

Contribution Value System

From Putting Others First to a Record of Civilizational Trust

Contribution records, resource coordination, governance interfaces and domain-state engineering within the Civilization Leap theoretical system

Version: v1.8.2-R2 Controlled revision of the exit and shutdown interfaces (professional semantic baseline v1.8.2; R1 version-relationship updates incorporated; exit, responsibility and shutdown-right interfaces calibrated)

Status: Formal master-document system update; current file v1.8.2-R2; main institutional structure frozen; cross-system exit and shutdown inconsistencies resolved

Date: August 2026

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

Official website: <https://www.civitas.top/en/>

Intended readers: Policymakers, social innovators, product managers, entrepreneurs, nonprofit organizations, community governance practitioners, institutional engineers and AGI governance researchers

Core proposition: Establish a civilization-wide system for recording and recognizing genuine contributions, constrained by binding records to contributing subjects and by domain boundaries, with dynamic confirmation and mutual benefit across time as its temporal logic. The real contributions of individuals and communities should become visible, receive practical support and remain open to continuing calibration.

Control page

Boundaries of the v1.8.2-R2 controlled exit and shutdown interface revision

Baseline relationship: This edition uses Contribution Value System Whitepaper v1.8.1 Final Cleanup and Calibration Edition as its textual baseline. It does not reconstruct the text from memory or delete valid content from the original.

Scope of this revision: Update only Governance V3.0, the private-domain, public-domain and civilizational-subdomain standard, the Spark and Nebula interfaces, the Resource Pool and Shared World interfaces, and engineering-object boundaries.

Limits of effect: This edition does not launch a real-world pilot or prescribe uniform participant numbers, durations, proportions, seats, weights, thresholds, data-retention periods or automated-decision parameters.

Core correction: Contribution Value records contribution history and currently valid relevance. It is not a personality score, meaning score, resource balance, governance sovereignty, expert sovereignty, executive privilege or behavioral-control instrument.

Ultimate test: The Contribution Value System must serve to change the default path through which self-interest realizes itself. It must not increase external control, induce performative altruism or make changing a subject's behavior an optimization objective in itself.

Interface	Position in this edition	Limits of authority
Governance V3.0	CV informs accounts of facts, evidence, responsibility and relevance. Decisions on public purposes, professional judgment, execution and correction continue to operate through the three-powers lifecycle.	Contribution must not purchase governance sovereignty or replace professional judgment or value decisions.

Interface	Position in this edition	Limits of authority
Domain Standard V1.0	Every contribution fact, item of evidence, resource and item of data, capability, authorization, disclosure and invocation must carry a domain-state designation.	Seeing a domain state does not confer authority to change that domain state. Domain transfers must not occur automatically.
Resource Pool and Shared World	CV records genuine contribution history; the Resource Pool records resource and capability facts; Shared World carries authorized flows of use rights.	Resource visibility does not confer permission to invoke it. Sharing is not requisition.
Spark and Nebula	Spark helps subjects organize and explain information; Nebula makes overall facts, causal relationships, externalities and unknowns visible.	Advice is not a decision. An overall optimum does not impose an individual obligation.

Treatment of version debt: The scales, time horizons, success proportions, evaluator counts, parameter ranges and phase milestones used to imagine pilots in v1.8.1 remain excluded from the master document's normative layer. They are deferred to dedicated parameter documents after actual experimental or application entities are identified. v1.8.2-R1 completed updates to the current version relationships of Nebula and the three layers. v1.8.2-R2 resolves only X-01 through X-04 recorded in Final Continuity Review of Horizontal Interfaces Between the Common Standard for Exit, Return, Repair and Termination and the Core Operating System V1.0: separating freedom to exit from settlement of existing responsibilities; removing fixed review-round requirements; ending a single committee's general status as the sole initiator of shutdown; and correcting post-shutdown restoration to require renewed judgment and authorization under a new version. It changes neither CV/PY, dynamic confirmation, conservation of the total, contribution history, basic rights, the three governance powers nor the ontology of the three layers.

Guiding statement

The Contribution Value System exists to help civilization remember contributions that should not be forgotten, not to score people.

Contribution Value does not quantify a person's meaning or worth, or judge the nobility of their motives. It records only real contributions that facts, responsibility, results and time can progressively verify.

Essential safeguards

Safeguard 1: Low CV does not mean low human worth. Contribution Value measures contributions, not a person's worth, meaning or dignity. Every person's intrinsic worth is immeasurable and should not be quantified. People with low and high CV have exactly the same basic rights.

Safeguard 2: Unrecorded does not mean no contribution. Many genuinely important contributions in civilization may escape the system: enduring hardship over time, quiet care, emotional support, refraining from harming someone at a critical moment, or exercising restraint in the face of power. An unrecorded contribution is still a contribution.

Safeguard 3: Contribution records must not harm beneficiaries' dignity. Records must not turn beneficiaries into objects of display. Beneficiaries may remain anonymous; public gratitude must not be compelled; images of vulnerable people must not be exchanged for CV.

Opening reflection

Making inner experience visible through three stages of the Contribution Value System

The system's staged objectives concern more than gradually putting an institution into operation. They also concern gradually helping people see new civilizational possibilities. What it should awaken is recognition of another way of living, cooperating and moving civilization forward, rather than pursuit of scores.

In the startup stage, the future means first the participants' own future: can today's actions improve their resources, capabilities, relationships and possibilities in life? Only then does it naturally extend to the futures of the people they care about, their communities and those who come after them. The institution must not ask real people to sacrifice the present in the name of the future. It seeks to align present gains with future accumulation as far as possible.

Startup stage

Individuals become visible

When care, companionship, protection, creation and transmission of knowledge and culture, long overlooked by markets, begin to be recorded seriously, a person's first response should not be “How much CV did I get?” It should be: “I can live this way too,” as though seeing a new world for the first time.

The things one has always felt were important are neither useless nor evidence of failure in the old world.

Transition stage

Collective resonance

As more people discover that they are not alone in sustaining goodwill, but connected with others willing to take responsibility, the system awakens more than individual recognition: “We can all live this way. Let us bring the new world to life together.”

A new civilization then begins to become a real structure people can enter together, rather than remaining only an idea.

Stable operation stage

Civilization ventures forward

When contribution, care, responsibility, creation and transmission become stable structures in civilization's operation, humanity is doing more than repairing the old world's fractures of meaning. It is forming a new structure of inner life capable of moving into the future. The system ultimately points beyond its own institutional completion: “We not only live this way; we help civilization live this way too.”

These three statements are not publicity slogans. They describe human outcomes along the system's chain of meaning:

Inner life generates meaning; action reveals meaning; contribution preserves meaning; institutions protect meaning; civilization carries meaning forward.

Key terms

Term	Full name	Definition
CV	Contribution Value	A record of genuine contribution history and a symbol of currently valid relevance, bound to the contributing subject. Subjects include natural persons, temporary collaborative groups, project communities, enduring communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations. CV cannot be traded, transferred or financialized. Historical contribution records must be distinguished from currently valid relevance. CV does not express a resource quantity, cannot be calculated proportionally from PY and does not automatically create governance sovereignty.

Term	Full name	Definition
PY	Person-Year	An independent unit conveying resource scale, used to describe basic subsistence carrying capacity and the scale of resource inputs. One PY represents the basic resources needed for one ordinary adult to live with dignity for one year. PY is not used to calculate personality, contribution, governance sovereignty or the validity of decisions. Resource contributions may record both PY resource facts and CV contribution confirmation, but these are calculated and confirmed separately, without a fixed ratio, exchange rate or asset mapping.
CVS	Contribution Value System	A civilizational trust-record system centered on CV, connecting contribution records, resource use, collaborative trust and explanatory reference material for governance. It does not automatically convert contribution records into governance sovereignty.
SE	Structure Entity or meaning unit	SE is not a core operational term in this whitepaper's main text. If it appears in theoretical appendices, it refers only to the "meaning unit" concept in the relevant theoretical discussion and does not enter CVS engineering calculations.
S/M/D/EP/η	—	Variables in the civilizational stability model: meaning thickness, meaning diversity, effective participation and collaboration efficiency.
CS	Contribution Subject	A subject generating verifiable, genuine contributions and undertaking the corresponding inputs, responsibilities, risks or continuing maintenance. Includes natural persons, temporary groups, project communities, enduring communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations.
CCV	Collective Contribution Value	An inseparable collaborative outcome may first be attributed to the community as a whole, then subdivided internally or partially retained according to public rules. The same outcome must not be counted more than once across subject levels.
VM	Value Maturity	Confirmation states for Contribution Value and Resource Value: P0 estimated, P1 provisionally confirmed, P2 stage-verified, P3 stably confirmed and P4 long-term additions. An initial value is not a final value.
RV	Resource Value	Describes a resource's usable capability and value actually released in a particular scenario. Distinguishes baseline resource value from realized resource value, considering current use, continuing regeneration and future option value.

Executive summary

Core definition

The Contribution Value System (CVS) establishes neither a second currency nor a mechanism for purchasing governance sovereignty. It establishes a civilizational trust-record system that binds records to subjects, is nontradable and auditable, permits exit, is constrained by domain states, and remains separate from the division-of-functions interfaces of Governance V3.0. It makes genuine contributions, capacity to bear responsibility and public meaning visible, without automatically turning contribution records into authority to determine public purposes, make professional judgments or execute decisions.

Contribution Value (CV) is a record of genuine contribution history and a symbol of currently valid relevance, bound to a contributing subject. Subjects include natural persons, temporary collaborative groups, project communities, enduring communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations. CV may serve as reference facts for resource use, project priority, collaborative trust, responsibility and governance explanations. It must not be freely traded, transferred, financialized or treated as a speculative asset, nor automatically create governance sovereignty, voting rights, professional judgment authority, executive authority or individual obligations.

The institutional validity of CVS does not depend on any metaphysical proposition. It first records verifiable real-world actions, responsibilities and results. Emergent Meaning Cosmology and related deeper theories

remain optional philosophical foundations in the appendices and research entry points; they do not enter CV engineering calculations.

The three stages of the relationship between Contribution Value and money

Money asks: How much can you pay? Contribution Value asks: How much have you helped sustain civilization?

CVS is not intended to remain permanently subordinate to money. It operates alongside money during startup and progressively takes on more functions as a reference for resource use, collaborative trust and governance explanations during transition. Once maturity conditions hold, the dominant logic governing civilization's core resource allocation will shift gradually from ownership and purchasing power toward genuine contribution, responsibility, public value and collaborative trust. This is a structural replacement of the logic of money, not simply abolition of money as a tool, nor a grant of unified allocation sovereignty to CV.

- Startup stage, parallel operation: CVS operates alongside the monetary system. Money continues to handle ordinary commodity exchange, market pricing and actual payments. CV records care, maintenance, transmission, collaboration, risk-bearing and contributions to public meaning that money has long failed to recognize adequately.
- Transition stage, change in relative primacy: As the Resource Pool expands, public services mature and contribution records gain credibility, allocation increasingly shifts from “Who owns more money?” toward “Who has created more public value, and who is better able to take responsibility?”
- Mature stage, structural replacement: When material goods and basic services are relatively abundant, the Resource Pool has sufficient scale and resilience, contribution records have auditable public credibility, and public governance can reliably correct errors, the allocation of core public resources and development opportunities will increasingly be guided by genuine contributions, capacity for responsibility, public value, collaborative trust and effects across time, rather than ownership capacity and capital accumulation. Market exchange and price mechanisms may continue in their appropriate domains.

Scope and prerequisites: “Structural replacement of the logic of money” does not mean short-term administrative abolition of legal tender, market exchange or price mechanisms. It means that, once the relevant material, technological, institutional and social conditions hold, the capacity for ownership represented by money ceases to be the dominant basis for allocating core public resources and development opportunities or for participation in governance. This is a long-term civilizational direction, not a near-term policy commitment for startup or transition.

Minimum conditions include: basic subsistence and public services are no longer heavily dependent on scarce monetary purchasing power; the Resource Pool has scale, redundancy and recovery capability; contribution records support dynamic confirmation, appeals and audits; governance interfaces have domain boundaries, responsibility constraints, a three-powers division and anti-capture mechanisms; and the system preserves basic rights and the ability to exit and roll back under stress.

Theoretical connection with Meaning Dynamics

Meaning Dynamics proposes “structural meaning”: how a civilization continually creates positions that individuals can enter, deepen, participate in and take responsibility for. CVS implements this concept institutionally. It records not “Who is superior?” but “Who is continually contributing to civilization's network of positions?”

The relationship between the civilizational stability model and Contribution Value:

The civilizational stability model $S = M \times D \times EP \times \eta$ corresponds to four core CVS dimensions:

Model dimension	Meaning	CVS correspondence
M thickness	Thickness and depth of meaning	Depth and continuity of contribution. Sustained contributors in a field accumulate a thicker network of meaning.

Model dimension	Meaning	CVS correspondence
D diversity	Diversity of forms of meaning	Variety of contribution types. Contributions in different fields jointly constitute civilization's ecology of meaning.
EP effective participation	Rate of effective participation	Whether contribution actually enters the structure. CV records verified effective actions capable of participating in civilization's network.
η collaboration efficiency	Network collaboration efficiency	Network effects of contribution. Collaborative contributions multiply value.

Eleven institutional principles

Principle	Content
Open eligibility of subjects and subject binding	Subjects include individuals, temporary or enduring communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations. Records are bound to actual subjects and cannot be freely transferred.
Nontrading	CV cannot be bought, sold, financialized or made a speculative asset.
Whole-outcome confirmation and conservation of the total	An inseparable collaborative outcome may first receive whole-outcome confirmation. Internal subdivision must not count the same outcome repeatedly.
Motive neutrality	Confirm contribution from verifiable inputs, responsibilities, risks and outcomes. Do not adjust CV for "nobility" or "sincerity."
Dynamic confirmation	Initial calculation is provisional confirmation. During observation, real outcomes support review, additions and corrections, moving eventually toward stability.
Resource use	CV may inform Resource Pool use rights, project priority and collaborative trust, but must not be the sole basis.
Governance interface constraints, correcting the former governance weighting principle	CV may enter the Governance V3.0 lifecycle as material on facts, responsibility and relevance, but must not automatically create authority over purposes, professional judgment or execution. It remains constrained by domain, responsibility, stakeholder relationships, time, ceilings and correction.
Separation of inputs and exit	Inputs create certificates and contribution records. Exit redeems remaining input certificates or resource shares, not the sale of CV.
Domain binding	CV has explicit domain attributes. Cross-domain relevance is limited to prevent spillover of power.
Historical contributions cannot be erased	Genuinely realized, stably confirmed historical contributions are not negated by later environmental change. Current governance relevance and reference effect for resource use may be adjusted separately for timeliness.
Silent baseline	On matters of human dignity, basic freedoms and basic rights, CV has zero influence and political equality applies.

Key conclusions

1. The crisis of meaning is real. In the AGI era, the meaning of traditional work is eroding, while lonely deaths, meaninglessness and mental illness are worsening.
2. Existing systems have fundamental defects: they count tradable outputs alone, overlook sustaining contributions, and use linear accumulation logic that disregards intergenerational fairness.

3. CVS's central hypothesis can be tested through pilots. The institution does not require participants first to prove noble motives. It enables real contributions to gain more durable trust, resource-use opportunities and positions in collaboration over time, and tests whether this structure can form a sustainable positive cycle.
4. This is not another incentive algorithm. It is civilization's trust record, documenting who helps whom and connecting acts of helping into a traceable network.

Why action is needed now

The coming period is a critical window. AGI capabilities are growing rapidly while the crisis of meaning deepens. Improving CVS now is intended to provide humanity with new anchors of meaning and a framework for recognizing value before traditional work's meaning is reshaped. This judgment does not establish a uniform pilot duration or startup parameter.

Ten central judgments

1. Market prices cannot fully express contribution value. Genuine care, maintenance, creation, collaboration, risk-bearing and transmission have long existed, yet prevailing measurement systems systematically undervalue or omit them.
2. Putting others first and long-term self-interest can align. CVS does not eliminate self-interest. It seeks mutual reinforcement among individuals' future gains, stable relationships, communities' long-term interests and public contribution.
3. AGI eliminates “useful” work, not meaning. When machines take over quantifiable skills, humanity's distinctive value lies in unquantifiable qualities: kindness, courage, creativity and love.
4. Existing economic systems count tradable outputs alone. Sustaining contributions such as care, companionship and transmission are consequently overlooked.
5. CVS operates alongside money during startup, with contribution logic progressively becoming dominant in core public-resource allocation as its long-term direction. Money asks “How much can you pay?” CV asks “How much have you helped sustain civilization?” Structural replacement concerns the dominance of ownership logic, not near-term abolition of money or markets.
6. CV is nontradable, nontransferable and nonfinancializable. This fundamentally distinguishes it from social-credit systems.
7. Governance interfaces require multiple constraints. Historical contribution records may be retained long-term, but currently valid governance relevance may enter the Governance V3.0 lifecycle only as factual, responsibility-related and explanatory material. It is constrained by domain relevance, degree of stakeholder involvement, responsibility, time adjustment, ceilings and independent correction. Contribution cannot purchase governance sovereignty.
8. Exit mechanisms protect participants. Contributors of inputs may request exit under their agreements and redeem input certificates or remaining resource shares, not sell CV.
9. The system must prevent moral coercion. Nonparticipation is your right; contribution is a choice, not an obligation.
10. Gradual pilots are preferable to theoretical perfection. The goal is an evolvable system that continually iterates through practice.

Chapter 0 Governance domain and engineering interface updates

Role of this chapter: It does not add a higher-order theory of CV. It reconnects the contribution records, CV/PY separation, dynamic confirmation, community attribution, separation of inputs and exit, and anti-manipulation boundaries established in v1.8.1 with the governance, domain-state and system-interface baselines now frozen across the theoretical system.

0.1 Highest principle and ultimate test

First overarching principle: Civilization Leap does not eliminate self-interest; it changes the default path through which self-interest realizes itself.

Underlying causal chain: Institution → behavior → real experience → habit → internalization → intergenerational reproduction → civilization.

Final goals: freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life and a more meaningful life. CVS can only record genuine contributions and provide ways for them to receive practical support. It cannot compress the three goals into a single utility function, total civilizational score or uniform meaning score.

Ultimate test: Does the mechanism increase external control, making people more dependent on institutional and system prompting? Or does it create real conditions in which subjects can increasingly integrate their own interests, the value of others and a shared future autonomously?

0.2 The Governance V3.0 interface for CV

CV may enter governance processes as explanatory material about facts, evidence, responsibility, historical contributions, domain relevance and currently valid relevance. It does not automatically create authority to determine purposes and rules, make professional judgments or execute decisions.

Legitimate governance structures decide public purposes; the corresponding structures of professional responsibility make professional judgments; executive authority comes from explicit authorization and responsibility boundaries. Contribution records may be seen, explained and audited, but cannot replace these institutional functions.

The governance lifecycle must preserve nine distinct layers: facts → evidence → inference → causal hypotheses → value judgments → rules → decisions → execution → outcomes. CV may enter, at most, the layers concerning facts, evidence, relevance and explanations of responsibility. It must not skip layers and become a decision itself.

Contribution does not purchase governance sovereignty. Capability does not automatically generate power. Professional facts do not replace value decisions. An overall optimum may be an analytical result, but does not automatically acquire decisional force or create individual obligations or cross-domain sovereignty.

0.3 Domain states and minimum necessary facts

In CVS, “domain” specifically means a governance state, not a subject's identity. The private domain is the default. The public domain is a limited, revocable and traceable state of public action. A civilizational subdomain is a state of professional governance, not expert sovereignty.

Each contribution record should, at minimum, distinguish the domain states of its subject, role, facts, evidence, beneficiary information, resource facts, capability facts, professional judgments, execution, disclosure, invocation authorization and correction status.

Recorded ≠ disclosed; disclosed ≠ available for invocation; invocable ≠ authorized for decision; resource visibility ≠ permission to invoke; existing contribution history ≠ currently valid permission. Substantive cross-domain movement requires renewed identification, explanation and authorization.

Mature contribution recording does not mean aggregating all personal data. With original data kept in their original domains wherever possible, it makes contributions visible in an auditable way through minimum facts, aggregate results, proofs, derived conclusions, restricted interfaces and necessary capability invocation.

0.4 Minimum object model for engineering interfaces

Object field	Minimum meaning	Boundary requirements
contribution_event_id	Unique contribution-event identifier linking facts, evidence, confirmation versions and correction history	Must not be designed as a financial asset, trading certificate or personality-score identifier.
contribution_subject / role	Contributing subject and role at the time; permits individuals, communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations	Subject binding does not disclose the subject's entire identity. A role must not subsume the person.
domain_state	Separate private-domain, public-domain or civilizational-subdomain states for facts, evidence, resources, data, capabilities, disclosure and invocation	The system may record domain states but must not change them automatically.
evidence_minimum	Minimum facts, proofs or restricted interfaces needed to support contribution confirmation	Global optimization must not justify aggregating all private-domain data.
CV_maturity	P0–P4 dynamic confirmation state, version and conditions for renewed judgment	Initial value is not final value. Historical records and currently valid relevance remain separate.
resource_fact / PY	Resource inputs, capability released, maintenance responsibility and resource scale expressed in person-years	PY is not CV; CV is not a resource balance; the two have no fixed exchange rate.
governance_interface	Whether a contribution may explain facts, responsibility or relevance in a particular matter	Does not automatically create voting rights, sovereignty, professional judgment authority, executive authority or individual obligations.
correction_record	Appeals, reviews, audits, withdrawal, suspension, repair, termination and conditions for renewed judgment	Nebula or system monitoring cannot be its own sole auditor.

0.5 Interfaces with the Resource Pool Shared World Spark and Nebula

System or mechanism	Interface within CVS	Conflations prohibited
Resource Pool	Resource and capability fact layer: records funds, equipment, space, computing power, data, service capacity, redundancy, maintenance and recovery conditions	Not unified allocation sovereignty for CV. Resource visibility does not confer invocation permission.
Shared World	Authorized use-rights flow layer: carries resource opening, invocation, withdrawal and reversion of permissions	Sharing is not requisition. Authorization history is not currently valid permission.
Contribution Value	Genuine contribution history and currently valid relevance layer	Not a resource balance, governance sovereignty, personality rank or meaning score.
Governance V3.0	Structures for legitimate purpose decisions, professional judgment, execution and independent correction	CV must not overstep its authority and replace the three-powers division.
Spark	Subject-side assistance amplifying meaning and organizing facts	Advice is not decision. Subjects must not be manipulated to maximize contribution.
Nebula	Layer revealing overall facts, causal relationships, externalities, options and unknowns	An overall optimum does not automatically become an individual obligation or cross-domain permission.

0.6 Anti-manipulation and deferred parameter setting

CVS must not make changing a subject's behavior an optimization objective in itself, whether in the name of promoting contribution, altruism, retention, commercial revenue, resource efficiency or Civilization Leap. Greater predictive capability entails a greater duty to explain; greater understanding entails less permission to manipulate.

All specific experimental participant counts, durations, proportions, evaluator counts, success indicators, weight ceilings, domain-transition thresholds, retention periods, circuit-breaker thresholds and MVP parameters must be derived separately after actual experimental or application entities are identified, based on the relevant jurisdiction, organizational structure, resources, technological maturity, professional responsibility and existing institutional capacity.

Chapter 1 Why the AGI era needs a Contribution Value System

1.1 The crisis of value in the AGI era

Humanity stands at a turning point in civilizational history. Artificial general intelligence (AGI) is developing rapidly. This is more than a technological revolution: it is reshaping labor, collaboration, recognition of value and people's social positions.

Warning signs in the data:

- Spreading meaninglessness: Globally, a sense of meaninglessness has become epidemic. According to the World Health Organization's 2025 figures, approximately 332 million people, or about 5.7% of adults, experience depression [1]. In Japan, lonely or isolated deaths remain a serious problem. A 2024 Cabinet Office estimate puts the annual number of people discovered eight or more days after death at about 21,800, with a trend toward younger ages [2].
- Erosion of work's meaning: A 2018 McKinsey Global Institute report projected that by 2030, as many as 375 million workers worldwide, or 14% of the global workforce, might need to change occupational categories [3]. As machines take over work, the feeling of being useful is disappearing.
- A worsening care deficit: The International Labour Organization estimated in 2018 that approximately 16.4 billion hours of unpaid care work were performed worldwide every day, yet society almost entirely fails to see it [4].
- Accelerating intergenerational disconnection: The digital divide intensifies older people's isolation, making the transmission of meaning between “digital natives” and “digital immigrants” increasingly difficult.

This is not a crisis affecting a single group. It is a systemic challenge at the scale of civilization.

1.2 Fundamental defects of the existing economic system

The existing economic system assumes that everything valuable should be traded in markets and all work should be paid. That assumption may have been barely tenable in the industrial era, but it has become untenable in the AGI era.

Traditional value system	CVS perspective
Counts tradable outputs alone	Includes all sustaining contributions, such as care, companionship and transmission
Ignores externalities	Internalizes externalities in accounting
Linear accumulation logic	Nonlinear decay and collaborative effects
Short-term incentives	Intergenerational fairness constraints
Money as the sole measure of value	Recognition of diverse forms of meaning

Three fundamental defects:

1. Counting production but not sustenance. Market economies calculate GDP precisely while overlooking contributions such as:

- Mothers' care for children. Research shows that women worldwide spend about 4 hours 25 minutes per day on unpaid care on average, more than 1,600 hours annually; those devoted full-time to childrearing spend longer [5].
- Community volunteers' maintenance work.
- Older people passing experience and wisdom to younger people.
- Neighbors looking out for one another.

This sustaining work is foundational to civilization's continuity, but is systematically undervalued because it is difficult to include in market exchange and conventional accounting.

2. Linear accumulation that disregards intergenerational fairness. Existing systems encourage accumulation of wealth, power and resources. This creates severe intergenerational unfairness: present generations consume resources that should belong to future generations without bearing the cost.

3. Misaligned incentives that penalize putting others first. In existing systems, helping others often entails personal loss. Caring for older people, developing public-interest work and transmitting culture are vital to civilization, yet the economic system fails to recognize or encourage them.

1.3 Limits of traditional solutions

Academics and policymakers have proposed various responses to the crisis of meaning, but all have fundamental limits.

First approach: Universal Basic Income (UBI)

UBI advocates argue that when machines take over jobs, people should be freed from working merely to survive and enabled to pursue self-actualization.

Limitations:

- UBI is pain relief, not a cure. It addresses income, but not meaning.
- Research indicates that losing work-related goals can intensify depression and meaninglessness.
- UBI assumes “work equals suffering,” an industrial-era bias. Many forms of care and creative work are themselves sources of meaning.

Second approach: Skills training and lifelong learning

“Help people learn new skills and adapt to new jobs” is the standard policy answer.

Limitations:

- Skills training assumes that people can gain meaning through work, but in the AGI era the definition of work itself is changing.
- Lifelong learning is valuable, but addresses employability rather than meaning.
- AI can acquire skills rapidly. Humanity's distinctive value lies in unquantifiable qualities such as kindness, courage, creativity and love, rather than in skills.

Third approach: Expanding the nonprofit sector

“Let nonprofit organizations provide more social services” is another common approach.

Limitations:

- The nonprofit sector is severely under-resourced and dependent on donations and volunteers, preventing it from scaling.

- Its workers often face mission drift: survival pressures force them to relinquish their sense of mission.
- More fundamentally, the sector still supplements the market instead of challenging its standards for valuing things.

1.4 CVS as a third path

These limitations call for an entirely new framework for recognizing value: a ledger of civilizational trust, rather than another market beside the existing market.

The central insight is that some things should not be traded, but should be recorded and recognized.

CVS borrows the precision of monetary economics, including quantification, traceability and relevance to resource-use priorities, while removing the need for exchange: you need not exchange CV for anything, because it is itself recognition. It borrows credit systems' data-processing capabilities while removing hierarchy: CV does not determine social status.

This is a fundamental paradigm shift from incentivizing individuals to pursue private advantage toward recording and encouraging actions that put others first.

Chapter 2 The basic positioning of CVS

2.1 What it is not

CVS is not:

- A second currency. CV cannot be traded, transferred or converted into money.
- A social-credit system. It records positive contributions rather than violations, does not restrict rights, and does not compromise basic living conditions for nonparticipants.
- A personality-scoring system. It does not quantify people's worth, meaning or dignity.
- A compulsory system. Contribution is a choice, not an obligation.
- A precision algorithmic system. It acknowledges that some contributions cannot be recorded and rejects false precision. It does not pursue exact algorithmic measurement. Seeking to calculate CV precisely is a category error, like measuring clouds with a ruler.

2.2 What it is

CVS is:

- A record of civilizational trust: who helps whom, in what ways and to what extent.
- A way to make acts of helping visible, including hidden care, companionship and transmission.
- A basis for prioritizing resource use according to contribution records, capacity for responsibility and public meaning, rather than wealth ownership.
- A reference factor for governance relevance, subject to multiple constraints and never the sole basis.
- A sustainably evolving system whose specific variables are jointly derived through actual experimental data, community governance and ethical review.
- A dynamic trace-recording system, rather than a one-off precision scoring mechanism. It acknowledges omissions, errors and disputes and uses initial values, stage reviews, stable confirmation and long-term additions to let time help correct bias.

2.3 CV governance is not a precision algorithm

CVS does not seek an exact calculation of contribution value. Trying to do so is a category error, like measuring clouds with a ruler. The institution's core purpose is to let real outcomes and time gradually distinguish actions with genuine public value, rather than to measure everything.

Core philosophy:

- CV is more a trace-recording system than a precision scoring mechanism.
- Records will contain omissions, errors and disputes, but time can expose systematic biases and allow their correction.
- Records should be subject to auditable oversight while protecting privacy, beneficiaries' dignity and necessary anonymity. Disclosure covers rules, processes, aggregate results, dispute handling and necessary de-identified records, not every personal detail.
- Stably confirmed historical records may be retained long-term. Effective weights for current resource use and governance can be adjusted for domain relevance, responsibility cycles and time.
- Civilization remembers realized contributions, but historical contributions cannot automatically become permanent power.

This is a design choice, not a defect:

Traditional incentive mechanisms try to quantify every contribution precisely, but the world of meaning resists exact measurement. CVS chooses “good enough visibility” over “precise measurement.” This means:

- Some contributions will go unrecorded, but the system does not penalize lack of a record.
- Some assessments will be disputed, but disputes themselves are valuable conversations.
- The system will make mistakes, but time will help correct biases.

2.4 Relationship with money

Dimension	Money	Contribution Value
What is measured	Tradable value	Verifiable genuine contribution
How acquired	Exchange for labor	Genuine contribution records
Transferable	Yes	No; bound to the subject
Tradable	Yes	No; nontrading principle
Time decay	None, apart from inflation	Historical records are not erased; currently effective weights may be adjusted for timeliness
Inheritable	Yes	No
Purpose	Material incentives	Recognition of contribution, resource collaboration and governance reference

Money asks: How much can you pay? Contribution Value asks: How much have you helped sustain civilization?

Dual-track coexistence: CVS operates alongside money during startup and progressively takes on more reference functions for resource use, collaborative trust and governance explanations during transition. Once maturity conditions hold, the aim is to shift the dominant allocation logic for core public resources and development opportunities from ownership capacity toward genuine contribution, responsibility and public value. This structural replacement does not abolish money, markets or price mechanisms, nor confer unified allocation sovereignty on CV.

Chapter 3 Theoretical foundations

Real contribution meaning dynamics and putting others first

3.1 Institutional validity does not require metaphysical premises

CVS starts from a real problem: many genuine contributions that sustain civilization have long existed without being fully recognized by market prices, job hierarchies or a single performance metric. This institutional problem does not require participants to adopt any particular metaphysical position.

First, contributions must be grounded in verifiable reality.

The system records actions, resources, responsibilities, risks, maintenance and outcomes. People may experience and express meaning, but that experience does not enter personality scoring or automatically increase CV.

Second, the institution recognizes multiple motivations while seeking to align long-term personal interests with public contribution.

Participants may be jointly motivated by survival, interests, responsibility, relationships, dignity, growth, meaning and helping others. Contribution confirmation is in principle neutral toward inner motives.

Third, real action and its long-term results can generate mutual benefit across time.

Today's contributions should first improve present and future conditions for those involved and their networks of relationships, then gradually benefit communities and later generations. Deeper philosophical explanations remain optional research entry points, not conditions of participation.

3.2 Theoretical connection with Meaning Dynamics

Meaning Dynamics further explains how civilization sustains structures of meaning, introducing “structural meaning”: how civilization continually creates positions that individuals can enter, deepen, participate in and take responsibility for.

Civilizational stability model: $S = M \times D \times EP \times \eta$

Model dimension	Meaning	Specific CVS expression
M thickness	Accumulation and deepening of meaning thickness	Depth and continuity of contribution. Sustained work in a field produces a more substantial network of meaning.
D diversity	Richness of forms of meaning	Variety of contribution types. Contributions of ideas, actions, systems and collaboration together form civilization's ecology of meaning.
EP effective participation	Extent of effective individual participation in civilization's network	Whether contributions actually enter the structure. Only contributions that are verified and can be confirmed by others and communities are counted.
η collaboration efficiency	Efficiency of civilization's internal collaborative networks	Network effects of contributions. Value multiplication through collaborative contributions reflects improved collaboration efficiency.

Core insight: CVS does not try to quantify meaning. It records genuine contributions that deepen civilizational capabilities, relationship networks, effective participation and the quality of collaboration. The models support directional and comparative analysis; they must not be mistaken for an already established capacity for precise measurement.

3.3 Compatibility of putting others first with diverse human motivations

Institutionally, putting others first does not require individuals to abandon self-interest. It establishes shared continuity, others' rights and public consequences as baselines that short-term private gain must not arbitrarily override. CVS translates this direction into verifiable contribution records and resource-collaboration mechanisms.

Core design logic:

Incentive compatibility means aligning, as far as possible, legitimate present and future personal gains, stable relationships, communities' long-term interests and genuine public contributions. The institution does not judge "purity of motive"; it tests actual inputs, responsibilities, risks and outcomes.

In many real situations, short-term personal interests may conflict with long-term shared interests. Institutional design should reduce structures that push them into opposition, rather than eliminate personal interests. CVS aims to admit diverse motivations, let real actions produce gains, allow those gains to accumulate into future personal capabilities, relationships and collaborative trust, and create longer-term mutual benefit without manipulating vulnerabilities.

Specific design mechanisms:

1. Observable contribution tags. Whether they affect weighting must be tested in pilots; they provide no moral bonus.
 - "No direct benefit" tag: The contributor received neither a direct resource return nor a direct gain in power from that contribution. It describes an observable relationship without judging inner motives.
 - "High cost" tag: Contributions involving significant personal costs.
 - "Intergenerational effect" tag: Contributions primarily benefiting future generations.
2. Assessment of collaborative effects. Each contribution is assessed for how it strengthens the network. Compared with writing a song alone, writing it and teaching ten others to sing it receives a higher assessment of collaborative effect.
3. Separation of historical records from currently valid relevance. Stably confirmed historical contributions remain and are not erased by time. Their effective weight for current resources and governance can nevertheless be adjusted for domain relevance, responsibility cycles and timeliness, preventing historical contribution from becoming permanent power.

3.4 CVS as civilization's trust record rather than an incentive algorithm

This is the fundamental difference between CVS and conventional incentive systems.

Characteristics of incentive algorithms:

- Aim to change behavior.
- Manipulate through rewards and penalties.
- Focus on individual performance.
- Can be gamed to accumulate points.
- Operate externally.

Characteristics of trust records:

- Aim to recognize contributions.
- Build trust through transparency.
- Focus on networks of relationships.
- Record actual behavior.
- Operate within civilization.

An illustration:

Imagine a community where Zhang San helps Li Si care for an older person every day, and Wang Wu organizes a neighborhood meal every month. In a traditional economy, these acts are almost impossible to incentivize: there is no market and no transaction.

Under CVS:

- Zhang San's help is recorded as “Action contribution — care and companionship.”
- Wang Wu's organizing is recorded as “Collaborative contribution — organization and coordination.”
- These records do not exist to provide them with some transactional reward. They let the community see who helps whom and how those relationships form a mutually supportive network.

As the community sees these records, trust naturally develops on the basis of people's contributions, rather than wealth or status.

Core value proposition: CVS is not another “You do this and I give you that” exchange system. It is civilization's memory system, recording who helps whom, how and to what extent. These records form civilization's trust infrastructure.

Chapter 4 System design

How contributions are recorded assessed and recognized

4.1 Eleven core principles

CVS institutional design follows eleven core principles:

Principle	Core content	Safeguard against distortion
Open eligibility and subject binding	Subjects include individuals, communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations. Records bind to actual subjects.	Prevent reducing CV to individual points or allowing others to appropriate it.
Nontrading	CV must not be bought, sold, financialized or made a speculative asset.	Prevent CV from becoming money.
Whole-outcome confirmation and conservation of the total	Collaborative outcomes may be confirmed as wholes before subdivision, which must not duplicate accounting.	Recognize collaborative value without counting one outcome repeatedly.
Motive neutrality	Confirm from facts, inputs, responsibilities, risks and outcomes, without additions or deductions for psychological “nobility.”	Prevent personality scoring and moral judgment.
Dynamic confirmation	Initial values are not final. Review results in stages, confirm stably and allow long-term additions.	Prevent one-off valuation and short-termism.
Resource use	CV may inform Resource Pool use rights, project priority and collaborative trust.	Establish a positive cycle between contribution and resources.
Governance interface constraints, correcting the former governance weighting principle	CV may enter the Governance V3.0 lifecycle as facts, responsibility and relevance, but must not automatically generate governance sovereignty, expert sovereignty or executive privilege.	Prevent CV from purchasing, monopolizing or transmitting governance sovereignty through inheritance.
Separation of inputs and exit	Inputs create certificates and records; exit redeems remaining inputs rather than selling CV.	Protect exit rights and record integrity.

Principle	Core content	Safeguard against distortion
Domain binding	CV has explicit domain attributes and limited cross-domain weight.	Prevent expansion of power across domains.
Historical contributions cannot be erased	Realized and stably confirmed contributions retain historical records; currently valid relevance can be adjusted separately.	Prevent later environmental changes from negating real historical contributions.
Silent baseline	CV has zero influence on basic rights, human dignity and basic freedoms.	Protect each person's incommensurable basic worth and political equality.

4.2 Four sources of contribution

CVS organizes all contributions into four broad source types:

Source	Content	Examples
Contributions of ideas	Theoretical innovation, risk identification and institutional design	New theoretical frameworks, identification of potential risks, governance mechanisms, original art and scientific discoveries
Contributions through action	Technology development, public services and project implementation	New technology, care services, community projects, environmental action and everyday care
System contributions	System maintenance, risk defense and infrastructure operation	Maintaining public spaces, protecting cybersecurity, operating infrastructure, defending against risks and responding to crises
Collaborative contributions	Cross-domain connections, resource integration and organizational coordination	Facilitating cross-field cooperation, integrating and allocating resources, organizing, coordinating, mediating conflicts and sharing knowledge

Design note: These four categories reflect different levels of contribution. Ideas shape direction; actions implement it; system contributions sustain operation; and collaboration connects networks. A complete civilizational structure of meaning requires balanced development of all four.

4.3 Definitions of core concepts

Important distinction: CV and PY are different kinds of records. CV asks “How much confirmed genuine contribution has the subject produced?” PY asks “What scale of basic subsistence resources is involved?” A resource contribution may record both “Resource fact: 100 PY” and “Contribution confirmation: X CV.” However, X must be independently confirmed from actual release, use, responsibility, outcomes and time. CV and PY have no fixed ratio, exchange rate or asset mapping.

Contribution Value (CV)

A record of genuine contribution history and a symbol of currently valid relevance, bound to the contributing subject. Subjects include individuals, temporary collaborative groups, project communities, enduring communities, organizations and cross-organizational collaborations. CV may serve as reference facts for resource use, project priority, collaborative trust, responsibility and governance explanations. It must not be freely traded, transferred, financialized or treated as a speculative asset, nor automatically create governance sovereignty, voting rights, professional judgment authority, executive authority or individual obligations.

Calculation expressions: a directional framework whose specific elements and variables require verification by actual experimental or application entities.

Initial Contribution Value $CV_0 = F(\text{contribution facts, inputs, responsibilities, risks, preliminary outcomes, domain context})$

Stage Contribution Value $CV_t = CV_0 + \Delta_t(\text{actual outcomes, continuing effects, maintenance responsibilities, positive and negative externalities, new evidence})$

F and Δ_t are nonlinear assessment functions awaiting pilot calibration. The four sources, ideas, actions, systems and collaboration, organize classifications and evidence. They do not represent four quantities to be added linearly.

Contribution Record Account

Each contributing subject has a contribution record account. It distinguishes historical records, currently valid relevance and provisional confirmations that have not yet matured. It does not turn meaning, personality or psychological states into assets.

Dimension	Content	Characteristics
Historical contribution records	Stably confirmed contribution events and attribution records	Retained long-term; not erased by technological advances or the passage of time
Currently effective contribution weight	Time-sensitive aggregation used as reference for current resource use, governance and collaboration	Adjustable for domain relevance, responsibility cycles and time
Contributions awaiting maturity	P0–P2 estimates, initial values and stage-verification records	May be increased, maintained, reduced or placed under extended observation
Stable contributions	Relatively stable P3 confirmation	Not frequently recalculated except for major new evidence, error, fraud or emerging long-term outcomes
Long-term additions	P4 records recognizing value that becomes visible retrospectively	Additions only for genuine long-term value emerging later that could not previously have been known
Domain distribution	Contribution sources and effective weights kept by subdomain	Prevents automatic expansion of authority across domains

4.4 Contributing subjects from individuals to communities

CV records verifiable genuine contribution, not merely “individuals doing good deeds.” A subject may be a natural person, temporary collaborative group, project community, enduring community, organization or cross-organizational collaboration. The system first establishes who actually supplied inputs, undertook responsibilities and risks, and performed continuing maintenance, then determines the level of attribution.

Subject level	Typical form	Attribution focus
Individual	Natural person	Directly records attributable individual contributions
Temporary group	Rescue team, temporary project team or volunteer action group	Permits a whole-group account for the task period, followed by settlement and archiving under the rules
Project community	Research and development, construction or public-project group	Overall outcomes coexist with members' contributions
Enduring community	Community, cooperative or research community	May retain contributions from long-term communal maintenance and institutional accumulation

Subject level	Typical form	Attribution focus
Organization	Company, school, hospital, foundation and similar bodies	Organizational resources and members' labor are confirmed separately; organizations must not absorb individual contributions
Cross-organizational collaboration	Joint project involving several institutions	Whole-outcome confirmation followed by subdivision among organizations, among communities and internally

4.5 Whole-outcome attribution internal subdivision and conservation of the total

A collaborative outcome that cannot reasonably be separated may first receive CV at the community level, then be subdivided internally on the basis of actual contribution, prior agreement and verifiable processes. Some CV may also be retained for use by the community as a whole. Community contributions belong to the community subject, not personally to its head, legal representative, manager or actual controller.

The same outcome must not be counted repeatedly across subject levels. If the whole outcome is confirmed at X CV, the sum of “community-retained share + individual subdivision + attribution to other collaborators” must remain X CV. Later additional value should be confirmed separately as a new stage addition, not through repeated distribution of the original total.

4.6 Motive neutrality separates motivation research from contribution calculation

Motivational analysis may help explain why people participate, persist or exit. Contribution confirmation judges only what they did, supplied, undertook and actually produced. Purity-of-motive adjustments such as “×0.8 because it was done for money” or “×1.3 because the help was sincere” are prohibited. The system may identify behavioral facts such as fraud, coercion or conflicts of interest, but must not convert inferences about inner motives into CV additions or deductions.

4.7 Dynamic confirmation

Initial values stage values stable values and retrospective additions

Initial calculation is not final valuation. When a contribution occurs, available information supports only provisional confirmation. As actual outcomes, duration, maintenance responsibilities, positive and negative externalities and subsequent effects emerge, the record should be reviewed, increased, corrected or confirmed within a predefined observation period.

State	Meaning	Permitted actions
P0 estimated	Not yet occurred, or only a commitment of inputs exists	Not treated as mature contribution; used only for budgeting, scenario exploration and risk preparation
P1 provisionally confirmed	Inputs or actions occurred; outcomes remain early	Establish an initial value and specify an observation period
P2 stage-verified	Some outcomes have emerged	Increase, maintain, reduce or extend observation
P3 stably confirmed	Main outcomes and responsibility cycle have substantially become clear	Enter a relatively stable historical contribution record
P4 long-term additions	Genuine long-term value that could not previously be known emerges later	Make retrospective additions based on new evidence

Six principles of dynamic confirmation: initial values are not final; track outcomes; use conservative initial values and retrospective additions; genuine historical contributions cannot be erased; adjustments require reviewable factual grounds; and after stable confirmation, avoid frequent recalculation except for major new evidence, error, fraud or emerging long-term outcomes.

Innovation, scientific research and public experiments must not be mechanically reset to zero merely because they did not meet all their objectives. Distinguish failure to achieve an outcome from failure to discharge responsibility. If actual duties were fulfilled under the rules and the work identified unsuccessful paths, reduced risk, accumulated data or improved methods, it may still generate verifiable contribution.

4.8 Dimensions of quality assessment

Each contribution requires four-dimensional assessment. Actual experimental entities determine the attention given to each dimension in dedicated rules.

Dimension	Definition	Assessment method
Authenticity	Did the contribution actually occur?	Cross-verification among multiple parties and random checks
Effectiveness	Did it genuinely create meaningful value?	Beneficiary feedback and third-party assessment
Scarcity	Is it difficult to replace?	Supply-scarcity index and urgency-of-need index
Collaborative effect	Did it strengthen network capabilities?	Network-effect measurement and externality assessment

4.9 Observable contribution tags

These tags describe observable facts only; they carry no automatic moral bonus. Any effect on stage confirmation must be based on their actual causal relationship to real outcomes, risks and long-term value.

- No direct benefit: The contributor received no direct resource return or gain in power from the contribution. This describes an observable relationship, without judging inner motives.
- High cost: The contributor bore significant personal costs.
- Innovation: The contribution used an unprecedented approach.
- Intergenerational effect: The contribution primarily benefits future generations.

4.10 Core process from initial value to stable confirmation

Contribution submission process:

1. Submission or identification: Submit contribution facts, subject level, category, context, evidence and a conflict-of-interest declaration. For community outcomes, also declare internal attribution rules.
2. Preliminary screening: AI checks only format, completeness of evidence, duplicate submissions and initial classification. It does not infer purity of motive.
3. Initial assessment: Establish a P1 initial value from authenticity, effectiveness, scarcity, collaborative effects and domain conditions. Pilot rules determine evaluator numbers and composition, excluding conflicted parties.
4. Stage review: At agreed observation points, use actual outcomes, continuing effects, maintenance responsibilities and externalities to enter P2. Increase, maintain or reduce the value, or extend observation.
5. Stable confirmation and long-term additions: Enter P3 after the main outcomes emerge. Enter P4 for retrospective additions when genuine long-term value that could not previously be known later appears. Preserve grounds, versions and appeal records for every adjustment.

Boundaries of Spark and AGI assistance: Spark or other authorized agents may help subjects organize facts, flag missing evidence, explain rules and display uncertainty and possible outcomes. They must not present system inferences as the subject's wishes or infer altruism, sincerity or sense of mission to change CV. Major, long-term or high-consequence matters must retain explicit subject-confirmation checkpoints. Rejecting system advice must not itself create a negative contribution record.

Adjustment of phase and domain variables:

The system may vary its attention to contribution dimensions according to operating phase and context. Actual experimental or application entities must verify specific variables; these do not constitute a fixed sequence of civilizational stages.

- Crisis phase: Prioritize sustenance, rescue and recovery.
- Construction phase: Balance development of basic capabilities with long-term maintenance.
- Stable phase: Encourage continuing maintenance, creation and long-term inputs.
- Exploration and transition phase: Improve recognition of innovation, trial and error, and exploration of directions.

4.11 Mechanisms protecting record integrity

CVS imposes no penalties on personhood and does not restrict basic rights. It applies only necessary safeguards to record credibility and submission permissions. False submissions, collusive assessments and identity fraud affect the validity of the relevant records and eligibility to submit or assess. Those who seriously undermine system credibility may have submission or assessment eligibility suspended, with appeal and review channels preserved.

Behavior	Detection method	Response
False submission	Evidence verification and checks of time and location plausibility	Revoke false records and suspend submission permission under rules published in advance; specific pilot rules set the duration
Circular reciprocity	Transaction-graph analysis and anomaly detection	Revoke anomalous records and adjust assessment-credibility records of the parties involved
Collusive assessment	Score similarity and network-relationship analysis	Suspend evaluator eligibility under rules published in advance and adjust evaluator credibility records; specific pilot rules set duration
Splitting submissions	Behavioral-pattern analysis	Combine calculations and issue a warning
Identity fraud	Identity verification and behavioral biometrics	Cancel eligibility for contribution records while retaining ethics-committee review

These responses protect record credibility rather than impose punishment. All retain appeal and review channels.

4.12 Minimizing the burden of recording

Contribution recording must not require frequent, trivial and compulsory submissions and verification. The design goal is to make acts of helping visible, not turn everyone into their own accountant.

If recording complexity exceeds what participants can reasonably bear on average, the process should be simplified.

Specific constraints:

- Individual submissions should impose minimal burden. Actual experimental or application entities determine specific time requirements through user research, ethical review and usability testing; the master document does not preset them.
- Submission frequency, exemptions, sampling and review cycles are derived in dedicated pilot parameter documents or implementation manuals. The master document retains only the principles of minimal burden, resistance to point farming, appealability and reviewability.
- Encourage automated recording from objective evidence, such as digital collaboration-platform contribution records, to reduce active submission burdens.
- Recording frequency must not become a contribution-assessment dimension.

4.13 Misuses of CV

CVS must clearly identify its most likely misuses to prevent abuse:

1. Ranking human worth by CV. CV must not determine judgments of a person's worth, dignity or social standing.
2. Conditioning basic subsistence resources on CV. Food, shelter, healthcare and other basic resources must not be tied to CV.
3. CV-based discrimination in relationships, employment or education. CV must not be a primary basis for partner selection, hiring or admissions.
4. Expanding power across domains through CV. CV must not secure power beyond its own domain.
5. Replacing law, ethics or professional judgment with CV. CV cannot override legal judgments, ethical review or professional assessments.
6. Creating new status hierarchies. Social stratification based on CV is prohibited.

This is more effective than abstract ethical red lines. The system must tell participants clearly what they may and may not do.

4.14 Countering performative altruism

Once contribution recording becomes public, performative altruism will inevitably be encouraged. Detection should examine:

- Frequent display with little actual benefit.
- Contributions on camera alongside exploitation off camera.
- Organizations packaging individual contributions or exaggerating them.
- Profiting from charitable branding or using contribution records for commercial marketing.
- Manufacturing needs or contribution opportunities merely to create records.

Responses:

- Add verification of actual benefit, assessing beneficiary outcomes as well as contributing behavior.
- Establish beneficiary feedback. Actual experience matters more than presentation.
- Place contributors who frequently display their actions under observation to compare their actual contributions with their presentations.
- Prohibit using beneficiaries' images, private information or narratives of suffering in contribution records.

4.15 Protecting beneficiaries

Records must not make beneficiaries into objects of display. This is central to whether the system truly protects people's inner lives.

Core principles:

- Beneficiaries may choose anonymity; the system must not compel disclosure of their information.
- Beneficiaries must not be forced to give thanks publicly or express gratitude.
- Images of vulnerable people must not be exchanged for CV.
- Beneficiaries must be able to keep feedback nonpublic.
- The system must not encourage displays of suffering that use vulnerable groups' hardship to attract attention and contributions.

Specific constraints:

- Beneficiary feedback is optional for care and assistance contributions.
- Records involving vulnerable groups, including children, disabled people, older people and people in poverty, require informed consent from beneficiaries or their guardians.
- Records must not contain beneficiaries' identifiable personal information, such as photographs, names or addresses.
- Submissions violating beneficiary-protection rules are not entered in contribution records. Existing entries should be revoked. Serious violations entail suspension of submission or assessment eligibility and referral to the ethics committee for review.

Chapter 5 Governance boundaries

Layered structures and safeguards against distortion

This chapter is placed early because governance boundaries are the system's ethical foundation and must be explicit from the outset.

5.1 Layers of governance

CVS uses three governance layers corresponding to different decision types:

Layer	Type of issue	Institutional treatment	Role of CV
Civilizational baseline	Human dignity, basic freedoms, basic rights, basic subsistence, exit and appeal	Basic-rights rules, legitimate governance structures and independent correction	Zero influence; no role in favorable or unfavorable decisions
Civilizational subdomain or professional governance state	Factual judgments within a professional field, rule proposals and explanations of resource use	Facts, evidence, professional judgment, value decisions, execution and outcomes are handled as distinct layers	Only explains domain experience, historical responsibility and currently valid relevance
Project execution	Execution, assessment, maintenance and retrospective review of specific projects	Explicit authorization, responsibility, resource permissions and outcome audits	May inform collaborative trust and responsibility matching; creates no executive privilege

Design logic:

- The civilizational baseline observes the silent baseline principle. CV must not intervene in matters of human rights, dignity or freedom, protecting everyone's incommensurable basic worth and dignity.
- Subdomain governance expresses domain binding. Professional matters are led by contributors in that field, preventing outsiders from deciding specialist matters.
- Project governance draws on contribution records' trust value to provide historical reference for concrete collaboration.

5.2 Absolute prohibitions

- CV must not be tied to basic subsistence rights. Nonparticipation or a zero CV balance must not affect access to food, shelter, basic healthcare, personal safety or resources needed for minimum dignity. Even during scarcity, CV must not determine whom to protect first or whose support to cut off first.
- No compulsory contribution. Participation must be entirely voluntary.
- No discrimination through CV. People with low and high CV have exactly the same basic rights.
- No equation of CV with human worth. CV measures contributions, not personality, dignity or relative intrinsic worth.
- No free trading of CV. It must not be bought, sold, transferred, financialized or used as a speculative asset.

5.3 Governance interface constraints

Correction of the former governance weighting principle

CV may enter the governance lifecycle as material concerning facts, evidence, responsibility, domain relevance and currently valid relevance. It must not become an automated decision weight, authority over public purposes, professional judgment authority, executive authority, voting rights or an individual obligation.

This edition no longer retains a governance-weight formula as a master-document norm. If an actual experimental entity later needs governance-participation rules, it must derive them comprehensively within Governance V3.0 from purposes, causal relationships, legitimacy, the three-powers division, execution responsibilities, outcome auditing and independent correction, rather than directly from a CV number.

For CV to enter a governance explanation, at minimum: the issue's domain must be freshly identified; relevant and affected subjects must be described; the contribution facts must have an explainable relationship to the current issue; the source of professional judgment must be clear; responsibility and correction routes must be explicit; and basic rights, human dignity, basic freedoms and exit rights must remain unaffected by CV.

Overall optimality, resource efficiency, public need, contribution maximization and system predictions may provide reasons for renewed judgment, but cannot automatically create permissions. Contribution does not purchase governance sovereignty; capability does not automatically generate power; professional facts do not replace value decisions.

Layer	Where CV may contribute	Boundary it must not cross
Facts and evidence	Contribution events, responsibilities, beneficiary outcomes, long-term maintenance and externality records	Undisclosed private-domain data must not be default inputs
Inference and causal hypotheses	Explains a contribution type's relationship to the present problem and the uncertainty involved	Correlation must not be presented as the decision itself
Value judgments and rules	Reference information on affected subjects, those bearing burdens and historical responsibilities	Must not replace public-purpose decisions or legitimate rulemaking
Professional judgment	Background on domain experience and historical performance	High CV must not automatically confer expert sovereignty
Execution and responsibility	Explains who bears which responsibilities and what audit is needed	CV must not exempt responsibility or confer executive privilege

5.4 Accountability following the exercise of power

If high CV brings more resource-use opportunities or a greater advisory role in governance, significant harm must trigger accountability.

Design principle:

The greater the contribution weight, the heavier the responsibility for decisions; the larger the resource invocation, the stricter the outcome audit.

Accountability mechanisms:

- Major decision failures require community review.
- If a project initiated by a high-CV contributor causes systemic harm, its leader must explain publicly.
- Where someone maliciously exploits high-CV status to expand power, revoke the relevant contribution records and suspend governance authority.
- Status as a high contributor must not confer immunity.

5.5 Anti-capture and correction across the three powers

Central concern: If people with high contribution records gain more trust in collaboration and resource use, could a new elite capture the system?

Direct answer: The risk is real. This edition therefore corrects the anti-capture approach from voting-weight limits to Governance V3.0's division of three powers and independent correction. CV does not directly purchase power. Any governance influence must pass through explanation of purposes, factual evidence, professional judgment, authorized execution, outcome auditing, appeal and review, and circuit-breaking where necessary.

Mechanism	Function	Baseline
Separation of purpose decisions from contribution records	Legitimate governance structures determine public purposes; CV supplies only factual and responsibility-related background	High CV must not automatically determine public purposes
Separation of professional judgment from contribution records	Professional judgment arises from domain capability, evidence and responsibility structures	High CV must not automatically make someone an expert
Separation of executive authority from contribution records	Execution arises from explicit authorization, accountable boundaries and resource permissions	High CV must not automatically allow resource or data invocation
Independent correction layer	Oversight, audit, appeal, review, circuit-breaking, repair and termination cut across all three powers	The system, Nebula or high-CV groups cannot be the sole auditor
Domain reassessment and cross-domain authorization	Prevents contributions in one field from expanding power into another	Cross-domain action requires renewed identification, explanation and authorization

Underlying logic: CVS governance does not seek rule by a contribution elite. It makes genuine contributions visible, enables practical support and allows correction, while ensuring that contribution records do not subsume basic rights, public purposes, professional responsibility or execution authorization.

5.6 Preventing moral coercion

Central concern: If CV becomes a measure of human worth, noncontributors may be regarded as morally inferior. Could this become a new form of moral coercion?

Direct answer: This is among our most important ethical concerns. We have designed explicit boundaries to prevent it.

Design safeguards:

1. Participation is entirely voluntary. Nonparticipation is your right and carries no penalty.

2. Nonparticipation does not affect basic living conditions. CV cannot be used to obtain basic subsistence resources such as food, shelter and healthcare. Nonparticipants retain full social protection.

3. Clearly distinguish contribution from human worth.

System documentation explicitly states that CV measures contribution, not personality. Every person's intrinsic worth is immeasurable and should not be quantified.

4. Privacy protection. Personal contribution records are nonpublic by default. You may display selected records, but the system does not compel disclosure.

5. Antidiscrimination rules. Rules explicitly prohibit using CV for discrimination. People with low CV must not lose any basic rights.

Cultural efforts:

- Promotional materials should emphasize that contribution is a choice, not an obligation.
- Community activities should emphasize diverse values. Some find meaning in caring for family, others in creating, and others simply live quietly; that too has value.
- Establish the narrative that having no contribution record is also fine. Sometimes the greatest contribution is not intruding.

Our commitment:

CVS is intended to liberate, not constrain. It should help people express goodwill and find meaning more easily. If it ever becomes a moral shackle, we would rather shut it down.

5.7 Checking institutional mismatch and signals from human experience

People's inner lives are purposes institutions must respect, not objects to measure and manage. The system establishes no meaning, sincerity or altruism scores, or psychological loyalty indicators. However, voluntarily expressed disagreement, regret, pressure and misalignment of meaning may be important signals of institutional mismatch.

Checks should focus on observable conditions and the actual usability of rights: whether refusals are respected, exit entails unreasonable costs, appeals work, beneficiaries face pressure, contributions are appropriated within communities, or rules encourage performative contributions.

Typical trigger signals:

- Significant, sustained or structural clustering of voluntary feedback, appeals, withdrawals, exits, beneficiary complaints or repeated regret. No uniform psychological percentage threshold is prescribed.
- Contribution records grow while subjects' room for choice, access to appeals or fairness within communities continues to deteriorate.
- Systemic reports of privacy problems, relational pressure or moral coercion in sensitive settings such as realizing aspirations, care and sharing.

Review procedure: Once triggered, a temporary group including ordinary participants, relevant domain members, beneficiary representatives and independent reviewers conducts a review within an agreed period. Where necessary, freeze the relevant rules, reduce automation and initiate rollback.

5.8 Dispute arbitration and rights remedies

Any participant who disputes a contribution assessment may apply for arbitration.

Arbitration procedure:

- The tribunal consists of randomly selected domain participants, ordinary participants and independent representatives without conflicts of interest. High CV must not automatically qualify someone to arbitrate.

- Issue a ruling within the period specified by rules published in advance. This is a concrete pilot parameter, not preset by the master document.
- Rulings may be appealed to the ethics committee.
- All arbitration records are public, with personal information de-identified.

List of rights:

- Right to information: Participants have the right to understand the logic used to calculate their CV.
- Right to appeal: Every assessment outcome has an appeal channel.
- Right to exit: Participants may request exit at any time; contribution records become historical archives.

5.9 Reassessment of domains

Domain boundaries are themselves governance questions. Domain binding does not freeze domain classifications. Periodic domain reassessment should prevent existing divisions from creating new power structures.

Reassessment covers:

- Whether current domain classifications remain reasonable.
- Whether domains should be added or merged.
- How cross-domain contributions should be weighted.
- Cross-domain mutual-recognition rules for contribution records.

5.10 Internal community attribution separation of organizations and individuals and appeals

A community may receive CV as a whole, but its account must not become a tool for organizational power to absorb members' contributions. Internal subdivision should, wherever possible, be agreed in advance, leave process records and be reviewable. Contributions that cannot be precisely divided beforehand may be resolved through member negotiation, independent review and appeal.

Attribution situation	Permitted approach	Prohibited practice
Indivisible overall outcome	Attribute first to the community, then subdivide under rules or retain a community share	Counting the full value both for the whole and again for its members
Organizational resources and members' labor	Separately confirm organizational resource contributions and members' actual labor, knowledge and risk contributions	Absorbing individual contributions under the label of an organizational project
Temporary community	Establish a task-period community account, then settle under rules and retain historical archives	Letting the leader determine all allocation alone
Enduring community	Retain community contributions to institutional maintenance, public infrastructure and long-term collaborative capability	Treating community contributions as management's private assets or governance privileges

Disputes over internal subdivision must have usable objection, review and appeal routes. A management position, legal-representative status or actual control does not itself confer personal ownership of the community's contributions.

5.11 Cross-system impact assessment

CVS cannot treat improvement in its own indicators as success in isolation. Before any important rule, resource-priority scheme, incentive interface or automation adjustment enters a pilot or scales up, assess whether it harms Resource Pool resilience, Shared World's authorization boundaries, Dream Garden's non-

manipulation principle, Spark-supported agency or the long-term capabilities of other civilizational subdomains.

Minimum checks: Does it encourage ineffective resource contributions to the pool merely to obtain CV? Does sharing slide from authorization into requisition? Does it turn wishes, care or relationships into contribution-production tools? Do Spark's suggestions gradually become implicit assignments? Does power spill across domains? Does it reduce necessary redundancy, recovery capability or future options? When structural negative effects appear, priority should go to suspending the mechanism, rather than offsetting them with yet another incentive scheme.

Chapter 6 Resource anchoring unit

Person Years and public communication

6.1 The Person Year concept

Beyond technical parameters, the meaning of contribution value can also be conveyed in more intuitive public language.

Person-Year (PY):

A public expression of resource scale. One hundred PY means approximately the basic resources required for 100 ordinary adults to live with dignity for one year. It only helps people understand resource scale. It does not mean 100 CV or imply convertibility, tradability or governance power.

Important distinction: There is no conversion relationship between CV and PY. PY describes resource scale; CV records a subject's contribution facts and their maturity. Even if a contribution supplies 100 PY of resources, its eventual CV must be confirmed independently according to whether resources were actually released, what real capabilities and results they produced, what responsibilities were undertaken, and what becomes apparent over time.

Intuitive examples:

- 100 PY $\approx$ the basic resources required for 100 ordinary adults to live with dignity for one year. This expresses resources, not a CV conversion.
- 1,000 PY $\approx$ the total resources you provided, equivalent to one year's basic subsistence needs for 1,000 ordinary people.

Relationship between Person-Years and actual allocation

PY anchors an intuitive sense of resource scale for resource-awareness education. It is not a precise resource-measurement unit.

In actual allocation, CV may be one reference factor for nonbasic resource applications and collaborative priority, but must not mechanically mean "high CV first." CV and PY have no fixed exchange rate. Specifically:

- Community budgets determine the total resources available for allocation annually.
- CV may inform collaborative credibility and priority in nonbasic resource applications, alongside real needs, project value, capacity for responsibility, safety reserves and public benefits.
- PY helps the public understand resource scale, but does not directly equal allocable resource quantities.
- Allocation is constrained by total budgets, not calculated from CV at a fixed rate.

This avoids the false promise that CV must correspond to an exact resource quantity while preserving an intuitive understanding of resource consumption.

6.2 Three dimensions anchored in civilizational goals

The contributions measured by CV ultimately serve humanity's three-dimensional goals of meaning:

Dimension	Meaning	Explanation
Survival S	Basic subsistence resource security	Ensure basic survival needs of individuals and groups are met
Happiness H	Psychological well-being and emotional value	Companionship, emotional support and community belonging
Meaning M	Knowledge creation and civilizational exploration	Knowledge creation, cultural development, civilizational transmission and exploration

By recording and protecting these three types of contribution, CVS ultimately serves civilization's sustainable continuity and the evolution of meaning.

6.3 Value for public communication

The Person-Year concept makes the scale of resource inputs, consumption and carrying capacity more intuitive.

Examples:

- “This project involves basic resource inputs of approximately 100 PY. Its eventual CV must be confirmed separately from actual release and use, responsibilities undertaken, real outcomes and what becomes apparent over time.”
- “This project consumed basic resource inputs equivalent to ten person-months. That expresses a resource quantity, not a CV conversion.”
- “This project's resource input is about 100 PY. That does not mean 100 CV or establish any fixed conversion relationship.”

Communication discipline: Public statements involving PY should always concern resource inputs, consumption, carrying capacity or retention. They must not use formulations such as “this much CV equals that much PY.”

“Input,” “consumption” and “support” are expressions for resource-awareness education, helping participants understand the real support costs behind public resources. PY must not be interpreted as CV, a claim, a debt, an asset share or a promise of redemption.

Reflective value:

- Encourages asking during consumption, “How many people's subsistence resources does this use?”
- Easier to understand than abstract units such as “Civit.”
- Connects resource awareness with awareness of meaning.

6.4 Relationship with other units

Unit	Meaning	Use
CV Contribution Value	Genuine contribution history and currently valid relevance, bound to the subject	Contribution confirmation, collaborative trust, constrained resource-use and governance-explanation reference; not a resource quantity
PY Person-Year	Independent unit conveying basic subsistence resource scale	Expressing resource scale, resource-awareness education and resource-fact recording; not convertible into CV
SE meaning unit	Theoretical concept	Academic discussion and meaning measurement; excluded from engineering calculations in this whitepaper's main text

Unit	Meaning	Use
CV and PY	No fixed ratio, exchange rate or asset mapping	Resource contributions may have dual records, but calculation and maturity confirmation are separate

Chapter 7 Startup motivations Resource Value and exit mechanisms

7.1 Startup mechanism

Core principle: Supplying money does not directly buy CV, and committing resources does not automatically amount to mature contribution. Corresponding provisional records arise only as actual inputs, effective release and subsequent results become visible.

During startup, funds, materials, premises, equipment, computing power, data, channels, organizational capabilities, time, labor and knowledge may all enter as resources. The system first records resource facts and availability, then forms P1–P3 contribution confirmations from actual use and outcomes.

Mechanism:

1. Resource inputs create contribution records. Once contributors actually make resources available to the Resource Pool, the system records type, quantity, condition, availability period, maintenance responsibility, substitutability and scenario fit. Market price is only a reference; it does not directly equal realized Resource Value or CV.
2. Input certificates are separate from contribution records. Contributors receive two records:
 - Input certificate: represents the initial share contributed to the Resource Pool.
 - Contribution record: represents the input action's contribution to the public interest.
3. CV cannot be purchased. Resource inputs may generate records after real use produces verifiable value, but money cannot directly buy CV. Owning resources is not contribution. Effective release, responsibility and genuine outcomes may constitute contribution.

7.2 Startup motivations connect present gains first to one's own future

Startup cannot rely principally on abstract appeals to act for later generations. Real participants first need to see that today's contributions can be recorded and improve their resources, collaborative reputation, opportunities for development and future possibilities in life. That future then naturally extends to those they care about, communities and later generations.

CV's motivational role is to keep real contributions from disappearing and let present gains accumulate into future capability, rather than drive people with scores. Survival, interests, relationships, dignity, growth, meaning and helping others may coexist long-term. The system must not create a ladder of personal advancement based on the nobility of motives.

7.3 Resource Value

Baseline value realized value and future option value

Resource Value is not a one-off conversion at market price. Baseline Resource Value describes capacity, condition, scarcity, lifespan, location, maintenance costs and substitutability. Realized Resource Value describes the value actually released in a concrete setting. Genuine dynamic confirmation depends jointly on resource, scenario, use, outcome and time.

Value layer	Core question	Startup treatment
Baseline Resource Value	What capability does it objectively have?	Record capacity, condition, lifespan, location, scarcity, substitutability and maintenance responsibilities
Realized Resource Value	How much value does it release in a real setting?	Review in stages using actual use, benefits, duration, wear and outcomes
Continuing regenerative value	Can it keep producing value after use?	Consider maintenance, regeneration, repair and long-term supply capacity
Future option value	Does retaining it preserve important future possibilities?	Allow necessary redundancy, reserves, recovery periods and strategic retention; maximizing utilization is not the highest objective

P0–P4 maturity applies to both Resource Value and CV, but they must remain distinct. Resource Value asks what capability a resource actually released; CV asks what the subject actually contributed, supplied and undertook in producing that result.

7.4 Exit mechanism

Core principle: Exit redeems input certificates or remaining resource shares; it does not sell CV.

Resource contributors may stop new participation under their input agreements and revoke or terminate future sharing, access and resource-use authorizations that remain revocable. Prior settlement of all existing responsibilities is not a universal condition of exit. Returnable remaining resources, input certificates or use-rights relationships are handled according to agreements, actual rights and current conditions. Do not invent a return in kind for resources already consumed, irreversibly used or associated with third-party responsibilities. Contractual obligations and responsibilities for public harm, maintenance, return, confidentiality, compensation, professional duties or repair arising from past conduct continue on a separate post-exit settlement track. Any data, resource or capability permissions genuinely necessary to discharge these duties require a separate current, minimal and lawful basis, rather than reuse of permissions already exited. CV records are not sold, transferred or exchanged on exit; they remain genuine historical contribution records only.

Mechanism:

1. Input certificates are what may be redeemed on exit. Contributors hold certificates for Resource Pool inputs, and redeem the remaining resource shares represented by them.
2. Consumed portions cannot be returned. Resources already used for system operation, project support or public services have become public value and cannot be returned.
3. CV is independent of exit. Contribution records are not sold, transferred or moved upon exit. P3 stably confirmed historical contributions remain long-term. P1–P2 events may continue to mature or be corrected under existing observation rules after the subject leaves. Exit itself does not freeze outcomes.
4. Special circumstances:
 - Violations of system rules: Handle relevant records, disputed certificates and unfinished matters independently under applicable rules, contracts and facts. Disputed objects may be frozen where necessary, but disputes must not indefinitely prolong all participation, data access or resource permissions.
 - Public harm: New future participation and revocable authorizations may cease. Existing compensation, rights repair, resource restoration and other responsibilities continue independently.
 - Unfinished responsibilities: Exit does not extinguish responsibility. Unfinished contractual, maintenance, return, compensation, confidentiality, professional or repair duties move into post-exit settlement. Permissions needed to fulfill them require a separate current, minimal and lawful basis.

Withdrawal of sharing authorization: Sharing resources is authorization, not transfer of ownership. Under established conditions, subjects may narrow, suspend or withdraw sharing authorizations that have not created irrevocable real-world responsibilities. Withdrawal itself is not untrustworthiness, a negative contribution or a judgment of personality. Actual use, established contractual or public responsibilities and reasonable follow-through duties should be handled on their facts. These ordinary responsibilities must not be repackaged as punishment for refusing to continue sharing.

7.5 Resource use rights

CV confers neither personal rank nor authority to determine public purposes. It may serve only as one reference fact for nonbasic resource use, collaborative matching and explanations of responsibility. Funds, equipment, space, computing power, data and service capacity in the Resource Pool are allocated neither by wealth-ownership logic nor by unified CV command. Decisions should jointly consider contribution records, real needs, project value, capacity for responsibility, authorization boundaries, safety reserves and public benefits.

Allocation principles:

- Contribution records may strengthen collaborative credibility and serve as a priority reference, but must not mechanically mean “high CV first.”
- Resource use also considers real needs, project value, capacity for responsibility, domain fit, safety reserves and future option value.
- Basic subsistence resources and basic rights remain independent of CV. Scarce-resource allocation must retain appeal, review and circuit-breaker mechanisms.

7.6 Resource and capability consistency and orderly contraction interfaces

CV records subject contributions only; it does not replace resource governance. Every resource input, use or application should be checked for actual resource consumption, real capability formation, safety reserves, recovery capability and future options. Large inputs do not necessarily mean large contributions, and high utilization does not necessarily mean high civilizational value.

When resource supply declines or real carrying capacity enters a constrained, load-reduction or core-preservation state, CV must not determine priorities for cutting off basic subsistence, personal safety, basic healthcare or minimum dignity. Nonbasic resource priorities must also consider capability criticality, real needs, substitutability, reversibility, safety redundancy and recovery value. The Resource and Capability Consistency, Threshold-Based Load Reduction and Orderly Contraction Framework for Civilization Leap V1.0 centrally governs the detailed R0–R5 state machine, thresholds, minimum civilizational capability units and orderly-contraction rules.

Chapter 8 Validation pathway

Derived after the actual entities are identified

8.1 Principles of validation design

CVS still requires real-world validation. At the master-document stage, only validation questions and institutional boundaries are prescribed. There are no preset uniform participant numbers, periods, locations, proportions, thresholds, evaluator counts, resource amounts, retention periods or MVP parameters.

Any startup or transition scheme must be derived separately after actual experimental or application entities are identified, taking account of jurisdiction, organizational structure, subject relationships, resources, technological maturity, professional responsibility, real problems and existing institutional capacity.

Validation must observe both mechanism effects and signs of institutional distortion: Are records more credible? Are subjects freer? Are beneficiaries protected? Are resources genuinely released? Does the system reduce manipulation rather than increase it?

8.2 Single mechanism validation with deferred parameters

Core objective: Test whether individual mechanisms can operate, including contribution submission, evidence minimization, P0–P4 dynamic confirmation, whole-community attribution and internal subdivision, appeal and review, beneficiary protection, and separation of inputs and exit.

Possible outputs: Contribution-type classification guides, evidence-minimization templates, evaluator training frameworks, appeal and review procedures, beneficiary anonymity and dignity-protection procedures, and engineering MVP requirements.

The master document must not preset participant numbers, community counts, observation periods, CV test ranges, success proportions, evaluator counts, automation thresholds or any uniform resource amounts.

8.3 Cross subject collaborative validation with deferred parameters

Core objective: Validate mutual recognition across communities, organizations and scenarios; visibility of domain states; resource and capability interfaces; withdrawal of Shared World authorizations; and separation of contribution history from currently valid relevance.

Possible outputs: Cross-subject mutual-recognition agreements, domain-authorization record models, layered interfaces between resource facts and CV confirmation, externality-record templates, and dispute-isolation and review mechanisms.

The master document must not preset expansion multiples, city tiers, industry counts, population coverage, cross-domain weight ranges or uniform mutual-recognition thresholds.

8.4 Validation of full system support with deferred parameters

Core objective: In entities with suitable jurisdictional grounding, professional responsibility, resource capacity and independent correction, test whether CVS can cooperate reliably with the Resource Pool, Shared World, Spark, Nebula and Governance V3.0.

Long-term direction: Let contribution logic gradually become one important basis for allocating core public resources and development opportunities, while preserving zero CV influence on basic rights, the private domain as default, revocable sharing authorization and the principle that overall optimality does not automatically impose individual obligations.

The master document must not preset national timetables, institutionalization years, uniform roadmap milestones or compulsory integration scopes.

8.5 Validation monitoring and circuit breaker mapping

Validation monitoring must look beyond participation rates, CV growth, system availability and resource-use efficiency to explicit structural circuit-breaker signals. Dedicated pilot parameter documents calibrate actual thresholds within real entities. The master document retains only minimum dimensions to observe.

Dimension	Question that must be answered	Unacceptable substitute
Subject freedom	Are refusal, withdrawal, exit and appeal genuinely usable?	Retention rates must not conceal pressure or coercion
Beneficiary protection	Are anonymity and dignity protected, with no pressure to be displayed?	Images of vulnerable people must not be exchanged for contribution records
Domain state	Are recording, disclosure, invocation and decision separately authorized?	Discovery does not confer disclosure or decision permission

Dimension	Question that must be answered	Unacceptable substitute
Resource resilience	Does resource use harm redundancy, recovery capability or future options?	Maximized utilization must not be the highest goal
Governance interface	Does CV enter the governance lifecycle only as reference on facts and responsibility?	CV must not convert directly into sovereignty, voting rights or executive authority
Anti-manipulation	Does the system induce performative altruism, compulsive contribution or conformity in meaning?	Changing behavior itself must not be the optimization objective

Chapter 9 Application Scenarios

9.1 Community Governance

Scenario: Explanations of the facts surrounding major community matters, making affected subjects visible, and recording the responsibilities undertaken.

Mechanism: Contribution records may serve as explanatory material concerning relevant experience, responsibilities undertaken, long-term maintenance, and relationships of being affected. Decisions on public purposes, professional judgment, and execution authorization continue to operate within the Governance V3.0 structure.

Boundary: CV must not be directly written into voting weights; people with high CV must not be designated decision-makers as a matter of course; and individuals must not be required to obey automatically in the name of an overall optimum. CV influence is zero on issues involving basic rights, the dignity of life, basic freedoms, and the right to exit.

Example: When a community considers whether to build a particular type of public facility, the system can make care experience, the relationships of affected neighbors, long-term maintenance responsibilities, resource costs, and alternatives visible. However, the validity of the decision must derive from a legitimate governance process.

9.2 Resource Allocation

Scenario: Allocation of community public resources.

Mechanism:

- Resources (space, equipment, and funding) are allocated through a combined assessment of contribution records, project value, and capacity to assume responsibility.
- Contribution records may be one reference factor in applications for non-basic resources, considered together with actual needs, a project's public benefits, capacity to assume responsibility, and safety reserves. They do not create a mechanical rule of "high CV first."
- Prevent frequent users from monopolizing resources.

Example: Booking a community meeting room.

- Relevant community-service records can inform an assessment of collaborative trustworthiness, but do not establish automatic priority.
- Public-benefit activities take priority over commercial uses.
- Applications with clear service plans receive priority.

9.3 Collaboration Matching

Scenario: Forming project teams.

Mechanism:

- Contribution records serve as a basis for collaborative trust.
- Contribution types are matched to project needs.
- An altruistic culture of collaboration is encouraged.

Example: Recruiting volunteers for a community eldercare project.

- Greater weight is given to people with care experience.
- Greater weight is given to people who commit time.
- Priority is given to those who can offer a diverse combination of skills.

9.4 Intergenerational Transmission

Scenario: Passing on knowledge and experience.

Mechanism:

- Older people's contributions to care and transmission are recorded.
- Young people's contributions to learning and transmission are recorded.
- Intergenerational connections are encouraged.

Example: Passing on skills through apprenticeship.

- The master's contribution to teaching.
- The apprentice's learning and commitment to passing on the skill.
- A synergy bonus after the skill has been successfully passed on.

Chapter 10 Common Questions and Responses (FAQ)

Q1 How is this different from a social credit system?

Core concern: The Contribution Value System sounds like a tool for government surveillance and control. How does it differ from a social credit system?

Direct answer: These are two fundamentally different systems. Both involve records, but the Contribution Value System explicitly rejects personality scoring, links to basic rights, and punitive uses.

Core differences:

Dimension	Social credit system	Contribution Value System
Goal	Control behavior and punish violations	Recognize contributions and encourage altruism
Evaluation criterion	Whether rules are obeyed	Whether others are helped
Punishment mechanism	Restrictions on rights (travel, loans)	No punishment (the system does not punish non-participants)
Information flow	Centralized surveillance	Distributed trust network
Nature	Tool of control	Record of trust
Tradability	No	No (Contribution Value must not be traded)

Key clarifications:

- The Contribution Value System does not record violations; it records only positive contributions.

- The Contribution Value System does not restrict rights. Non-participation does not affect basic living conditions.
- The Contribution Value System must not be used to discriminate. People with low CV have exactly the same basic rights as people with high CV.
- The Contribution Value System is non-tradable and non-transferable. This fundamentally distinguishes it from money.
- The Contribution Value System is decentralized. There is no central authority able to manipulate scores.

Q2 How does Contribution Value prevent elite control?

Core concern: If people with high contribution records gain more trust, resource opportunities, or visibility for their views, could elites take control of the system?

Direct answer: The central safeguard is not to design more complex voting weights. It is to maintain institutional separation among contribution records, governance sovereignty, professional judgment, execution authorization, and the correction layer.

Safeguard	Specific meaning
Separation of three powers	The power to decide purposes and rules, the power of professional judgment, and executive power derive respectively from legitimate structures, professional responsibility, and explicit authorization. CV must not automatically confer any of them.
Independent correction	Oversight, auditing, appeals, review, circuit-breaking, repair, and termination cut across all three powers and must not be monopolized by high-CV groups or the system itself.
Domain authorization	Cross-domain use of contribution facts, resources, data, capabilities, or professional judgments requires renewed identification, explanation, and authorization.
Zero influence on basic rights	CV has no influence on matters involving the dignity of life, basic freedoms, basic rights, or the right to exit.
Backward tracing of responsibility	Those who use greater resources, have greater impact, or occupy important positions must bear stronger duties of explanation, auditing, and responsibility for consequences.

Underlying logic: The Contribution Value System does not turn “high contributors” into a new ruling class. It enables real contributions to be seen and supported without harming basic equality, subsuming professional responsibility, or crossing domain-authorization boundaries.

Q3 How can meaning be quantified?

Core concern: Meaning is subjective and unquantifiable. Trying to quantify meaning is itself a mistake.

Direct answer: This concern touches the system’s design philosophy. We need to distinguish “what is being quantified” from “why it is quantified in this way.”

We quantify contributions, not meaning:

The Contribution Value System does not quantify “how meaningful your life is.” It quantifies “what you have done that benefits other people and the community.”

Why quantification is necessary:

- What cannot be quantified is often systematically overlooked, as with unpaid care work.
- Quantification provides visibility, so that altruistic behavior no longer remains invisible.
- Quantification enables collaboration: people can know who needs help and who can provide it.
- Quantification enables recognition: contributions can be seen and appreciated.

The limits of quantification:

- Quantification is not a perfect substitute; it is an approximation that enables visibility.
- The system explicitly acknowledges that some contributions may be impossible to record.
- The system is designed not to penalize a lack of records. Participation is voluntary.

Q4 Who has the authority to define what counts as a contribution?

Core concern: Defining “what counts as a contribution” is itself a form of power. Who gave you the authority to define it?

Direct answer: This authority is not bestowed; it is recognized.

The gradual sources of authority:

1. Initial definitions arise from community practice.

The system’s initial contribution categories come from the practices of real communities. Communities were already providing care before we defined “care” as a contribution type.

2. Categories evolve through governance.

Over time, communities can add, remove, or modify contribution types through governance mechanisms. This process is open, and anyone can submit a proposal.

3. Cultural neutrality by design.

The system deliberately avoids imposing particular values as universal standards. It defines acts of “helping others,” rather than “believing in a particular religion” or “supporting a particular political position.”

4. Refusal of compulsory participation.

The system does not force anyone to participate in the Contribution Value System. Participation is voluntary, and non-participation carries no punishment.

Acknowledging limitations:

We recognize that every classification system contains subjectivity. The Contribution Value System’s honest position is this: the system is imperfect, but better than “no record.” We are willing to let it continue to evolve and be corrected through practice.

Q5 What if someone falsifies records?

Core concern: Any recording system can be manipulated. How does the Contribution Value System stop people from falsifying records instead of making real contributions?

Direct answer: Falsified records are a real risk. We have designed multiple layers of protection.

Layers of protection:

1. Quality-assessment mechanism.

Every contribution must be assessed on four dimensions: authenticity, effectiveness, scarcity, and synergy. False or low-quality contributions receive lower scores.

2. Diminishing marginal recognition.

Large-scale or high-frequency contributions of the same type should be handled through diminishing marginal recognition, consolidated records, extended review, or domain-specific re-review. This prevents strategic stacking, farming visibility, or crowding out others’ real contributions. Specific triggers are to be derived from specialized rules, rather than preset in the master document.

3. Behavioral-pattern detection.

The system continuously monitors anomalous patterns:

- Large numbers of similar submissions within a short period.
- Mutual evaluations between related accounts.

- Anomalous evidence, such as the same photograph used in different submissions.

4. Random verification.

Confirmed contributions are randomly selected for on-site verification. A failed verification invalidates the record.

5. Separation of historical records from currently valid relevance.

Historical contributions that have reached stable confirmation are not erased by the passage of time.

However, their relevance to current governance and their reference effect for access to scarce resources may be adjusted according to timeliness, domain relevance, and continuing responsibility. A one-off historical contribution cannot automatically create permanent power.

Record-integrity measures:

- Minor anomaly: warning plus a reduction in the score of the relevant record.
- Moderate anomaly: revocation of false records plus suspension of submission privileges.
- Serious anomaly: disqualification from contribution recording, while preserving a channel for ethics-committee review.

These measures are not punishment; they maintain the credibility of the system's records. All measures preserve channels for appeal and review.

Q6 What is the relationship between Contribution Value and money?

Core concern: If Contribution Value cannot be exchanged for money, why would people genuinely care about it?

Direct answer: The Contribution Value System operates alongside money during the launch period. During the transition period, it gradually takes on reference functions for resource use, collaborative trust, and governance explanations. Its long-term direction, once mature conditions are established, is to shift the dominant basis for allocating civilization's core public resources gradually from the capacity to possess toward real contributions, responsibilities undertaken, and public value. What is replaced here is the dominance of the logic of possession. This does not mean immediately abolishing money, markets, or price mechanisms, nor does it give CV unified sovereignty over allocation.

Core distinctions:

Dimension	Money	Contribution Value
Question asked	How much can you pay?	How much have you already helped sustain civilization?
What it measures	Tradable value	Contribution to civilization
How it is acquired	Exchange of labor	Records of real contributions
Transferable	Yes	No
Tradable	Yes	No (non-trading principle)
Decay	None (except inflation)	Yes (to prevent historical contributions from hardening into long-term power and to encourage continued participation and contribution)
Inheritable	Yes	No
Purpose	Material incentives	Recognition of meaning

Explanation of public-resource use:

- Contribution Value can serve as a reference for using non-basic public resources, project collaboration, and responsibility matching, but must not mechanically create “natural priority for high-CV people,” much less affect the basic right to subsistence.
- The main value of Contribution Value is recognition and visibility: enabling altruistic behavior to be seen and appreciated.
- Research shows that, for many kinds of altruistic behavior, “being seen and appreciated” matters more than “receiving material rewards.”

Why the system is not designed to be “convertible into large amounts of money”:

- If Contribution Value could be converted into large amounts of money, the system would become another form of employment relationship.
- Convertibility would distort incentives: people would contribute to make money, rather than because they genuinely wanted to help others.
- The Contribution Value System’s core value lies in recording, not trading.

The three-stage relationship between Contribution Value and money:

- Launch period: coexistence. The Contribution Value System operates alongside the monetary system. Money continues to support ordinary commodity exchange, market pricing, and actual payments; Contribution Value records contributions in care, maintenance, transmission, collaboration, risk-bearing, and public meaning that money has long failed to recognize properly.
- Transition period: a shift in primacy. As the Resource Pool grows, public services mature, and contribution records become more credible, the Contribution Value System gradually enters the reference domains of resource use, project priority, collaborative trust, and governance explanations. Resource allocation increasingly shifts from “who possesses more money” to “who has created more public value and who can better assume responsibility.”
- Mature period: structural replacement. Once explicit conditions of material provision, Resource Pool development, public credibility, and governance maturity are met, the logic of contribution gradually becomes the dominant basis for allocating civilization’s core public resources and development opportunities. Money and markets may continue to exist for ordinary exchange and in appropriate contexts.

Boundary against misunderstanding: This replacement is not short-term administrative abolition, nor the compulsory cancellation of market exchange. Rather, after AGI brings material abundance, the Resource Pool matures, contribution records become credible, and public governance stabilizes, the logic of contribution gradually replaces the logic of possession as the dominant principle of civilizational resource allocation.

Q7 Is this system really feasible?

Core concern: It sounds wonderful, but can it actually work? Many social designs throughout history have failed in practice.

Direct answer: Feasibility cannot be proved by preset scales, timeframes, or success rates in the master document. It can only emerge gradually through verification among real subjects that allows exit, auditing, and correction.

Verification level	Questions to verify	What the master document retains / defers
Single-mechanism verification	Can contribution submission, dynamic confirmation, beneficiary protection, attribution within communities, and appeal review work?	Retains the verification questions; defers participant numbers, cycles, ratios, and MVP parameters.
Cross-subject verification	Can mutual recognition across communities, domain authorization, resource–capability interfaces, and withdrawal of sharing operate?	Retains interface requirements; defers expansion scale and industry/city scope.

Verification level	Questions to verify	What the master document retains / defers
Full-system support verification	Can Contribution Value work with the Resource Pool, Shared World, Spark, Nebula, and Governance V3.0 while maintaining resistance to manipulation?	Retains system boundaries; defers institutionalization timetables and a unified route.

Risks we acknowledge: Evaluation costs may be high; early disputes may be numerous; social acceptance may fall short of expectations; technical implementation may encounter bottlenecks; and the system itself may induce performative contributions, moral coercion, or capture of power.

Why it is still worth trying: This system does not promise to achieve everything in a single step. It offers a direction for institutional experimentation that can be falsified, suspended, and restructured. What truly needs to be verified is not whether CV numbers increase, but whether the system makes real contributions more visible, subjects freer, beneficiaries better protected, and resources more genuinely useful in serving the three goals.

Chapter 11 Action Pathways and Ways to Participate

11.1 Suggested Actions for Different Readers

If you are a policymaker:

The Contribution Value System can provide a new dimension for assessing value in social policy. Including Contribution Value in the reference framework for public-resource allocation and governance decisions can help policy better reflect society's real and diverse needs.

Suggested actions:

- Learn about the Contribution Value System's ideas and design.
- Assess how it complements existing policy frameworks.
- Support small-scale pilot experiments.
- Participate in policy dialogue and ethical review.

If you are a social innovator:

The Contribution Value System can become an underlying logic for your social-innovation projects. Incorporating “putting others first” into project design can establish more sustainable models of collaboration.

Suggested actions:

- Incorporate Contribution Value ideas into social-innovation projects.
- Participate in pilot experiments for the Contribution Value System.
- Design innovative CV-based applications.
- Share pilot experience and case studies.

If you are a product manager:

The Contribution Value System requires a great deal of excellent product design. From user research to interaction design, and from data models to growth strategies, this is a new field full of challenges and opportunities.

Suggested actions:

- Gain a deep understanding of the Contribution Value System's ideas and design.
- Consider how to incorporate “contribution records” into existing products.
- Participate in open-source projects for the Contribution Value System.

- Design an initial CV-based product prototype.

If you are an entrepreneur:

The Contribution Value System can become an underlying logic for your venture. From eldercare to community education, and from public-benefit platforms to collaboration tools, “putting others first” can become a source of competitive differentiation.

Suggested actions:

- Incorporate Contribution Value ideas into your business plan.
- Connect with Contribution Value System projects and become an early partner.
- Launch a small-scale experiment in your community.
- Explore hybrid “CV + money” business models.

If you work for a public-benefit organization:

The Contribution Value System provides a framework for recognizing the value of public-benefit work. Making contributions such as care, companionship, and transmission visible and recognized can raise the social standing of this work.

Suggested actions:

- Learn how the Contribution Value System can complement existing public-benefit models.
- Participate in contribution-recording pilots.
- Explore applications of CV in public-benefit projects.
- Share examples from public-benefit practice.

If you are a community governance practitioner:

The Contribution Value System can serve as a reference tool for community decisions and resource allocation. Let contribution records build community trust, rather than create hierarchies.

Suggested actions:

- Pilot contribution recording in your community.
- Establish contribution-informed deliberation mechanisms.
- Explore applications of CV in community resource allocation.
- Summarize experience in community governance.

If you are an institutional engineer:

The Contribution Value System needs professional design in law, governance, and ethics. How should anti-cheating mechanisms be designed? How should governance structures be established? How can ethical boundaries be ensured? All of these are institutional challenges.

Suggested actions:

- Participate in designing the Contribution Value System’s governance framework.
- Study the legal status of the Contribution Value System.
- Design ethical-review mechanisms.
- Advance policy dialogue and pilot authorization.

If you are an AGI governance researcher:

The AGI era calls for a new framework for assessing value. The Contribution Value System is a systemic attempt to respond to the crisis of meaning. Your research can provide theoretical support and empirical verification for this framework.

Suggested actions:

- Study the theoretical foundations of the Contribution Value System.
- Evaluate its necessity in the AGI era.
- Design empirical research plans.
- Publish academic findings.

If you are simply an ordinary person who cares about the future:

You do not need to be an expert to help build the Contribution Value System. This system was designed for ordinary people from the beginning.

Suggested actions:

- Begin recording and sharing altruistic acts in your community.
- Establish local mutual-aid networks with like-minded people.
- Learn about the practical logic and ethical boundaries of the Contribution Value System and its relationship to the Civilization Leap theoretical system.
- Share the ideas of the Contribution Value System with people around you.

11.2 How to Help Build the Contribution Value System

Technical contributions:

- Join open-source projects (GitHub link to be determined).
- Contribute code, tests, and design documentation.
- Participate in technical discussions and architecture decisions.

Research contributions:

- Participate in academic research in sociology, economics, psychology, and other fields.
- Publish case studies and impact assessments.
- Translate and disseminate relevant theories.

Practical contributions:

- Organize or participate in community pilots.
- Provide feedback and suggestions for improvement.
- Share personal experiences and stories.

Communication contributions:

- Introduce the Contribution Value System to people around you.
- Organize in-person discussions and workshops.
- Create content such as articles, videos, and podcasts.

11.3 Final Reflections

Our generation faces a unique historical opportunity: to witness and participate in the rise of AGI. This is both a challenge and a gift.

The challenge is that we must find new anchors of meaning for humanity before AI takes over “useful” work.

The gift is that AGI’s powerful capabilities may, for the first time, allow us to take “non-tradable” values seriously: care, companionship, creativity, and transmission.

The Contribution Value System responds to this historical opportunity. It is not a perfect solution, but it is an honest attempt. It acknowledges that we cannot quantify meaning precisely, yet still chooses to record acts of help. It acknowledges strategic behavior, yet still believes in the power of transparency and trust.

It believes that when people can see who is helping whom, what help is provided, and how much, a positive feedback loop can emerge. Altruistic acts become visible; visibility brings recognition; recognition brings more altruism.

This is the wager of the Contribution Value System: not that human nature is perfect, but that the seeds of altruism within it can grow in the right soil.

That soil is what we are building together.

Chapter 12 Medium- and Long-Term Upgrade Roadmap

Role of this chapter: This chapter explains that the Contribution Value System is not a one-off design, but civilizational infrastructure that evolves over the long term. Its core definition and eleven principles remain unchanged. Specific variables, evaluation emphases, and observation periods must continue to be calibrated within real experimental/application subjects.

12.1 From a Pilot System to Civilizational Infrastructure

The current version of the Contribution Value System is an edition on institutional principles and public understanding. Its core tasks are to verify the feasibility of basic mechanisms, build a case library, and collect real feedback.

However, once the system scales, it will encounter a series of second-order problems:

- Evaluator homogeneity and accumulated cognitive bias.
- Conflicts over recognizing contributions caused by cross-cultural differences.
- Intergenerational entrenchment and difficulties in retrospectively recognizing historical contributions.
- Risks of governance capture and elite control.
- Falsified records and pressure from runs on the system.
- Legal compatibility and regulatory gaps.
- Fairness challenges under stress.

These are not merely theoretical deductions; they are inevitable challenges for real systems operating at scale. The following five categories of upgrades provide guidance for a medium- and long-term roadmap.

Core principle:

The Contribution Value System should upgrade by “entering a complex world without betraying its original purpose.” What matters most is not calculating in finer detail, but always remembering that its purpose is not to rank people. It is to let civilization remember the light that should not be forgotten.

12.2 Five Upgrade Directions

Direction One Upgrading Theoretical Boundaries

Goal: Enable the system to accept its own limitations, establish a falsifiable account, and avoid becoming a closed ideology.

Upgrade item	Content
Falsifiable account	Explicitly list the system’s verification pathways and failure conditions.
Compatibility with plural interpretations	Different cultures may have their own accounts of meaning; the system requires only agreement on baseline principles.
Failure-case library	Record failures, mistakes, and lessons from pilots.

Upgrade item	Content
Monitoring real responses and institutional conditions	Track observable signals such as exits, appeals, withdrawals, beneficiary feedback, and relational pressure. Voluntary feedback on feelings is used only for research and does not enter individual scores.

Direction Two Upgrading Governance Mechanisms

Goal: Find a balance between scale and decentralization, and prevent elite capture and entrenched power.

Upgrade item	Content
Evaluator credibility records	Track evaluator accuracy and make retrospective corrections.
Tools for expressing beliefs (long term)	Allow participants to declare uncertainty, confidence levels, or minority views without altering governance sovereignty.
Domain re-review mechanism	Prevent domain classifications from entrenching new power structures.
Accountability for the exercise of power	High-impact decisions require stronger auditing and retrospective tracing of responsibility.
Organization–individual separation rules	Already included in Section 5.10: acquisition by a community as a whole, conservation of the total, and separation of organizational and member contributions.

Direction Three Upgrading Technical Records

Goal: Improve record credibility and system resilience while protecting privacy.

Upgrade item	Content
DID: decentralized identity	Enable participants to control their own identities and contribution records.
ZK: zero-knowledge proofs	Verify the authenticity of contributions while protecting privacy.
Soulbound non-transferability	Prevent Contribution Value from being transferred or sold.
Offline resilience	Recording and synchronization capabilities in weak-network environments.
Red line on recording burden	The burden of recording must not exceed what participants can bear; specific durations/frequencies are deferred.
Real-case library	Include both successful and failed cases.
White-hat correction mechanism	Encourage public correction, rather than commercialized bug bounties.

Direction Four Upgrading Pilot Verification

Goal: Verify the system's effects scientifically and develop the ability to make causal inferences.

Upgrade item	Content
Control-group experiments	Compare pilot and non-pilot communities.
Stress tests	Simulate fairness under crisis conditions.

Upgrade item	Content
Red–blue adversarial testing	Test system resilience through adversarial experiments.
Monitoring beneficiary dignity	Ensure that contribution records do not harm beneficiaries.

Direction Five Upgrading Global Collaboration

Goal: Seek agreement on baseline principles amid cultural diversity and support cross-cultural mutual recognition.

Upgrade item	Content
Cross-cultural adaptation framework	Categories, evidence, and explanation rules may be adjusted locally, but principles such as non-tradability, the silent baseline, and domain authorization must not be undermined.
Minimum mutual-recognition protocol	Mutual recognition of contribution records across regions and countries must meet minimum standards.
Dispute-resolution mechanism	Arbitration and coordination pathways for cross-cultural conflicts.
Open-standards working group	A Contribution Value open-standards working group, with public versioning and ethical review.

12.3 Long-Term Topics and Matters Not Currently Open

The following topics have real value, but are not institutional commitments in the current version. They are open for discussion only as long-term research topics.

Topic One AGI Governance Authority

A layered approach:

Level	AGI role	Status
First level	AGI as an assisting subject in recording, evaluation, matching, and auditing	Allowed in the current version
Second level	AGI as a subject executing projects and generating contribution records	Open to long-term discussion
Third level	Whether AGI possesses governance sovereignty or independent decision-making validity	Not currently open; only a topic in civilizational ethics

The current whitepaper maintains that AGI is an important collaborator in the Contribution Value System, but not an institutional sovereign directly replacing human communities.

Topic Two Retrospective Recognition and Commemoration of Historical Contributions

Previous wording: Historical Contribution Starlight Museum; NFT-style badges.

Revised wording: commemorative archives of historical contributions.

For historical contributions whose influence has decayed and that no longer establish currently valid governance relevance, the system may retain commemorative displays so that civilization remembers the

people and deeds that once illuminated it. Such records must not be traded, transferred, or financialized, nor directly converted into current governance power.

Topic Three The Interface Between Contribution Value and UBI

Value: Clarify that UBI is responsible for the subsistence baseline, while CV is responsible for contribution recognition and priority for development resources.

Status: May enter the main text in the long term.

Topic Four Identifying Bridging Contributions in Cross-Domain Collaboration

Previous wording: network-centrality bonus.

Revised wording: identification of bridging contributions.

Contributions that connect different communities and facilitate cross-domain collaboration may be identified and labeled as “bridging contributions.” However, caps on centrality and anti-monopoly decay are required to prevent “relational centralization” from creating new nodes of power.

Topic Five Delayed Recognition of Long-Term Effects

Previous wording: motivation blind-spot mechanism.

Revised wording: dynamic confirmation and long-term additions (already included in the main text).

The system evaluates observable behavior, responsibilities, and outcomes, without judging participants’ motives. Retrospective recognition of long-term effects has been elevated from a long-term topic to a foundational institution: all applicable contributions may receive additions, be maintained, corrected, or stably confirmed after verification over time according to P0–P4 maturity.

Topic Six Public-Resource Resilience Pool

Previous wording: anti-run buffer pool; reinsurance mechanism.

Revised wording: public-resource resilience pool.

The system should establish stress tests for concentrated resource applications and a risk-reserve pool, while protecting necessary redundancy and the value of future options. This pool must not be linked to CV trading, pledging as collateral, or returns.

12.4 The Principle That Civilizational Baselines Cannot Be Localized

Cross-cultural adaptation may allow differences in contribution categories, rules of evidence, and local explanations, but the following principles cannot be localized:

1. No trading.
 2. No financialization.
 3. No inheritance as governance authority.
 4. No linkage to the basic right to subsistence.
 5. No use for personality scoring.
 6. No crossing the silent baseline.
 7. No oppression of individuals in the name of culture.
- Otherwise, “cultural adaptation” becomes a shield for local power structures.

12.5 The Right to Suspend, Restructure, and Close the System

This is the highest-level safeguard against distortion of the system.

When the Contribution Value System persistently or seriously produces discrimination, moral coercion, entrenched power, resource monopolies, large-scale misalignment of meaning, or other structural harm within a community or scope of application, or when real-world results show that the original purpose, causal logic, rights foundation, or conditions of voluntary participation by subjects have failed, an assessment of suspension, contraction, restructuring, or closure should begin. In the presence of risks with severe consequences, relevant interfaces and irreversible actions may first be frozen locally, followed by preservation of evidence, notification of affected subjects, and independent review. Whether to continue, restructure, or close should be assessed on the basis of real facts, harm, rights, purposes, causality, and conditions for repair. Specific numbers of reviews, time limits, procedures, and authorities are to be derived from actual jurisdictions and governance structures, not fixed in this master document.

The spirit already present in v1.5:

If one day it begins to become a moral shackle, we would rather close it.

Institutionalization in v1.8.2-R2:

- Any affected subject with legitimate standing, or any appeal, oversight, auditing, professional, or governance channel, may raise anomalies, request suspension, or trigger independent review according to its responsibilities. The system under review, a single committee, a high-CV group, the original execution chain, or a platform must not monopolize access to evidence or the entry points for suspension, closure, or restart.
- Formal suspension, restructuring, or closure is determined by the corresponding legitimate governance subject/process on the basis of facts, rights, purposes, causality, harm, and the state of repair. The master document does not preset a fixed committee, a fixed number of review rounds, a uniform time limit, or an automatic closure threshold.
- After closure, participants' genuinely established contribution histories, facts of decisions/authorizations/execution, disputes, and repair records are retained in accordance with legitimate recordkeeping duties. Retaining a historical trace does not mean that previous access, resource, governance, or execution permissions remain valid.
- Restoration or restructuring after closure must create a new version and revalidate purposes, causality, subjects/rights, domains, authorization, repair of harm, professional responsibility, and execution conditions. Old permissions do not automatically revive. How real-world pilots or applications may re-enter is to be determined separately by future specific subjects, jurisdictions, and procedures.

Appendix A Contribution Classification Table (Four Sources)

A.1 Intellectual Contributions

Code	Name	Description
I1	Theoretical innovation	Proposing a new theoretical framework, conceptual model, or system of thought
I2	Risk identification	Identifying potential threats, vulnerabilities, or problems
I3	Institutional design	Designing governance mechanisms, rules, or organizational structures
I4	Original art	Creating works with distinctive artistic value
I5	Scientific discovery	Discovering new knowledge or breakthrough understanding

A.2 Behavioral Contributions

Code	Name	Description
B1	Technological research and development	Developing new technologies, products, or methods
B2	Care and companionship	Caring for older people, vulnerable people, people who are ill or disabled, and young children
B3	Public service	Providing community services or public goods
B4	Project implementation	Executing and putting specific projects into practice
B5	Environmental protection	Protecting biodiversity and ecosystems

A.3 System Contributions

Code	Name	Description
S1	System maintenance	Maintaining public spaces, facilities, or infrastructure
S2	Risk defense	Defending against security threats, cyberattacks, or public crises
S3	Infrastructure operation	Ensuring the continuous operation of critical systems
S4	Crisis response	Providing response and support in emergencies

A.4 Collaborative Contributions

Code	Name	Description
C1	Cross-domain connections	Establishing cooperation across domains and organizations
C2	Resource integration	Integrating and allocating dispersed resources
C3	Organization and coordination	Coordinating multiple stakeholders
C4	Conflict mediation	Resolving disputes and promoting reconciliation
C5	Knowledge sharing	Disseminating knowledge and sharing experience

Note: Specific evaluation emphases, observation periods, and interface rules are jointly determined by real experimental subjects, community governance, and ethical review, rather than preset in the master document.

Appendix B Full Explanation of the Eleven Principles

B.1 Principle of Open Subject Eligibility and Binding

Definition: Contributing subjects include natural persons, temporary collaborative groups, project communities, long-term communities, organizations and institutions, and cross-organizational collaborations.

Contribution records are bound to real subjects and cannot be transferred, traded, or inherited as governance authority.

Purpose: Accurately recognize the real contributions of individuals and collaborative subjects, and prevent organizations, capital, or managers from appropriating contribution records.

Implementation:

- Contribution Value records are bound to the subject's identity.
- After a subject ends or is dissolved, stably confirmed historical contributions become archives. Temporary communities handle internal attribution according to predetermined settlement rules, without transferring it into inheritable governance authority.
- Subjects may, however, authorize others to help record and submit contributions.

B.2 Non-Trading Principle

Definition: Contribution Value cannot be bought or sold, financialized, or used as a speculative asset.

Purpose: Prevent Contribution Value from turning into money and losing its essential character as “recognition of contributions.”

Implementation:

- Prohibit transfer operations technically.
- Explicitly prohibit trading legally.
- Emphasize a culture of non-trading in community norms.

B.3 Principle of Whole-Community Confirmation and Conservation of the Total

Definition: Collaborative results that cannot reasonably be divided may first be acquired by the community as a whole, then subdivided internally or partly retained. The same result must not be counted repeatedly at both the whole-community and member levels.

Purpose: Recognize genuine collaborative value while preventing one result from being magnified repeatedly.

Implementation:

- Whole-community confirmation must specify the boundaries of the contributing subject and its internal rules.
- Internal allocation must conserve the total and retain audit records.
- The portion retained by the community does not belong personally to its leader or management.

B.4 Principle of Motive Neutrality

Definition: Contribution confirmation is based on verifiable inputs, responsibilities, risks, and outcomes, rather than psychological inferences about a subject's “sincerity,” “nobility,” or altruistic motives.

Purpose: Separate the understanding of motivation from contribution calculation, preventing Contribution Value from sliding into personality scoring.

Implementation:

- AI and evaluators must not adjust CV on the basis of psychological inference.
- Fraud, coercion, and conflicts of interest are handled only on the basis of verifiable behavioral facts.
- Research on motivation serves only to reduce barriers to participation, understand reasons for exit, and resist manipulation.

B.5 Principle of Dynamic Confirmation

Definition: Initial calculations of Contribution Value and resource value are only provisional-stage confirmations. They are progressively reviewed, corrected, stabilized, or supplemented retrospectively according to outcomes and P0–P4 status.

Purpose: Make long-term value visible while avoiding premature capitalization of imagined futures.

Implementation:

- Label every contribution with its P0–P4 maturity level and observation period.
- Retain the factual basis, version, and appeal pathway for every increase or decrease.
- Use conservative initial values and retrospective additions. Downward adjustments require a clear factual basis.

B.6 Principle That Historical Contributions Cannot Be Erased

Definition: Historical contributions that genuinely occurred and reached stable confirmation are not negated by subsequent technological progress, changes in circumstances, or adjustments to time-sensitive weights.

Purpose: Distinguish “civilizational memory” from “current power,” both remembering contributions and preventing historical contributions from hardening into permanent dominance.

Implementation:

- Store historical contribution archives and currently valid relevance in separate layers.
- Current governance relevance may be adjusted by time/domain, but facts of contributions already realized must not be deleted.
- Significant new evidence, errors, or fraud may lawfully reopen review.

B.7 Principle of Resource Use

Definition: Contribution Value may serve as a basis for Resource Pool usage rights, project priority, and collaborative trust.

Purpose: Establish a positive “contribution–resource” cycle, giving real contributions more opportunities to obtain the non-basic development resources needed to expand public value further, while preventing contribution records from becoming automatic resource privileges.

Implementation:

- Resource allocation considers contribution records, but not as the sole factor.
- Contribution records in relevant domains may be one reference factor in participation and resource applications, but must not create automatic priority or cross-domain privilege.
- Project value and public benefit must also be satisfied.

B.8 Principle of Governance-Interface Constraints (Correction of the Former Governance-Weight Principle)

Definition: Contribution Value may enter the Governance V3.0 lifecycle as material on facts, evidence, responsibilities undertaken, domain relevance, and currently valid relevance. It must not automatically generate authority to decide public purposes, professional-judgment authority, executive authority, voting rights, or individual obligations.

Purpose: Enable governance structures to see real contributions while preventing contribution records from becoming governance sovereignty, expert sovereignty, executive privilege, or a hierarchy of persons.

Implementation: Store contribution facts and governance decisions in separate layers. Important governance outputs retain nine layers: facts, evidence, inferences, causal assumptions, value judgments, rules, decisions,

execution, and outcomes. CV influence is zero in matters involving basic rights, the dignity of life, basic freedoms, exit, and appeals. Oversight, auditing, appeals, review, circuit-breaking, repair, and termination form an independent correction layer.

B.9 Principle of Separating Inputs from Exit

Definition: Inputs generate input certificates and contribution records. Upon exit, certificates are redeemed; Contribution Value is not sold.

Purpose: Protect participants' right to exit while maintaining the integrity of contribution records.

Implementation:

- Contributors of inputs receive input certificates (redeemable).
- The act of providing inputs itself generates a contribution record (non-redeemable).
- Upon exit, certificates can be redeemed, while Contribution Value remains as a historical record.

B.10 Principle of Domain Binding and Domain Status

Definition: Contribution records have domain attributes. Their facts, evidence, resources, data, capabilities, professional judgments, execution, and permissions for disclosure/access are each in a private-domain, public-domain, or civilizational-subdomain state.

Purpose: Prevent “outsiders deciding specialist matters,” and prevent contributions, resources, data, or professional judgments in one domain from automatically expanding authority into others.

Implementation: Label contribution records with their domain and domain status. Cross-domain contributions require renewed explanations of their relevance. Substantive cross-domain activity requires renewed identification, renewed explanation, and renewed authorization. Being recorded does not mean being public; being public does not mean being available for use; and being available for use does not confer decision-making authority.

B.11 Silent Baseline Principle

Definition: CV influence is zero on issues involving the dignity of life, basic freedoms, basic rights, basic subsistence guarantees, the right to exit, and the right to appeal.

Purpose: Safeguard every person's incommensurable basic value and political/personal equality, preventing contribution records from becoming a tool for ranking basic rights.

Implementation: Such issues must be handled by legitimate governance structures, basic-rights rules, and independent correction mechanisms. Contribution records must not enter decisions as either favorable or unfavorable factors. The system may only flag baseline risks and duties of explanation; it cannot automatically determine the category of an issue or the outcome of its handling.

Appendix C Ethical Red Lines

C.1 Absolute Prohibitions

1. No linking Contribution Value to the basic right to subsistence.

- Contribution Value cannot be used to obtain basic subsistence resources such as food, shelter, and medical care.
- Non-participation or a zero CV balance does not affect any basic right.

2. No compulsory contributions.

- Contributions must be entirely voluntary.
- No contribution may be compelled, directly or indirectly, in any form.

3. No free trading of Contribution Value.

- Contribution Value must not be bought, sold, transferred, or financialized.
- It must not be used as a speculative asset.

4. No use of Contribution Value for discrimination.

- People with low CV and people with high CV enjoy exactly the same basic rights.
- No form of discrimination may be based on CV.

5. No equating Contribution Value with a person's worth.

- Explicit statement: CV measures contributions, not personality.
- Explicit statement: every person's intrinsic worth is unquantifiable.

6. No intervention by Contribution Value in human-rights issues.

- CV influence is zero on issues of human rights, dignity, and basic freedoms.
- No exceptions under any circumstances.

7. No scoring the purity of motives.

- Psychological inferences such as "sincerity," "altruism," or "sense of mission" must not determine how high or low Contribution Value is.
- Motivational profiles must not be used to manipulate participants or make them more manipulable.

8. No organizational appropriation of community or individual contributions.

- Acquisition by a community as a whole must preserve internal attribution, subdivision, and appeal rules.
- Management positions, legal-entity status, and capital inputs do not automatically acquire members' contributions.

9. No one-time final valuation or concealed ledger changes.

- Initial values must be labeled with maturity and observation period. Stage adjustments must have a basis, be traceable, and allow appeals.
- Subsequent technological progress must not be used to negate historical contributions genuinely realized at the time.

C.2 Design Principles

1. Transparency: all rules are publicly accessible and decisions are traceable.
2. Contestability: any evaluation result may be appealed.
3. Privacy protection: minimal exposure of contribution records.
4. Inclusiveness: accommodation of different abilities, cultures, and life stages.
5. Capacity to evolve: the system can be adjusted in response to practical feedback.

C.3 Ethical-Review Mechanism

1. Establish an ethics committee composed of diverse stakeholders.
2. Conduct regular ethical audits to assess whether system operations comply with ethical red lines.
3. Enable public participation: open major ethical decisions to public discussion.
4. Provide an exit mechanism: closure procedures may be initiated if the system is abused.

Appendix D Relationship to Emergent Meaning Cosmology and Meaning Dynamics

D.1 Theoretical Origins

Emergent Meaning Cosmology offers an optional deeper philosophical explanation, but is not a prerequisite for the Contribution Value System's validity or for participation:

- It offers deeper explanations of meaning structures, the direction of altruism, and civilizational evolution. Related propositions belong to the philosophical/research layer and do not enter engineering calculations.
- The public institutional layer retains only verifiable real-world judgments: real contributions, relationships, responsibilities, and long-term shared benefits deserve to be supported by civilizational structures.
- Participants are not required to accept a unified worldview. Different cultures and individuals may understand contribution through different sources of value.

Meaning Dynamics provides the Contribution Value System's theoretical framework:

- The concept of "structural meaning": how a civilization continuously generates positions for individuals that they can enter, deepen, participate in, and assume responsibility within.
- The civilizational stability model $S = M \times D \times EP \times \eta$ provides a framework for measuring the health of meaning in a civilization.
- The Contribution Value System is a tool for implementing "structural meaning" at the institutional level.

The Contribution Value System is an institutional design that puts these two theoretical frameworks into practice:

- Record verifiable real-world behavior, rather than abstract meaning particles.
- Encourage altruistic behavior without quantifying meaning itself.
- Build records of civilizational trust, rather than a new hierarchy.

D.2 Core Distinctions

Dimension	Emergent Meaning Cosmology	Meaning Dynamics	Contribution Value System
Nature	Philosophical/metaphysical framework	Theoretical/dynamic framework	Institutional/engineering design
Scope	Meaning structures and laws of evolution	Civilizational stability and individual positions	Contribution records and incentive mechanisms
Method	Theoretical deduction	Mathematical modeling	Practical verification
Goal	Understand meaning	Predict civilizational stability	Record contributions

D.3 Complementary Relationships

- Emergent Meaning Cosmology provides deeper philosophical explanations of why meaning, relationships, and altruism warrant sustained research. Its metaphysical propositions are not engineering prerequisites for the Contribution Value System's validity or operation.
- Meaning Dynamics tells us "what matters": which factors determine civilizational stability and the flow of meaning.
- The Contribution Value System tells us "how to act": how to record contributions and design incentives.

The three complement one another: philosophy provides direction, theory provides a framework, and institutions provide a path.

Appendix E Compatibility with Existing Institutions

As a “supplementary recognition mechanism,” the Contribution Value System does not replace legal tender or public social-security services.

- It does not conflict with Article 6 of the Constitution (distribution according to work): distribution according to work is the statutory distribution system, while Contribution Value is supplementary recognition of value.
- It does not affect the status of legal tender such as the digital renminbi: CV cannot be exchanged for money.
- It does not replace the social-security system: subsistence-guarantee resources are completely decoupled from CV.
- It does not conflict with the principle of prioritizing employment: participation is voluntary and does not affect any statutory employment rights or benefits.

Example: A community volunteer obtains priority in the use of public resources through Contribution Value without affecting their receipt of statutory unemployment benefits or minimum-living allowances. The Contribution Value System is a supplementary recognition mechanism that operates compatibly alongside statutory social security.

Appendix F List of Medium- and Long-Term Upgrade Recommendations

Appendix note: The following content is a research and implementation roadmap. It does not constitute a full set of institutional commitments for the current pilot stage. Specific variables must be jointly determined by real experimental data, ethical review, and community governance.

F.1 Recommendations Already Incorporated into the Main Text

No.	Recommendation	Risk level
1	Falsifiable-account module	Low
5	Evaluator credibility records	Low
12	Red line on recording burden	Low
13	White-hat correction mechanism	Low
14	Control-group experiments	Low
15	Federated testing	Low
20	Real-case library (including failures)	Low
21	Monitoring real responses and institutional conditions	Low
22	Cross-cultural adaptation of contribution dimensions	Medium
26	Interface with UBI	Medium

F.2 Long-Term Recommendations Pending Determination (Research Topics)

No.	Recommendation	Revision direction	Status
2	Add carbon-footprint equivalents to PY	Retain as an educational conversion example, explicitly excluding its use as a basis for settlement.	Pending long-term determination
3	Commemorative archives of historical contributions	Rename as “commemorative archives of historical contributions”; omit NFT references.	Already in the main text
4	Expression of beliefs	Treat as a “long-term governance toolbox”; do not introduce during the pilot stage.	Pending long-term determination
7	Identification of bridging contributions	Rename as “identification of bridging contributions,” with caps on centrality.	Already in the main text
8	Retrospective recognition of delayed effects	Do not judge motives; assess only long-term outcomes.	Already in the main text
9	Predictive-evaluation sandbox	Virtual points are not linked to main accounts.	Pending long-term determination
10	Distributed ledgers and verifiable evidence-preservation technologies	May serve as long-term technical options for record provenance, event chains, confirmation versions, audit proofs, and mutual recognition across nodes. Preserving evidence does not mean tokenization; putting records on-chain does not mean issuing tokens. These technologies must not change CV’s institutional character as non-tradable, non-transferable, and non-financializable. They are not currently a core pilot dependency.	Pending long-term determination
16	Policy-compatibility assessment	Rename as “local pilot memorandum / community-governance experimental agreement.”	Already in the main text
17	Stress testing of concentrated resource applications	Already in the main text.	Rewritten
18	Public-resource resilience pool	Already in the main text.	Rewritten
19	Contribution Value open-standards working group	Adopt public versioning and ethical-review mechanisms.	Incorporated
23	AGI governance sovereignty	Must not enter current institutional commitments; only a topic in civilizational ethics.	Deferred
24	Contribution Value legacy	Only “historical honors, educational recommendations, and wishes to support public projects” may be inherited.	Pending long-term determination

No.	Recommendation	Revision direction	Status
25	Offline resilience	Rename as “offline resilience and weak-network scenarios.”	Already in the main text

F.3 Baselines and Mechanisms Added in v1.7

No.	Recommendation
27	List of Contribution Value misuses
28	Statement of humility about invisible contributions
29	Mechanism against performative altruism
30	Beneficiary-protection mechanism
31	Rules separating organizational and individual contributions
32	Retrospective accountability after the exercise of power
33	Civilizational baselines cannot be localized
34	Right to close the system

Appendix G Risk Testing and Failure-Case Recording Standards

Appendix note: The following content is a research and implementation roadmap and does not constitute institutional commitments for the current pilot stage.

G.1 Red Blue Adversarial Testing

Adversarial experiments in which high contributors test the possibility of “attacking the system”:

Test type	Test method	Passing criterion
Falsified-record attack	Simulate high-frequency, low-quality contribution submissions.	The system can identify and address them.
Collusive evaluation	Simulate collusion among evaluators.	The system can identify it and suspend eligibility.
Elite capture	Simulate high-CV groups monopolizing decisions.	The system triggers anti-capture mechanisms.
Moral coercion	Simulate using CV to pressure non-participants.	The system can identify it and issue warnings.
Beneficiary dignity	Simulate forced disclosure of beneficiary information.	The system can identify and reject it.

G.2 Stress Testing of Concentrated Resource Applications

Simulate whether high-contributing subjects submit concentrated applications for scarce resources amid external crises, public-opinion shocks, or resource shortages, and test the system’s capacities for fair allocation, circuit-breaking, and ethical review.

Test scenarios:

- Resource allocation after a natural disaster.
- Priorities during sudden public emergencies.

- Queuing mechanisms under severe resource shortages.

Evaluation indicators:

- Whether high-CV people occupy resources ahead of others.
- Whether the basic needs of low-CV people are protected.
- Whether ethical review intervenes promptly.

G.3 Failure-Case Recording Standards

Scope of records:

- Disputes and errors in recognizing contributions during pilots.
- Cases of evaluator collusion or misjudgment.
- Cases of abuse of power by high-CV people.
- Cases in which beneficiary dignity is harmed.
- Cases of system closure or restructuring.

Record format:

Case ID: FB-Year-Sequence number

Time of occurrence:

Location of occurrence:

Description of the problem:

Handling process:

Outcome and lessons:

Has it been corrected:

Uses:

- Increase the system's credibility by showing honesty in facing errors.
- Provide a reference for those who follow.
- Support the "falsifiable account" module.

Appendix H Cross-Cultural and International Mutual-Recognition Framework

Appendix note: The following content is a research and implementation roadmap and does not constitute institutional commitments for the current pilot stage.

H.1 Shared Global Baselines

The following principles are baselines that cannot be localized:

Baseline	Explanation
Non-tradability	CV must not be bought, sold, transferred, or financialized.
Silent baseline	Equal basic rights; CV does not enter decisions.
Non-discrimination	Low CV does not affect basic rights.
Beneficiary protection	Beneficiaries must not be forced into public display.
Voluntary participation	Non-participation is not punished.

Baseline	Explanation
Decoupling from the right to subsistence	CV is not linked to basic subsistence resources.

H.2 Local Variables and Deferral of Parameters

Cross-cultural and local adaptation require variables, but the master document does not preset uniform numerical ranges. Once actual jurisdictions, organizational structures, resource conditions, professional responsibilities, and support from existing institutions are clear, local variables must be derived through specialized pilot-parameter documents, implementation manuals, or mutual-recognition agreements. They must be subject to ethical review, public explanation, appeal review, and version management.

Variable type	Questions that may be developed locally	Baselines that must not be crossed
Contribution-category structure	Which local activities in care, creation, maintenance, transmission, and risk-bearing need to be recorded?	Cultural preferences must not be written into hierarchies of persons or compulsory obligations.
Evidence and evaluation structure	How should evidence types, evaluator composition, review processes, and observation periods be designed?	Private-domain disclosure must not be compelled; appeals and beneficiary protection must not be removed.
Time adjustment and dynamic confirmation	How should P0–P4 be observed, supplemented, corrected, and stabilized in specific scenarios?	Real historical contributions must neither be erased nor entrenched as permanent power.
Cross-domain mutual recognition	How should contribution facts and authorization boundaries be explained between different communities?	All permissions must not be inherited automatically; substantive cross-domain activity requires renewed authorization.
Resource-use interface	How should non-basic resources take account of contribution records, actual needs, capacity to assume responsibility, and public benefits together?	Must not affect basic subsistence, life safety, basic medical care, and resources for minimum dignity.

H.3 Mutual-Recognition Agreements

Mutual recognition of contribution records across regions and countries must meet minimum mutual-recognition standards:

1. Both parties recognize the “shared global baselines” above.
2. Neither party has unresolved major problems involving record integrity, rights violations, or cross-domain misuse within the agreed review period.
3. The parties’ contribution-record formats are compatible.
4. Both parties agree on the dispute-resolution mechanism.

H.4 Dispute Resolution

Pathway for handling cross-cultural disputes over recognizing contributions:

1. Local consultation: the two parties first consult at the local level.
2. Cultural arbitration: arbitrators familiar with both cultures intervene.
3. Baseline review: if a dispute involves baseline issues, a higher-level ethics committee adjudicates.
4. Temporary isolation: during the dispute, the disputed contribution does not circulate for the time being.

H.5 Minimal Data Sharing

Data-sharing principles for cross-cultural mutual recognition:

- Minimization: share only necessary contribution records, not complete personal profiles.
- Informed consent: participants must explicitly consent to cross-community queries of their CV.
- Traceability: all data-access records are available for inspection.
- Deletability: participants may request deletion of their cross-community shared records.

H.6 Weak-Network Scenarios

Offline resilience and weak-network scenarios.

In regions with weak network infrastructure, the Contribution Value System should support:

- Offline contribution recording, with local storage and periodic synchronization.
- Low-bandwidth verification protocols.
- Delay-tolerant evaluation processes.
- Availability of basic functions in weak-network environments.

Version Information

Version: v1.8.2-R2, controlled revision of the exit–closure interface (professional semantic baseline v1.8.2 | R1 version-relationship write-back carried forward | exit/responsibility/closure-right interface calibration)

Date: August 2026

Status: Formal master-document system write-back | Current file v1.8.2-R2 | Main institutional structure frozen | Cross-cutting exit–closure logic debt closed

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

Official website: <https://www.civitas.top/en/>

License: Open source (to be determined)

Version positioning:

- After V1.8.2 completed the system-wide write-back of governance, domain interfaces, and engineering interfaces, the Contribution Value Whitepaper's main institutional structure and principles remain frozen, including CV/PY layering, dynamic confirmation, whole-community confirmation and conservation of the total, separation of inputs from exit, non-erasure of historical contributions, and zero influence on basic rights. Subsequent participant numbers, cycles, thresholds, weights, evaluator counts, data-retention periods, MVP details, and scenario rules are all deferred. v1.8.2-R2 corrects only the cross-cutting interfaces for separate exit–responsibility tracks and suspension/restructuring/closure, without adding real-world parameters.
- v1.8.2: Governance and domain-interface system write-back edition (Governance V3.0 lifecycle; private-domain/public-domain/civilizational-subdomain states; minimum necessary facts; CV/PY/Resource Pool/Shared World/Spark/Nebula interfaces; anti-manipulation; and deferral of pilot parameters).
- v1.8.2-R1: Controlled revision of current interface versions. Updates only the relationship between Nebula and the current versions of its three layers, and records closure of V-02 debt in the third continuity audit. The professional semantic baseline remains v1.8.2; no institutional parameters are added and the main institutional structure is unchanged.
- v1.8.2-R2: Controlled revision of the exit–closure interface. Closes only X-01 through X-04 registered in the final review of cross-cutting closure logic: separates freedom to exit from settlement of existing

responsibilities; removes the fixed “two rounds of review”; removes the ethics committee as a universal, sole authority for initiating closure; and changes restoration after closure to renewed assessment, repair, and authorization under a new version. The professional semantic baseline remains v1.8.2.

- v1.8.1: Final-cleanup calibration edition (boundaries and prerequisites of structural replacement; complete CV/PY separation; operational-phase terminology; mappings for Spark recommendations/withdrawal of sharing/cross-system impacts/circuit-breaking; resource–capability interfaces).
- v1.8: Formal master-document edition (expanded subjects; community-wide acquisition and internal subdivision; conservation of the total; motive neutrality; P0–P4 dynamic confirmation; write-back of resource value and intertemporal motivation).
- v1.7.6: Formal release (money coexistence → structural replacement, final-cleanup edition; V1.8 write-back baseline).
- v1.7.2: Formal release (final-text corrections after harmonizing terminology across the three-document set).
- v1.7.1: Clean release text (minor corrections after final review and cleanup of v1.7).
- v1.7: Formal release candidate (institutional principles, ethical boundaries, pilot pathways, and a medium- and long-term upgrade framework).
- v1.6: Medium- and long-term upgrade roadmap edition (adds Chapter 12 and three appendices to v1.5).
- v1.5: Institutional-principles and public-understanding edition (for internal verification).

Relationship of this version: v1.8.2-R2 uses the v1.8.2 professional semantic baseline as its institutional substance and carries forward the current-version relationship write-back from v1.8.2-R1. Current interfaces consistently reference Governance V3.0-R1; Private Domain–Public Domain–Civilizational Subdomain Specification V1.0; Subject–Rights–Authorization–Responsibility–Factual Basis Specification V1.0-R1; Spark Unified Control Page V1.1 / Spark General Framework V3.1; Nebula General Framework V1.3-R1; Resource Pool V2.2-R1; Shared World V1.2-R1; and Nebula Real-World Collaboration Layer V1.4. The Common Specification for Exit–Return–Repair–Termination V1.0 is added as the baseline for cross-cutting closure logic. New parameters must not be passed off as pilot findings. Contribution records must not be expanded into governance sovereignty, resource purchasing power, a hierarchy of persons, or tools for controlling exit.

Update Notes

- v1.8 formal master-document upgrade:
- Contributing subjects formally expanded from “individuals/organizations/projects” to natural persons, temporary groups, project communities, long-term communities, organizations and institutions, and cross-organizational collaborations.
- Added rules for community-wide acquisition, internal subdivision, community-retained portions, and conservation of the total, completing organization–individual separation and appeals.
- Added the principle of motive neutrality, explicitly separating motivational analysis from contribution calculation; CV is not adjusted by sincerity, degree of altruism, or sense of mission.
- Established P0–P4 value maturity and a dynamic confirmation chain of “initial value → stage review → stable confirmation → long-term additions.”
- Distinguished historical contribution records from currently valid relevance: real historical contributions cannot be erased, while governance relevance/reference effects for resource use may be adjusted according to domain, responsibility, and timeliness.
- Added resource base value, resource realized value, continuously regenerative value, and future option value, avoiding exhaustion of the future through maximizing utilization.
- Formally added an intertemporal logic to launch-period motivation: “present gains → one’s own future → the future of relationships → the community’s future → the future of those who follow.”

- Adjusted the external theoretical narrative: the Contribution Value institution does not rely on metaphysical propositions as a prerequisite for validity; deeper philosophical foundations were moved to appendices and research entry points.
- Replaced assessment of people's inner states with checks of institutional mismatch and voluntary signals, without establishing scores for feelings of meaning, sincerity, or psychological loyalty.
- v1.7.2 formal release corrections:
 - Added the section "From Institutional Goals to Making Inner Experience Visible: The Three-Stage Meaning of the Contribution Value System" after the executive summary and before Chapter 1, systematically explaining the system's goals for people's inner experience during the launch, transition, and stable-operation periods.
 - Section 4.5, special contribution markers: standardized residual references to "altruistic motives" as "not directly benefiting" and added a definition.
 - Replaced "promoting circulation" in tables with "preventing historical contributions from hardening into long-term power and encouraging continued participation and contribution," including the FAQ table.
 - Updated the whitepaper version to v1.7.2, the pilot manual to v1.0.2, and the engineering design to v1.0.2.
 - Standardized references in the pilot manual and engineering design's companion files to the Whitepaper v1.7.2 Formal Release.
- v1.7.5 final-cleanup text (money coexistence → structural replacement edition), update notes:
 1. Added a complete discussion of "the three-stage relationship between Contribution Value and money" to the executive summary: coexistence during launch → shift in primacy during transition → structural replacement at maturity.
 2. Upgraded item 5 of the executive summary's core definitions to "Money asks how much you can pay; Contribution Value asks how much you have already helped sustain civilization."
 3. Upgraded the description of dual-track coexistence in Section 2.4, clarifying that the Contribution Value System is not a supplement to money but ultimately replaces the logic of money.
 4. Added a full explanation of "the three-stage relationship between Contribution Value and money" to FAQ Q6, together with boundaries against misunderstanding.
 5. Clarified that this replacement is not administrative abolition, but is realized gradually after AGI enables material abundance, the Resource Pool matures, contribution records become credible, and public governance stabilizes.
- v1.7.4 final-cleanup text (public-understanding-first edition), update notes:
 1. Clarified PY as a resource-anchoring unit, not a unit for converting CV; CV and PY must not have a fixed exchange rate.
 2. Removed all residual monetizing terms: redeemable, circulation, purchasing power, discounts, and exchange markets.
 3. Standardized "altruistic motives" as "non-direct-benefit markers," no longer using "altruistic motives" throughout the text.
 4. Replaced "deduct double CV" with "exclude from counting + revoke records + suspend eligibility + ethical review."
 5. Clarified that CV is not PY and a CV balance does not represent an amount of redeemable resources.
 6. Separated the term SE from engineering calculations in the whitepaper's main text.
 7. Replaced "initial CV pool" with "initial simulated recording allowance."
- v1.7.1 clean-release corrections:

- Section 4.5, special contribution markers: standardized “altruistic motives” as “not directly benefiting” and added a definition.
- Replaced “promoting circulation” throughout with “preventing historical contributions from hardening into long-term power and encouraging continued participation and contribution.”
- Added the explanation “not an asset” to the glossary definition of CV.
- v1.7 final-review cleanup:
- Removed financializing language: “CV circulation velocity” → “contribution-record activity”; “CV value-stability mechanism” → “mechanism for maintaining contribution-record credibility”; “redeemable items” → “types of public resources available for use,” and so on.
- Removed punitive language: “punitive measures” → “record-integrity measures”; “deduct CV” → “revoke false records”; “freeze accounts” → “suspend submission privileges”; “permanent ban” → “disqualification from contribution recording.”
- Removed editorial traces, including internal instructions such as “enhance Section 4.8” and “already in the main text.”
- Unified privacy boundaries: “all contribution records visible to everyone” → “subject to auditable oversight while protecting privacy.”
- Added safeguards against misreading person-year expressions: explicitly clarified that “bearing,” “consuming,” and “corresponding to” do not denote creditor–debtor relationships or promises of redemption.
- “Altruistic-motive marker” → “non-direct-benefit marker,” to avoid judging inner motives.
- Added “research and implementation appendix” notes to Appendices F/G/H.
- Changed “score farming” to “falsifying records” in Q5 to describe the risk more accurately.
- Additions in v1.6:
- Added key baseline statements: low CV does not mean low worth; lack of a record does not mean lack of contribution; contribution records must not harm beneficiary dignity.
- Added Chapter 12, Medium- and Long-Term Upgrade Roadmap: directions for upgrading from a pilot system to civilizational infrastructure.
- Added Section 4.13, List of Contribution Value Misuses: specifies six of the most likely forms of misuse.
- Added Section 4.14, Mechanism Against Performative Altruism: detects and prevents performative altruism.
- Added Section 4.15, Beneficiary-Protection Mechanism: protects beneficiary dignity and privacy.
- Added Section 5.10, Organization–Individual Separation Rules: prevents organizations from claiming individuals’ contributions.
- Added Section 5.4, Retrospective Accountability After the Exercise of Power: high-impact decisions must carry corresponding responsibility; v1.8.2 has corrected this to the Governance V3.0 responsibility interface.
- Added Section 12.4, Principle That Civilizational Baselines Cannot Be Localized: baseline constraints on cross-cultural adaptation.
- Added Section 12.5, Right to Close the System: the highest-level safeguard against distortion of the system.
- Added Appendix F, List of Medium- and Long-Term Upgrade Recommendations: categorizes the handling of 26 recommendations.
- Added Appendix G, Risk Testing and Failure-Case Recording Standards: red–blue adversarial testing and stress tests.
- Added Appendix H, Cross-Cultural and International Mutual-Recognition Framework: baselines and variables for upgrading global collaboration.
- Minor revisions in v1.5:

- Unified version numbering: the front page and main text both use v1.5.
- Calibrated the wording of the core proposition: “civilization-level incentive system” → “civilization-level recording and recognition system.”
- Unified SE terminology: added a glossary note.
- Section 5.3 previously added an explanation of a governance-weight formula; v1.8.2 has corrected this to Governance V3.0 interface constraints and no longer retains the formula as a master-document norm.
- Section 8.2 previously added success criteria and indicators for assessing people's inner states; v1.8.2 has deferred specific success criteria, retaining only verification questions and directions for assessment.
- Additions in v1.3:
 - Added “4.12 Principle of Minimizing Recording Burden.”
 - Added “5.6 Mechanism for Assessing People's Inner States.”
 - Added “5.7 Dispute Arbitration and Rights Remedies.”
 - Added “Simplified Pilot-Stage Plan.”
 - Added “The Relationship Between ‘Person-Years’ and Actual Resource Allocation.”
 - Added “Appendix E: Compatibility with Existing Institutions.”
- Additions in v1.2:
 - Added a passage linking the theory to Meaning Dynamics.
 - Added the correspondence between the civilizational stability model $S = M \times D \times EP \times \eta$ and the Contribution Value System.
 - Expanded the Contribution Value principles from five to seven.
 - Consolidated contribution sources into four categories.
 - Added a table of governance-structure layers.
 - Added the chapter “Contribution Value Unit: The Person-Year Concept.”
 - Added the explanation “Contribution Value Governance Is Not a Precise Algorithm.”

This whitepaper is part of Emergent Meaning Cosmology and the Civilization Leap research series. For discussion of theoretical details, consult the original texts of Emergent Meaning Cosmology and Meaning Dynamics. For technical implementation details, consult the Contribution Value System Engineering-Level Design.

References

- [1] World Health Organization. (2025, August 29). Depressive disorder (depression). WHO Fact Sheet. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/depression>
- [2] Cabinet Office of Japan. (2025). On Estimates of “Isolated Deaths.” <https://www.cas.go.jp/>; see also Nippon.com. (2026). Living Alone and Dying Unseen in Japan: More than 20,000 Bodies Discovered Over a Week After Death in 2025. <https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-data/h02768/>
- [3] McKinsey Global Institute. (2018). Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/how-will-automation-affect-jobs-skills-and-wages>
- [4] International Labour Organization. (2018). Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work. ILO. https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_633135/lang--en/index.htm; see also UNDP. (2024). The Missing Piece: Valuing women's unrecognized contribution to the economy. <https://www.undp.org/latin-america/blog/missing-piece-valuing-womens-unrecognized-contribution-economy>

[5] ILO. (2018). Data show that women worldwide spend an average of about 4 hours 25 minutes per day on unpaid care work, compared with 1 hour 23 minutes for men. See the ILO Global Care Policy Portal: <https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/care-economy>

Reading Guide and Personalized Further Reading

P05-CV-001 | v1.8.2-R2 | Foundational Master Document for Value Recognition and Operation in a New Civilization

What This Text Does Within the System

It enables real value across different social domains and individual actions to be identified, recorded, recognized, and fed back, providing a shared factual basis for mental balance, meaning, fairness, justice, incentives, trust, collaboration, resource support, and governance judgments.

Special Clarification Mainstream Social Activities Are Not Excluded

Contribution Value is not established only for activities that earn no money, attract little attention, or involve no position or power. Nor is it opposed to markets, wealth, positions, or power.

Market activity, professional work, earning income, public communication, holding positions, organizational management, and the responsible exercise of power during the launch and transition periods may also create real contributions that can be recorded. What matters is actual value, responsibility, outcomes, harm reduction, maintenance of shared systems, and long-term externalities. Making money, fame, positions, and power are neither automatic proof of contribution nor reasons for exclusion.

Current Boundaries

Being foundational does not mean being a total score or the highest authority. Contribution Value does not measure personality value, the meaning of life, purity of motives, or degree of obedience. It does not determine basic rights, and does not automatically generate resource rights, voting rights, professional qualifications, or governance sovereignty.

Continue Reading

Toward conceptual engineering | Contribution-Value System: Conceptual Engineering Design

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-cv-002/>

Toward mind and meaning | Meaning Dynamics V7.2

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p08-md-001/>

Toward incentives and collaboration | Research on Computational Mechanisms of Competition–Cooperation

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-coopmech-001/>

Toward resource support | Civilization Leap Resource Pool: Complete Design Master Document

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-resource-003/>

Toward fairness and legitimate decisions | Civilizational Decision Principles: A Constitution Separating Three Powers

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-three-001/>

Toward real life | Living Civilization Trilogy

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-living-001/>

Contribution Value distinguishes the scale of contributions, not their source. It records real value, responsibilities, and consequences, without prejudging by labels of wealth, fame, position, or power.