expired teaching commitment and an uncompleted return undertaking can therefore receive different assessments without contradiction.

7.5 Discharge, reassignment and revision

A continuing responsibility needs an assessable stopping condition. Completion of the required act is one possibility. Effective reassignment under a justified arrangement is another. A permissible release or revision of the claim can also matter. Changed circumstances may remove the need, alter the appropriate response or introduce a defeating reason. The justification for stopping should be tied to the ground that supported action.

An administrative handover can leave a practical gap if the receiving actor has accepted neither the function nor the relevant burden. Conversely, a successful handover may permit the original actor to withdraw while support continues elsewhere. The assessment should therefore examine authorization, actual uptake and any residual commitments, with a proportionate review point.

These conditions place limits in both directions. Mere elapsed time supplies an incomplete account of discharge when an agreed transfer remains unfinished. Indefinite monitoring supplies an excessive response when a bounded duty has been completed and later decisions properly belong to the participant. Continuing responsibility is compatible with a justified end to the responsible actor's involvement.

8 Practical Responses and Their Conditions

This section examines the content of possible responses. It distinguishes the target activity from the institutional means used to support it, then considers the compatibility of transferred conditions and the risks of unwanted control. The analysis develops a conditional adequacy argument for a specified practical option while leaving the duty to provide that option to the preceding normative inquiry.

8.1 Response selection by target

Possible responses include usable notice, completion of an agreed project stage, return of materials, transfer of records, access to information, coordination with another venue, financial assistance, acknowledgment and a supported ending. Each addresses a different possible target. A response should therefore be evaluated against the interest and ground that justify it, together with its burdens and alternatives.

For instance, a participant may need access to personal design files while choosing to abandon the project itself. Another may want a final session to stabilize unfinished work for transport. A third may prefer a successor organization. Describing all three needs as “continuity” risks selecting one institutional solution for different activities. Target specification makes the relevant difference visible.

8.2 Joint adequacy of transferred conditions

Transferring an asset and enabling its use are separate practical achievements. A loom can be delivered to a venue that has space but lacks permitted access during the participant’s available hours. Instructions can arrive after an irreversible disposal decision. A package therefore requires compatible conditions, including timing and the participant’s ability to use them.

Claim 8.1 (Conditional adequacy of a transition package). A transition package enables a specified participant activity when its jointly available components supply the conditions required for that activity within the declared horizon, under the relevant permissions, protections and acceptable burdens.

The argument proceeds in five steps. First, describe the activity and the conditions it requires. Second, identify which package components supply those conditions. Third, check their compatibility, including simultaneous or appropriately sequenced availability. Fourth, establish permission, participant access and the stated protections. Fifth, infer the availability of the specified activity under those premises. The result is a conditional practical claim. An obligation to supply the package requires the separate normative argument; broader later projects require their own adequacy assessment.

The compatibility step carries particular importance. Suppose, hypothetically, that a tool is available on Tuesdays and the only permitted room is available on Thursdays. Each arrangement appears useful when assessed separately. Their combination fails to enable a Tuesday-or-Thursday activity requiring both together. A coordinated time can change that result without adding equipment. The example illustrates a dependency in the package; it supplies no claim about an actual workshop.

8.3 Participant organization and successor arrangements

Participants may wish to continue collectively. Support could include information, a permitted equipment transfer or help identifying premises. The organizer should distinguish enabling their association from assigning them an obligation to run it. Collective continuation can impose substantial work on a small group, whose apparent agreement may conceal an unequal burden.

A successor also needs adequate authority and capacity. Being named in a closure document establishes a designation; accepting a defined function and being able to perform it establish further conditions. The successor’s terms may differ from the original programme’s terms. Participants need enough information to judge whether that difference preserves the activity they value or changes its character substantially.

8.4 Compensation and acknowledgment

Financial compensation can be relevant when a justified claim concerns a loss for which money supplies an appropriate response. The difficulty of valuing an unrealized future does not eliminate ordinary claims about identifiable costs, destroyed materials or broken commitments. It does require care in describing what a payment is intended to address.

Acknowledgment can address another dimension. A participant may reasonably seek an explanation of a decision or recognition of an avoidable disruption. Such a response can remain meaningful alongside practical assistance. It should avoid presenting recognition as evidence that every material condition has been restored. Conversely, a successful transfer can leave an independently justified acknowledgment claim unresolved.

8.5 Repair and renewed control

Assistance can give the former organizer continuing influence over activities that participants wish to direct themselves. A transfer conditional on exclusive association, publicity or the organizer's continuing approval may preserve equipment access while constraining later choice. The moral evaluation needs the terms and alternatives, including any legitimate reasons for conditions attached to the resources.

A proportionate response can separate necessary protection from discretionary direction. For example, an agreement may preserve appropriate safety arrangements while allowing participants to choose future projects. The details require practical and institutional knowledge. The analytical point is that a remedy's enabling effect and its allocation of authority belong in the same assessment.

Participants may also prefer an ending. A supported decision to stop can include returning materials, preserving chosen records or helping complete a dignified closure of joint work. The value of a generative practice includes the possibility of revision and departure. Responsibility for its conditions therefore need not take the form of preserving its earlier trajectory.

9 Hypothetical Workshop Comparisons

This section tests the framework through hypothetical cases that vary particular grounds and response conditions. The cases establish conceptual possibilities and expose missing premises. They report no actual organization or participant. Each comparison identifies the proposed change, the responsibility question it raises and the limit of the resulting conclusion.

9.1 A clearly bounded introductory course

A workshop offers six introductory sessions using shared tools. The terms clearly identify the final session, the limits of equipment access and the arrangements for collecting materials. Participants begin projects suited to that period. The sessions are completed, materials are returned and the organizer accurately explains the available information about further opportunities.

The case supports the legitimacy of finite provision under its assumptions. A participant's later enthusiasm for a more advanced activity is valuable, while that enthusiasm alone supplies an incomplete argument for a continuing duty on the original organizer. A stronger claim would need a further ground, such as a surviving undertaking, an avoidable obstacle or a justified assistance role.

The case also leaves room for ordinary generosity. A volunteer may choose to provide additional advice without having been under a prior duty to do so. Preserving that distinction matters for the moral texture of a community arrangement. An account that classifies every worthwhile continuation as required would obscure both legitimate limits and voluntary contribution.

9.2 An induced project with an avoidable collection loss

A second workshop encourages a participant to begin a lengthy project and explicitly undertakes to provide a collection period after teaching ends. The organizer later plans immediate disposal of uncollected work, although the agreed period remains feasible and proportionate. The participant has reasonably organized transport around the undertaking.

This case contains a specific commitment as well as reliance and current control. Completing the teaching sessions leaves the collection question intact. Under the stipulated validity and absence of defeating reasons, the organizer has a limited continuing duty to honor that arrangement. The conclusion concerns the collection period; it establishes no general duty to fund the participant's next project.

If an unforeseen urgent condition makes the original arrangement impossible, the assessment changes. The actor should examine feasible alternatives under the commitment's conditions and the relevant moral grounds. The impossibility of one form of performance can alter the required response while leaving explanation or another appropriately justified act available. The case should therefore be reassessed with the changed facts and revised practical assumptions.

9.3 A beneficial specialization and a feasible transition

A third workshop enables a participant to develop a valued practice requiring specialist equipment. The participant gains skills that would probably have remained unavailable without the programme. Closure nevertheless creates a serious interruption. A nearby venue could support the selected practice if the organizer provides a permitted project record and coordinates a short orientation.

The earlier benefit and the possible closure burden concern different comparisons. If the response satisfies the proposed normative premises, its value can support a limited continuing reason despite the participant's overall gain. The record and orientation also require their own adequacy conditions: the venue must accept the participant, the equipment must be suitable and the schedule must be usable.

The case changes if the alternative is merely nominal. An inaccessible venue or an unaffordable membership may leave the target unavailable. A referral then remains a communication whose practical effect requires testing. The framework makes that question explicit while leaving the extent of the organizer's duty dependent on authority, burden and the grounds of the claim.

9.4 A justified closure with divided remedial capacity

A fourth workshop loses its premises through a wider change that the organizer could neither reasonably anticipate nor prevent. The organization has little money left. A community body has an independently justified transition-support role and the capacity to coordinate a suitable alternative. The former organizer retains accurate project information that participants permit it to share.

The case separates several tasks. Historical blame for the premises loss remains unsupported under the stipulated facts. The community body's role can support coordination; the organizer's residual control can make a limited information transfer relevant. A fair response can therefore distribute performance without assigning every actor the same responsibility or pretending that the successor caused the original loss.

If the community body lacks a justified role, its capacity alone leaves an allocation question. A broader assistance principle might support action, but that principle must be defended. This variation prevents the case from converting the existence of a capable helper into an unargued universal duty.

9.5 A participant-led ending

A fifth workshop's participants decide that continuing their shared project would impose burdens they prefer to avoid. They ask for return of personal materials and preservation of a selected joint record, subject to everyone's legitimate interests. The organizer believes that continued activity would demonstrate the programme's value and offers support only on that condition.

Table 2: Grounds and limits in the hypothetical workshop comparisons. Each row depends on the facts stipulated in the corresponding case.

Case arrangement	Relevant ground or question	Limit of the conclusion
Bounded introductory course	Fulfilled finite undertaking	Later enthusiasm requires a further ground for a duty
Collection undertaking	Specific commitment, reliance and control	The collection duty has a limited object and duration
Specialized practice	Defensible interest and feasible transition	Nominal referral requires practical adequacy checks
Divided remedial capacity	Appropriate role and separate remaining tasks	Capacity and causal blame retain distinct grounds
Participant-led ending	Agency, materials and a chosen record	Institutional success aims require independent authority

The case exposes a possible conflict between support and direction. An interest in showing institutional success does not by itself justify control over the participants' future activities. The proposed account assesses their requested ending and the terms of assistance, including any valid shared commitments. Generative value remains compatible with a decision to conclude a particular practice.

9.6 Comparison across the cases

Table 2 records the differing grounds and limits. The cases share closure while varying the morally relevant connection. The variation explains why a general verdict based only on the event of closure or the existence of historical influence would be inadequate.

10 Institutional Allocation and Participant Standing

This section examines the distribution of responsibility among organizers, funders, successors and participants. It begins with a bounded practical comparison from verified funding research, then develops the paper's own allocation questions. The objective is to preserve directed claims and usable participation within a wider institutional setting, including the interests of people outside the existing programme.

10.1 A bounded comparison from funding research

The IVAR report *Duty of Care*, published in 2012, draws on 59 interviews with social-welfare voluntary organizations connected to six participating funders. Some interviewees wanted funders to plan for exit and help identify future support. The report also records the practical constraints facing funders and develops a proposed relational orientation to grant-making. Its qualitative selection and historical setting limit generalization; its terminology identifies a proposed orientation for funding practice [1].

The comparison identifies a practical question already articulated outside this research programme: the relationship between a bounded grant and the conditions left when funding ends. It supplies neither evidence about the hypothetical workshops nor a measurement of effective transition. The present paper develops its normative claims independently and uses the comparison to identify issues that a workshop study could investigate.

One such issue is the relation between the funded organization and its participants. Helping an organization survive may preserve participant options, yet the connection requires evidence. A change of provider or a supported ending could sometimes address the relevant interests more adequately. The organizational funding question and the participant-level practical question should therefore remain connected without being treated as identical.

10.2 The allocation of tasks and burdens

An institution may have responsibility to perform an act, arrange its performance or contribute to its cost. These are different requirements. A former organizer might supply project information, a successor might provide orientation and a funder might finance a justified transition. The allocation should identify each function and the reason for assigning it.

Cost allocation can differ from immediate performance. The actor best placed to perform a time-sensitive task may have a reasonable claim for contribution from another actor. Resolving that later claim need not always precede a feasible immediate response, although the legitimacy of asking the first actor to bear temporary costs requires examination. A framework should make both stages visible and avoid imposing an indefinite burden through an apparently provisional arrangement.

The existence of several relevant actors can also create a coordination problem. Each may wait for another, leaving a collectively feasible response unrealized. A justified coordinating role can address that problem, provided it has the authority, information and resources needed. Simply naming a coordinator without those conditions reproduces the gap at another level.

10.3 The organizer's institutional identity

Closing a programme, replacing its staff and dissolving its organization are different events. A continuing body can retain resources and commitments even after the workshop ends. Where the body itself ceases to exist, responsibility must be examined through whatever roles, arrangements or individuals actually remain. The moral account should identify those facts before assigning performance.

Staff members also have legitimate limits. An institutional commitment should not silently become an unlimited personal obligation for the final volunteer who remains reachable. A defensible allocation considers authority, accepted role, available resources and fair treatment of those performing the work. Their familiarity with participants can be valuable while leaving the extent of their responsibility open.

10.4 Participant standing and effective influence

Participants have a distinctive epistemic position concerning their activities and the meaning of interruption. A responsible assessment should provide usable opportunities to identify needs, correct assumptions and consider alternatives. That standing can support participation in decisions without making every individual preference decisive over shared resources.

The process should distinguish information gathering from decision authority. A consultation can identify overlooked needs while leaving a funder responsible for a constrained allocation. A participant group can hold a genuine decision role under an appropriate arrangement. Both forms need clear scope, accessible information and an account of how disagreement will be handled. Attendance or a signature alone gives an incomplete picture of influence.

Participants are also diverse. An established group may favor a continuation that excludes newcomers, less vocal members or people unable to take on unpaid organizational work. Representation therefore requires attention to membership, mandates and avenues for minority concerns. The moral importance of a shared history does not remove these questions.

10.5 People beyond the existing relationship

Continuing assistance uses resources that may serve other purposes. People who have never accessed a workshop can have stronger claims than those facing a modest loss after substantial benefit. A defensible account must therefore examine the opportunity costs of preserving a familiar activity. Historical connection can supply a special reason while leaving wider distributive considerations relevant.

The response may combine a limited discharge of directed commitments with a different long-term allocation. Returning materials and completing an agreed handover can be compatible with redirecting future funds. This distinction helps preserve both the moral significance of an existing relationship and the possibility of changing an institution's priorities for adequately justified reasons.

11 Objections and Counterconditions

This section tests the proposed account against objections concerning finite association, excessive responsibility, unwanted dependence and competing claims. Each objection identifies a possible failure of the framework or its application. The replies specify the conditions under which the proposal remains defensible and the circumstances that require revision or a different response.

11.1 The legitimacy of finite association

The strongest objection begins from the value of bounded undertakings. Workshops can be possible precisely because organizers commit to a limited period. Participants can understand and accept those terms. Treating the resulting enthusiasm or specialization as a reason for indefinite support would alter the undertaking retrospectively and discourage provision.

The account preserves this objection's force. A finite undertaking can be fulfilled, and later interests alone require a further ground for a duty. The inquiry becomes substantial when there is an additional commitment, supported reliance beyond the declared scope, a remaining protected object or an independently justified assistance role. Even then, the response requires a specified act, horizon and proportionate allocation. A theory that routinely converted those grounds into permanent provision would need revision.

11.2 The expansion of responsibility through influence

A workshop can influence a person's preferences, friendships and later decisions in ways that are difficult to isolate. If influence creates responsibility for every downstream result, the original institution becomes morally answerable for an expanding and indeterminate history. Such an account risks both excessive burden and an inflated view of institutional authorship.

The response is to specify the mechanism, interest and ground. Causal contribution alone leaves moral responsibility open, and temporal sequence alone leaves causal contribution open. Participants and other actors also contribute to developing practices. A justified responsibility concerns a particular connection and response; it does not confer perpetual authority over the person's later projects. Unresolved attribution should remain explicit in the record.

11.3 Reflective endorsement and chosen specialization

Participants may deliberately choose a specialized practice with full awareness of finite access. Their commitment can be an expression of agency, even when later interruption is painful. An account that treats every such vulnerability as imposed harm would diminish the value of chosen projects and misdescribe the relationship.

Reflective endorsement therefore matters to the evaluation. Its scope must be identified: accepting finite teaching differs from waiving a separate collection undertaking, and valuing the practice differs from authorizing every later restriction. Adequate alternatives and relevant information also matter when interpreting agreement. The framework should preserve voluntary specialization while examining the particular conduct and claim at issue.

11.4 The risk of renewed control

Continuing assistance can maintain a relationship that participants would prefer to leave. A former organizer might use access to tools or information to secure loyalty, publicity or deference. An account intended to protect practical options could then justify the very control that makes those options difficult to revise.

The response requires assessment of authority within the remedy. Necessary protective conditions and discretionary steering should be distinguished through their purposes, effects and alternatives. A participant may choose continued support under acceptable terms, or may prefer a less extensive option

with greater control over its use. Assistance should therefore be evaluated with attention to these trade-offs, preserving the possibility that withdrawal after a completed transfer is the more respectful response.

11.5 Scarcity and displaced burdens

A transition package can benefit current participants while consuming resources needed by staff, other programmes or excluded groups. Local closeness may make current losses vivid and distant needs easier to ignore. A responsibility account based on historical relationship risks entrenching that asymmetry.

Directed commitments can have special force while remaining subject to a defensible assessment of competing claims. Some modest acts may discharge existing responsibilities at little opportunity cost; extensive continuation may require a much stronger argument. The framework therefore distinguishes the content and ground of each response. It leaves difficult distributive conflicts open where the available moral premises fail to rank the alternatives adequately.

11.6 The limits of practical mitigation

Some valued activities depend on a unique configuration of people, place and equipment. A substitute may preserve technical function while losing much of the activity's meaning. The requirement to identify feasible alternatives should therefore leave room for irreplaceable loss. A nominally equivalent service can be an inadequate response to the actual target.

The impossibility of full restoration changes the practical inquiry. Partial support, compensation where justified, acknowledgment or help with a chosen ending can still have value. Their adequacy requires honest description of what remains lost. A response that promises complete recovery without the relevant conditions would weaken both the practical result and the trust required for its assessment.

11.7 The contribution beyond familiar obligations

A final objection concerns explanatory value. Commitments, care, reliance and remedial responsibility already provide substantial resources. The workshop framework may merely rearrange familiar considerations while introducing unnecessary terminology.

The proposed value lies in keeping the grounds, phases, targets and response conditions connected in one assessable argument. It is useful only if that organization reveals an overlooked inference, a missing actor, an incompatible transition package or a confusion between institutional survival and participant activity. If applications repeatedly add little to an ordinary commitment or assistance analysis, the framework should be compressed. Its terminology remains revisable, and a claim of conceptual priority plays no role in its justification.

12 Open Questions and Research Design

This section identifies the empirical and philosophical work needed to assess the framework beyond hypothetical cases. It proposes a bounded comparative design, an evidence structure and conditions for revising the account. The objective is to expose unresolved obligations that a polished conceptual argument can otherwise obscure.

12.1 Comparison of closure arrangements

A practical study could compare workshops that ended through a planned funding limit, an unexpected loss of premises and a deliberate change of organizational priorities. Selection should also include adequately completed finite programmes, successful transfers and participant-led endings. Such variation would test the framework's boundaries and reduce the risk of selecting only cases that invite a continuing-responsibility judgment.

The unit of analysis should be a specified participant activity and proposed response within a documented institutional arrangement. Comparing organizations only by whether they survived would miss the paper's focal distinction. The study would need to record who retained control over which conditions, what was communicated and which alternatives were practically available.

12.2 Evidence concerning reliance and effects

Evidence could include programme terms, renewal communications, project records, closure plans, participant accounts and information from receiving organizations. These sources have different roles. A written term establishes a representation; an interview can identify understanding or experience; an observed transfer can establish an operation under its actual conditions. None alone supplies a complete causal or normative conclusion.

Open Problem 12.1 (Justified reliance in evolving programmes). Develop an account of justified reliance that remains sensitive to informal communications and repeated practice while distinguishing reasonable expectation, valid commitment, hope and retrospective reinterpretation.

The inquiry should examine disagreement between participants and organizers, including cases in which either account changes over time. Evidence of past ambiguity may support a reason to improve communication while leaving a particular allegation unresolved. The moral and empirical questions should retain their different standards of assessment.

12.3 Assessment of practical transition

A transition study should identify the activity, horizon and required conditions before assessing success. A tool transfer, referral or new membership can then be examined for usability, timing, costs and protections. Follow-up should distinguish immediate access from sustained opportunity and an enabled option from compulsory uptake.

Open Problem 12.2 (The adequacy of partial reconstruction). Specify defensible ways to assess a transition that preserves some practical functions while changing the relational meaning of the activity, especially when participants disagree about acceptable substitutes.

The research should also examine burdens on successors, volunteers and less visible participants. A successful headline transition can rely on unsustainable unpaid work or exclude people whose needs are difficult to accommodate. Those effects belong in the assessment of the package itself.

12.4 Normative allocation and stopping conditions

The framework leaves several normative questions unresolved. These include the comparative force of reliance and wider need, the justification of special institutional roles, the allocation of costs across contributors and capable helpers, and the point at which a response has adequately discharged the claim. A complete theory would need to explain the priority or incomparability of those considerations.

Open Problem 12.3 (Fair discharge under continuing effects). Identify conditions under which a specified responsibility is fairly completed, reassigned, revised or defeated while some effects of the original workshop remain part of the participant's life.

The problem permits an important distinction: effects can persist longer than duties grounded in them, while some duties can survive the end of ordinary interaction. Empirical duration alone therefore supplies an incomplete account of moral duration.

12.5 Revision and abandonment conditions

The account should be revised if its proposed grounds systematically conceal participant choice, oversign duties to the nearest visible actor or treat feasible options as though they were morally required. It should also change if the phase structure obscures institutions in which closure and reorganization proceed through continuous changes with overlapping phases.

The strongest test concerns usefulness in contested cases. The framework should improve the clarity of the claim, its grounds or the assessment of responses. Where it merely renames an already clear argument, a simpler formulation is preferable. This criterion keeps the vocabulary answerable to the research aim of facilitating criticism and discussion.

13 Conclusion

This section states the result of the inquiry and its remaining limits. It returns to the distinction between a workshop's ending, the persistence of its effects and the grounds of a particular responsibility. The conclusion draws together the normative and practical arguments without extending them beyond their stated assumptions.

A community workshop can legitimately close while specified responsibilities remain. Their persistence depends on commitments, protected interests, supported reliance, present control or independently justified remedial roles, together with the conditions of an appropriate response. Historical influence alone leaves that assessment open. The relevant claim identifies a bearer, participant, act, horizon and ground.

The preliminary responsibility profile becomes more useful when its elements receive distinct roles. Evidence of contribution differs from a normative reason, and a normative reason differs from the feasibility and authority required for effective action. Foreseeability can bear on past blame while present knowledge and capacity bear on assistance. Several grounds can support one response, and several actors can perform different justified tasks.

Practical reconstruction requires the same specificity. Transferred equipment, records and referrals support an activity only through compatible conditions of use. The justified target may be continuation, a revised practice or an ending chosen by participants. A successful response can therefore permit the former organizer to withdraw, while continued support can also remain valuable under acceptable terms.

The paper establishes a conditional framework and a set of analytical comparisons. Actual attribution, the adequacy of the proposed moral premises and difficult conflicts among claims remain matters for further inquiry. Its purpose is to make those questions visible in a form that participants, organizers and critics can examine, preserving both the value of finite shared projects and the significance of the conditions they leave behind.

References

- [1] Eliza Buckley, Ben Cairns, Alison Harker, and Romaine Hutchison. Duty of care: The role of trusts and foundations in supporting voluntary organisations through difficult times. Technical report, Institute for Voluntary Action Research, October 2012.
- [2] Robert E. Goodin. Vulnerabilities and responsibilities: An ethical defense of the welfare state. *American Political Science Review*, 79(3):775–787, 1985. Publisher abstract consulted.
- [3] Niko Kolodny and R. Jay Wallace. Promises and practices revisited. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 31(2):119–154, 2003.
- [4] David Miller. *National Responsibility and Global Justice*. Oxford University Press, 2007. Selected chapter 4 passages consulted, pp. 98–107.
- [5] Iris Marion Young. Responsibility and global justice: A social connection model. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 23(1):102–130, 2006. Publisher abstract consulted.