

# Contribution Value System Pilot Concept Template Early Draft

Current public edition: v1.0.4-H1

Author: Zijun Fu | Produced by Civilization Leap Research Group

Historical body title: Contribution Value System Pilot Implementation Handbook

Version: v1.0.3

Version note: Aligned with the Contribution Value System Whitepaper v1.7.6, with particular updates to the account of coexistence with money followed by structural replacement, pilot-resource wording, language for public understanding, and prevention of misreading as a points-redemption mall.

Companion document: Contribution Value System Whitepaper v1.7.6 Official Release

Intended readers: Volunteers in the 100-person pilot, community coordinators, and evaluators

Core idea: Make altruistic actions visible; let civilization remember contributions that should not be forgotten.

B5 W2 controlled revision note: This document is the individual P1 review result for CVS-PILOT. It adds only the minimum T-10 boundaries proportionate to its responsibilities. It creates no new authority and changes no protocol, schema, state machine, interface, frozen parameter, or existing real-world effect.

## **T-10 pilot participation basic rights appeals and exit W2 EMB-2 and execution type EMB-4**

Pilot boundary: This handbook serves only limited, voluntary real-world pilots from which participants can exit. Pilot results must not be extrapolated into society-wide rankings of personality, credit, meaning, or governance.

Basic rights: Participating, not participating, temporarily being unable to contribute, or exiting the pilot does not affect basic subsistence, personal dignity, basic public services, or general political eligibility.

Scarcity and incentives: Pilot resources and specific incentives may be allocated according to public conditions, but contribution records must not monopolize resource eligibility. Scarcity rules must be temporary, contestable, reviewable, and include a pathway to restoration.

Appeals and correction: Participants have the right to know a record's basis, object, supplement evidence, request human review, correct records, withdraw current uses, and receive explanations of the handling of their cases.

Responsibility and exit: Organizers, evaluators, data processors, and appeal handlers bear their respective responsibilities. After exit, no new effects are generated. Historical evidence is separately preserved, deleted, or de-identified according to purpose, duration, and authorization. Sources: T-10 Consolidated Volume of Interdisciplinary Theoretical Upgrades V1.0; T-10 Master Register of Derived Fields for Six Types of System Components by Object, Version, and Stage B3 V1.0; T-10 Master Embedded-Audit Register for Six Types of System-Component Document Families by File, Version, and Stage B4 V1.0; B5 W1 P0 Controlled Embedding Acceptance Report V1.0.

## **A word before we begin**

Welcome to the first group of volunteers in the Contribution Value System pilot!

This handbook is the “operating edition” of the whitepaper. The whitepaper explains “why” and “design principles”; this handbook explains “how” and “what you should do.”

We hope to make everything as simple as possible. If anything remains unclear after reading, please ask a community coordinator at any time. They will patiently help you.

Some good news: You do not have to memorize all the rules. You will gradually become familiar with this handbook through practice. We ask you to remember just one thing:

The Contribution Value System is not about scoring people. It is about letting civilization remember contributions that should not be forgotten.

## Part One Pilot overview

### Pilot goal

The central goal is to test whether the system's core mechanisms really work and accumulate real experience for future improvements.

Specifically, we want to test:

- Whether ordinary people can understand and use the contribution-declaration system
- Whether contribution assessments are fair and consistent
- Whether participants find the system meaningful
- Whether anyone feels offended or coerced

### Participants

100 volunteers from three different types of communities.

### Pilot duration

Six months, from month X to month X in 2026.

### Pilot scenarios

Three communities correspond to different everyday settings.

| Community   | Scenario                 | Main contribution types                                                           |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Community A | Eldercare                | Companionship for older people, assistance with daily care, mental-health support |
| Community B | Children's education     | Homework tutoring, interest activities, mutual assistance among parents           |
| Community C | Environmental protection | Waste-sorting advocacy, organizing green initiatives, environmental education     |

Note: Each community emphasizes different contribution types, but contributions of Community B's type made in Community A, such as teaching children to paint beside an eldercare home, can also be declared. We encourage cross-domain contributions.

### Pilot resources

- Initial record-testing range: 10,000 CV, for testing contribution-recording, ranking, and assessment mechanisms. It does not constitute personal assets, resource shares, or redeemable allowances.
- Available public resources: Community service time, public-benefit support from partner merchants, and eligibility to apply for public spaces with priority.

### What is CV

Contribution Value (CV) is the system's core symbol. It records your contributions, but it is not money. CV cannot be bought or sold, transferred, or exchanged for cash. Its purpose is to make good actions visible and recognized.

## **Success criteria for internal use by the pilot team**

These criteria assess the pilot's success; they are not requirements imposed on you:

- CV declaration accuracy > 90%
- Agreement among evaluators > 70%
- User satisfaction > 80%
- No serious fabricated-record incidents
- At pilot end, no more than 10% report "systematic misalignment of meaning"

## **Part Two Participant guide**

### **What is the Contribution Value System**

In the simplest terms:

You can first understand it as a "civilizational contribution notebook." It records not who is morally superior, but contributions that were often overlooked even though they genuinely supported other people, communities, and civilization.

Imagine what would happen if everyone who helped a neighbor care for an older person, volunteered to tutor children, or picked up roadside litter could be recorded and seen by others.

Today's society records only "work that earns money." Yet many important good things cannot be measured with money: a mother caring for her child, neighbors helping one another, older people passing experience to younger people. These things happen quietly and are rarely seen.

The Contribution Value System seeks to turn these "invisible good deeds" into "visible contributions."

Three important reminders:

- Contribution Value is not money and cannot be bought or sold.
- Contribution Value is not your "value score." Not participating does not mean you are "worthless."
- The system forces nobody to participate, and nonparticipation brings no punishment.

### **Perhaps for the first time you will feel that you can live this way too**

Many people join a pilot for more than a little convenience or curiosity about a new system. Deeper down, perhaps you already know that care, companionship, help, protection, and transmission deserve to be taken seriously.

In its startup stage, the system hopes your first feeling will not be "How many points did I get?" but:

"I can live this way too, as if seeing a new world for the first time."

You do not have to be a hero or accomplish something earth-shattering. You simply leave traces of real goodwill, care, and responsibility. These traces are not meant to rank you, but to let the world know that these things deserve to be remembered.

As more and more people feel “We can all live this way,” the new world will cease to be merely imagined. Together, we will live it into existence.

## **Why should I participate**

You can have your own reasons. Here are some possible reasons from participants. See whether any resemble yours.

Reason One: Let my efforts be seen

“I go to the eldercare home every week to chat with older people, but nobody ever knows. Contribution Value makes me feel my efforts are meaningful.”

Reason Two: Support an experiment that might improve society

“I want to see whether ‘altruism’ can be systematically recorded and recognized. The idea is worth trying.”

Reason Three: Meet more like-minded people

“Through contribution records, I can find others who also want to help people and build deeper connections.”

Reason Four: Participate more easily in the use of public resources

“During the pilot, applications for some public spaces, community service time, and partner public-benefit resources will be prioritized with reference to contribution records. This is not reward redemption; it tests how contribution records can support more reasonable use of public resources.”

Reason Five: I am simply curious

“I want to see how this system actually works.”

Whatever your reason, you are welcome.

## **What do I need to do**

It is simple: Record the good things you do.

Specifically, you may need to:

1. Declare contributions: When you help someone, volunteer, or benefit the community, spend two or three minutes recording it in the system.
2. Receive assessment: Other volunteers, selected randomly, assess whether your contribution records are authentic and effective.
3. Participate in peer assessment: As a community member, you will also be invited to assess others' contributions. This is how everyone jointly maintains fairness.
4. Join monthly reviews, optional but recommended: At a monthly community gathering, discuss that month's contributions, difficulties, and suggestions for improvement.

## How are my contributions recorded

### Step 1: A contribution takes place

You do a good thing in the community, such as buying groceries for a neighbor, chatting with an older person, or joining an environmental cleanup.

### Step 2: Submit a declaration

Open the contribution form. The pilot team will provide the specific method, which might be a WeChat mini-program, webpage, or paper form. Enter:

- What you did, choosing a contribution type
- A brief description, within 200 Chinese characters
- When, where, and whom you helped, optional
- Any evidence such as photographs or chat records, optional

### Step 3: Await assessment

The system randomly invites evaluators according to contribution type and risk level. Ordinary low-risk contributions are generally assessed by two or three evaluators. Contributions with high impact, high CV, disputes, or implications for resource priority or governance weights are assessed by three to five. These evaluators are not the people you helped and do not benefit from the contribution.

### Step 4: Receive confirmation

After approval, your contribution is formally recorded in the system. You can view your contribution records in your personal dashboard.

The entire process usually takes one to seven days.

## Will my privacy be protected

Yes. We take privacy very seriously.

| Privacy issue                               | Explanation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Beneficiaries may remain anonymous          | If the person you helped does not want to be identified in the record, enter “an older person” or “a resident” rather than a name                                                                                                                      |
| Contribution records are private by default | Nobody can see your detailed records unless you actively choose to display them                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Personal information is protected           | The system will not disclose your personal information to third parties                                                                                                                                                                                |
| You may exit at any time                    | Your records become historical archives and cease being used for current CV weights, resource ranking, or governance weights. The system may use them only for de-identified statistics, pilot retrospectives, dispute auditing, or uses you authorize |

Beneficiary privacy:

- Do not use beneficiaries’ photographs in contribution records without explicit consent.

- Do not force beneficiaries to express gratitude.
- Do not use beneficiaries' difficult circumstances to "win sympathy."

## **Can I exit at any time**

Yes, at any time, without any obstacle.

- You need not explain why.
- You need not apply in advance.
- Exiting does not affect contributions previously recorded; they remain as historical records.
- If you wish to return after exiting, you may apply again.

Our promise: Not participating is your right. Nonparticipation will not affect your access to any basic service or expose you to discrimination.

## **Seven things participants need to remember**

1. Contribution Value is not money. It cannot be bought, sold, or exchanged.
2. Contribution Value is not a personality score. High or low CV does not determine whether you are a good person.
3. You will not be punished for nonparticipation. This is a right, not a duty.
4. Before helping others, do not disturb them for the sake of recording. Contribution is natural, not a performance.
5. When others' privacy is involved, prioritize anonymity. Beneficiary dignity matters more than the record.
6. If unsure whether something counts as a contribution, ask a coordinator first. They will help you.
7. If the system makes you uncomfortable, give feedback, appeal, or exit. Your feelings come first.

## **Frequently asked questions**

Q1: I am unsure whether my action counts as a "contribution." What should I do?

A: Submit it first. If you think it helps society or others, it deserves recording. Evaluators will judge its effectiveness. Even if it is not recognized as effective this time, that will not affect future declarations.

Q2: I helped someone who does not want to be recorded. What should I do?

A: Do not record specific information. Enter "a neighbor" or "a resident in the community," without a name. Beneficiary informed consent is required.

Q3: What if an evaluator scores my contribution unfairly?

A: You may appeal. The system has an arbitration mechanism, with other randomly selected evaluators reviewing the case. See Part Three for the detailed appeal process.

Q4: May I choose not to assess others' contributions?

A: Yes. Evaluation rotates among participants and is not compulsory. But we hope you will take part occasionally, since this is how everyone maintains fairness. If you have special circumstances, such as heavy work commitments or illness, you may request a deferral.

Q5: What if I discover false contribution declarations?

A: Tell us through the “problem feedback” channel. False declarations undermine fairness, but we investigate fairly rather than punish immediately. We believe most people are sincere.

Q6: Can Contribution Value be exchanged for money?

A: It is non-tradable and non-transferable. It is neither money nor welfare points. Its role is to make contributions seen and recognized, and test whether records can help public resources be used more reasonably. During the pilot, CV can give you priority when applying to use some public resources, such as a community activity room. This is not “exchanging CV for things”; ranking tests whether contribution records support fairer resource allocation.

Q7: Will people look down on me if my CV is low?

A: They should not. The system expressly prohibits judging people’s worth by CV. Tell us if someone discriminates against you. Everyone’s circumstances differ: Some have time to participate more; others have heavy work or family pressures. Contributing is a choice, not an obligation.

Q8: What happens to my recorded contributions after the pilot ends?

A: They remain as historical records and will not be deleted even after the pilot. They belong to you and to this period of history.

Q9: If I do not want to use a phone/computer, is there another way to declare contributions?

A: Yes. Pilot communities provide paper forms and offline assistance. Give your form to a coordinator, who will enter it into the system for you.

Q10: Is this pilot safe? Could it be used to monitor us?

A: The Contribution Value System is entirely different from a social credit system:

- We record only “good deeds,” not “bad deeds.”
- Your records will not be used to punish you.
- The system is decentralized; no single institution controls all the data.
- If the pilot is abused, anyone may request suspension or closure.

## Part Three Contribution declaration instructions

### Declaring an individual contribution in five minutes

Preparation: Have information about your contribution ready. Information about the people helped is useful if available.

Step One: Choose a contribution type

Find “contribution type” in the form and choose the closest option from the drop-down menu. The classification table continues on the next source page.

| Main category               | Specific types                                                                                 | Examples                                                                    |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Intellectual contributions  | Theoretical innovation, institutional design, original art, etc.                               | Propose community improvements, design activities, create community stories |
| Behavioral contributions    | Care and companionship, public service, project implementation, environmental protection, etc. | Chat with older people, tutor children, organize cleanup activities         |
| Systemic contributions      | System maintenance, risk defense, crisis response, etc.                                        | Help maintain community facilities or assist safety patrols                 |
| Collaborative contributions | Cross-domain connections, resource integration, organizational coordination, etc.              | Connect two organizations for cooperation or mediate neighborhood disputes  |

Not sure which to choose? Select the closest. Evaluators will judge whether the type fits and help adjust it if necessary.

#### Step Two: Describe the contribution

In the description box, explain within 200 Chinese characters:

- What you did
- When and where
- Whom it helped, or how society benefited

Example 1, eldercare:

“On the afternoon of April 15, I accompanied Grandma Li from the community on a one-hour walk and chat in the park. She has recently had difficulty walking, so I also bought groceries for her. She was very happy and said she had not been out for a long time.”

Example 2, children's education:

“On the evening of April 16, I tutored Xiaoming in mathematics for two hours in the community activity room. He is in third grade. We covered fractions, and he finally understood the concept.”

Example 3, environmental protection:

“On the morning of April 17, I organized a six-person community team to collect litter beside the river. We collected three bags of plastic bottles and packaging and also promoted waste sorting to passersby.”

#### Step Three: Upload evidence, optional

You may upload relevant evidence:

- Photographs, such as activities or cleanup results
- Screenshots of chat records
- Other supporting materials

Why is it optional? We understand that not every contribution leaves evidence. If none is available, an honest description is sufficient. Evidence does, however, make assessment more efficient.

#### Step Four: Enter beneficiary information, optional

If specific people are involved, you may choose the options on the next source page.

- Enter anonymously: “an older person in the community” or “a primary-school pupil.”
- Omit beneficiary information and describe only the action.

Privacy-first principle: If unsure, use anonymity or leave the field blank. Beneficiary privacy matters more than complete records.

Step Five: Declarations and submission

Read and confirm:

☐ This contribution is an action in which I genuinely participated.

☐ Where beneficiaries are involved, I have obtained their informed consent; anonymous recording also counts as informed consent.

☐ I received no direct monetary payment for this contribution.

Click “Submit.”

## Contribution declaration form template

Reference for paper use

Contribution Declaration Form | No. \_\_\_\_\_

Declarant: \_\_\_\_\_ Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Declaration date: \_\_\_\_\_

Community: ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C

Contribution type: Tick the appropriate item.

☐ Intellectual ☐ Behavioral ☐ Systemic ☐ Collaborative

Specific type: \_\_\_\_\_

Contribution description, no more than 200 Chinese characters:

---

---

---

Continued on the next source page.

Beneficiaries, optional:

☐ Anonymous, such as a resident, older person, or child

☐ Specific name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please note that informed consent has been obtained.

☐ No specific individual involved

Evidence materials: ☐ None ☐ Available; please attach

Declaration confirmation:

☐ This contribution is an action in which I genuinely participated.

☐ Where beneficiaries are involved, informed consent has been obtained.

☐ This contribution brought no direct monetary payment.

Declarant signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

End of contribution declaration form

## What happens after submission

Your declaration goes through these steps:

Your declaration



[Preliminary review] Automated system checks, within one day

- Is the format correct?
- Are any required fields missing?

Continued on the next source page.

↓ Pass / return for revision

[Assessment] Within two to five days

- Evaluators are randomly assigned by contribution type and risk level: Usually two to three for ordinary low-risk contributions; three to five for high-impact, high-CV, disputed contributions or those involving resource priority or governance weights. Evaluators are not beneficiaries and gain nothing from the contribution.
- Evaluators assess independently, without meeting or knowing others' scores.

↓

[Aggregation] Within one day

- Calculate average scores.
- Trigger arbitration if objections arise.

↓

[Confirmation]

- Contribution Value is formally recorded in your account.
- You receive a notification.

Normally, the full process takes three to seven days.

## Viewing your contribution records

Method One: Personal dashboard, app / mini-program / webpage

After login, go to “My Contributions” to see:

- Cumulative Contribution Value
- Distribution of contribution types, a pie chart
- Historical contribution list
- Contributions awaiting review, approved, or not approved

Method Two: Contact a community coordinator

If you are not comfortable using electronic devices, ask a coordinator to look up and print the records for you.

Method Three: Monthly review meeting

At the monthly community gathering, the coordinator announces contribution statistics. You can ask about your own records there.

## Part Four Evaluator instructions

### The evaluator role

You are a “gatekeeper” of the Contribution Value System.

Your task is to ensure that every contribution record is genuine, valuable, and fair.

As an evaluator, you need to:

- Read declarations carefully.
- Score independently against the four-dimensional criteria.
- Avoid personal bias and favoritism.
- Provide honest assessment comments.

You do not need to be an expert.

Ordinary volunteers are fully capable of evaluating, because the core questions are “Did this really happen?” and “Did it really help someone?”

## Assessment process

Step 1: Receive an assessment invitation

The system notifies you: “You have two new contribution declarations to assess. Please complete them within three days.”

You can see the declarations in the “Awaiting Assessment” list.

Tiered evaluator-count rules:

- Ordinary low-risk contributions: Two to three evaluators.
- High-impact, high-CV, disputed contributions or those involving resource priority or governance weights: Three to five evaluators.
- For formal statistical reporting, no fewer than three evaluators.
- If the pilot uses two evaluators because too few people are available, label it “simplified assessment.”

Step 2: Read the declaration

Read the contribution description, evidence, and beneficiary information carefully.

Step 3: Complete the four-dimensional assessment form

Score each contribution on four dimensions, from 1 to 5:

1 = strongly disagree; 2 = somewhat disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = strongly agree.

See the next section for specific criteria.

Step 4: Add overall comments, optional

If you see a problem, explain it. For example:

- “Beneficiary information is missing, so effectiveness cannot be verified.”
- “The description is too brief to show what was actually done.”
- “This contribution does not seem very credible.”

Step 5: Submit the assessment

Click “Submit Assessment” to finish.

Note: You cannot change it after submission. Check carefully first.

## Four dimensional assessment table

| Dimension     | Meaning                                       | Scoring criteria from 1 to 5                                                                        |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Authenticity  | Did this contribution really happen?          | 1 = clearly false; 3 = cannot judge but basically credible; 5 = sufficient evidence of authenticity |
| Effectiveness | Did this contribution genuinely create value? | 1 = no actual help; 3 = some help; 5 = very clear and specific help                                 |

| Dimension | Meaning                                                 | Scoring criteria from 1 to 5                                                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scarcity  | Is this contribution difficult to replace?              | 1 = anyone could do it; 3 = certain skills or conditions required; 5 = only a few could do it                                    |
| Synergy   | Did this contribution strengthen the community/network? | 1 = helped only an individual; 3 = some enabling effect; 5 = clearly promoted collaboration or connections among multiple people |

Scoring examples:

Case 1: Walking and chatting with an older person

- Authenticity: 5, specific time and location, detailed description.
- Effectiveness: 4, the person genuinely received companionship, although its effect is difficult to quantify.
- Scarcity: 3, many people could chat with older people, but few are willing.
- Synergy: 3, mainly help at an individual level.

Case 2: Organizing a ten-person community cleanup

- Authenticity: 5, photographic evidence and ten participants.
- Effectiveness: 5, clear improvement to the community environment.
- Scarcity: 4, organization and coordination require some ability.
- Synergy: 5, brought multiple people into participation and strengthened community cohesion.

Case 3: Buying groceries for a neighbor

- Authenticity: 4, credible but lacking specific evidence.
- Effectiveness: 4, genuinely solved a practical problem for the neighbor.
- Scarcity: 2, many people could buy groceries for a neighbor along the way.
- Synergy: 2, mainly mutual help among neighbors.

## Avoiding bias

Bias is among the most common problems in assessment. Common forms and responses follow.

| Bias            | Description                                                                           | Response                                                                                                        |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Favoritism      | Higher scores for declarants you know, lower scores for strangers                     | Evaluate actions, not people. Even a stranger deserves a high score if the contribution is genuine and valuable |
| Similarity bias | Higher scores for contributions resembling your own                                   | Evaluate the contribution itself, not its similarity to yours                                                   |
| Recency bias    | Recently seen contributions are remembered more clearly and influence scoring         | Do not assess too many declarations at once; stay focused                                                       |
| Style bias      | Higher scores for polished, detailed writing and lower scores for simple descriptions | Focus on substance, not presentation                                                                            |
| Sympathy bias   | Higher scores for contributions from vulnerable groups, lower for powerful groups     | Objectively assess the contribution's value, whoever the beneficiary is                                         |

One small tip follows.

Before evaluating, ask yourself: “Without this person’s name or any background information, would the contribution description itself convince me?”

## Evaluator reputation points

Why do evaluators need reputation points?

Because evaluators’ fairness directly affects the whole system’s credibility.

Reputation-point rules

| Behavior                                                  | Change in reputation points |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Complete assessments on time, within three days           | +1 point per month          |
| High-quality assessments, consistent with most evaluators | +1 point per quarter        |
| Unexplained delay of more than seven days                 | –1 point                    |
| Repeatedly divergent scores, agreement < 40%              | –3 points                   |
| Identify a false declaration, subsequently verified       | +5 points for that instance |

What reputation points do:

- Evaluators with high reputation points are more likely to receive priority selection for important assessments.
- Those whose points remain too low have their evaluator eligibility suspended.
- The quarterly “Evaluator Star” receives public commendation.

Our expectation: You do not need to be a “perfect evaluator,” only as objective and fair as possible. If unsure, honestly entering “cannot judge” is better than scoring arbitrarily.

## Part Five Community coordinator guide

### Coordinator responsibilities

You are the central connector in your pilot community.

Your main responsibilities are:

#### 1. Recruitment and onboarding

- Help new participants understand the system.
- Answer common questions.
- Distribute handbooks.

#### 2. Daily support

- Collect paper contribution-declaration forms.
- Help participants unfamiliar with electronic devices.
- Handle participants’ general questions.

#### 3. Data collection

- Organize monthly review meetings.
- Collect user-satisfaction questionnaires.
- Record feedback from the human-heart check.

#### 4. Escalating problems

- Identify and handle disputes.
- Escalate to the pilot team when necessary.

#### 5. Maintaining the atmosphere

- Encourage active declarations.
- Commend exemplary contributions.
- Prevent negative sentiment from spreading.

### Organizing monthly review meetings

Monthly reviews are an important source of community cohesion.

Suggested agenda, 60–90 minutes

| Session               | Duration   | Content                                                                         |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Opening               | 5 minutes  | Welcome everyone and briefly revisit the month's theme                          |
| Contribution sharing  | 15 minutes | Invite two or three participants to share contribution stories voluntarily      |
| Data briefing         | 10 minutes | Announce monthly statistics, including declaration counts and type distribution |
| Problem discussion    | 20 minutes | Gather difficulties, suggestions, and questions                                 |
| Satisfaction feedback | 10 minutes | Distribute a brief anonymous questionnaire                                      |
| Human-heart check     | 10 minutes | Ask, "How have you felt this month? Has anything felt wrong?"                   |
| Looking ahead         | 5 minutes  | Preview next month's activities and thank everyone                              |

Points to remember:

- Location: Choose somewhere convenient, such as a community activity room.
- Timing: Consider working participants; a weekend afternoon or weekday evening may work.
- Atmosphere: Keep it relaxed and informal, allowing everyone a chance to speak.
- Records: Assign someone to note key points for the pilot retrospective.

### Collecting human heart check feedback

The human-heart check is the Contribution Value System's "early-warning system."

Its purpose is to ensure that the system does not make people feel coerced, offended, or alienated.

Collection methods:

Method One: Monthly anonymous questionnaire

Human-heart Check Questionnaire

Rate these statements from 1 to 5, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:

1. Participating in the Contribution Value System feels meaningful to me.
2. I participate voluntarily.
3. Declaring contributions is not troublesome.
4. Assessments are fair.

5. I do not feel “coerced” by this system.

6. I am willing to continue participating in the pilot.

Open questions:

- What made you uncomfortable this month? Optional.
- What improvements would you suggest? Optional.

Method Two: Open discussion

Ask directly at the monthly review:

- “How has everyone felt this month?”
- “Has anything felt not quite right to anyone?”
- “Has anyone felt forced?”

Method Three: Suggestion box

Provide an anonymous suggestion box, physical or a WeChat anonymous poll, so that people who do not want to speak at the meeting can still give feedback.

## Handling dispute escalation

| Dispute type                | Handling                                 | Escalation criterion                                      |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Declaration-content dispute | Coordinator mediates; reassess if needed | Coordinator cannot resolve it                             |
| Unfair-assessment dispute   | Enter arbitration                        | Still dissatisfied after appeal                           |
| Interpersonal conflict      | Coordinator mediates                     | Involves multiple people and affects community harmony    |
| System problem              | Refer to pilot technical team            | Affects multiple users                                    |
| Ethical problem             | Escalate immediately                     | Any report involving privacy violations or moral coercion |

Handling principles: Listen before judging; do not rush to conclusions; protect whistleblowers' privacy; remain impartial.

Escalation channel: Contact the pilot project team: [Contact details TBD].

## Part Six Pilot data collection templates

### Contribution declaration statistics

Completed monthly by the community coordinator.

[Community name] Monthly Contribution Declaration Statistics Form

Continued on the next source page.

Reporting month: \_\_\_\_\_ Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_

### Overall data

Total declarations: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Declaration accuracy: \_\_\_\_\_ Average review time in days: \_\_\_\_\_

### Type distribution

[ ] Intellectual contributions: \_\_\_\_\_ Share: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Behavioral contributions: \_\_\_\_\_ Share: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Systemic contributions: \_\_\_\_\_ Share: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Collaborative contributions: \_\_\_\_\_ Share: \_\_\_\_\_

### Top five most frequent contribution types

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Count: \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_ Count: \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_ Count: \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_ Count: \_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_ Count: \_\_\_\_\_

### Evaluator data

Number participating in assessments: \_\_\_\_\_

Average assessments per person: \_\_\_\_\_

Continued on the next source page.

Evaluator agreement coefficient: \_\_\_\_\_

Overdue uncompleted assessments: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Special flags**

"Non-direct benefit" flags: \_\_\_\_\_

"High cost" flags: \_\_\_\_\_ "Intergenerational effects" flags: \_\_\_\_\_

End of monthly contribution statistics form

### **Evaluator agreement record**

Automatically generated by the system or compiled by the coordinator.

Monthly Evaluator Agreement Report

Reporting month: \_\_\_\_\_

Overall agreement:

Evaluator agreement coefficient: \_\_\_\_\_ Target > 70%

Evaluator participation rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement by dimension:

Authenticity: \_\_\_\_\_

Effectiveness: \_\_\_\_\_

Scarcity: \_\_\_\_\_

Continued on the next source page.

Synergy: \_\_\_\_\_

Low-agreement cases, requiring particular attention:

Case number: \_\_\_\_\_ Score difference: \_\_\_\_\_

Focus of dispute: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcome: \_\_\_\_\_

Changes in evaluator reputation points:

High-reputation evaluators, points  $\geq 10$ : \_\_\_\_\_ people

Low-reputation evaluators, points  $\leq 3$ : \_\_\_\_\_ people

Eligibility suspended: \_\_\_\_\_ people

End of evaluator agreement report

### **User satisfaction questionnaire short version**

Collected monthly, anonymously.

Monthly User Satisfaction Questionnaire

Choose the option closest to your feelings, from 1 to 5.

1. I understand how the Contribution Value System works.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

2. Declaring contributions is not difficult for me.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Continued on the next source page.

3. I believe assessments are fair and impartial.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

4. Participating in the Contribution Value System feels meaningful to me.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

5. I am willing to continue participating in this pilot.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

6. I do not feel “morally coerced” by this system.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Open questions, optional:

7. What made you uncomfortable this month?

---

8. What improvements would you suggest?

---

Collection method: ☐ Paper ☐ WeChat poll ☐ Other

Number collected: \_\_\_\_\_ questionnaires

End of user satisfaction questionnaire

### **Human heart check feedback form**

Collected monthly by the coordinator.

Human-heart Check Feedback Record

Continued on the next source page.

Recording month: \_\_\_\_\_ Collection method: \_\_\_\_\_

### Quantitative indicators

Number of responses collected: \_\_\_\_\_

Share “feeling a misalignment of meaning or pangs of conscience”: \_\_\_\_\_% Target  $\leq 30\%$

Share “feeling morally coerced”: \_\_\_\_\_%

Share with “satisfaction < 3 points”: \_\_\_\_\_%

### Negative feedback summary requiring particular attention

Feedback type 1: \_\_\_\_\_

People affected: \_\_\_\_\_ Severity: ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Response measures: \_\_\_\_\_

Feedback type 2: \_\_\_\_\_

People affected: \_\_\_\_\_ Severity: ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Response measures: \_\_\_\_\_

### Positive feedback summary

Feedback type 1: \_\_\_\_\_

People affected: \_\_\_\_\_

Feedback type 2: \_\_\_\_\_

People affected: \_\_\_\_\_

Continued on the next source page.

Has the human-heart check mechanism been triggered?

☐ No, negative feedback < 30%

☐ Yes → Reported to the ethical review group? ☐ Yes ☐ No

End of human-heart check feedback form

## Part Seven End of pilot assessment

### Success criteria checklist

For internal use by the pilot team.

Pilot Success Criteria Checklist

Mechanism feasibility:

☐ CV declaration accuracy > 90%

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ Evaluator agreement > 70%

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ User satisfaction > 80%

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ Serious fabricated-record incidents = 0

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ System availability > 99%

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

Human-heart check:

☐ Reports of systematic misalignment of meaning ≤ 10%

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ No complaints of moral coercion

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

Continued on the next source page.

Case-library development:

☐ Valid contribution cases collected  $\geq 100$

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ Covers all four contribution categories ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Includes representative disputed cases ☐ Yes ☐ No

Processes and documentation:

☐ Produced a contribution-classification guide based on real cases ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Produced a revised evaluator-training handbook ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Produced a list of user-experience improvement suggestions ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Completed an initial draft of weight parameters ☐ Yes ☐ No

Participant feedback:

☐ Post-pilot survey completion rate  $\geq 80\%$

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Met ☐ Not met

☐ Participants willing to continue into the next stage

Actual value: \_\_\_\_\_% ☐ Met ☐ Not met

Overall assessment:

Number of criteria met: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Overall rating: ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Pass ☐ Fail

Main strengths: \_\_\_\_\_

Main shortcomings: \_\_\_\_\_

Improvement suggestions: \_\_\_\_\_

End of pilot success criteria checklist

## Case collection template

For organizing representative contribution cases for subsequent dissemination.

### Contribution Case Record Form

Basic information:

Case number: \_\_\_\_\_

Community: ☐ A, eldercare ☐ B, children's education ☐ C, environmental protection

Contribution type: ☐ Intellectual ☐ Behavioral ☐ Systemic ☐ Collaborative

Declaration date: \_\_\_\_\_

Declarant, optional: \_\_\_\_\_

Contribution description, original wording; may be de-identified:

---

---

---

Assessment data:

Authenticity score: \_\_\_\_\_ Effectiveness score: \_\_\_\_\_

Scarcity score: \_\_\_\_\_ Synergy score: \_\_\_\_\_

Final Contribution Value: \_\_\_\_\_

Continued on the next source page.

Special flags:

☐ Non-direct benefit ☐ High cost ☐ Innovation ☐ Intergenerational effects

Case highlights: Why does this case deserve to be recorded?

---

---

De-identification:

☐ De-identified, suitable for public sharing

☐ Not de-identified, internal research only

De-identification explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

Authorization for use:

☐ Consent to use in training materials

☐ Consent to use in media reporting

Authorizing person's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

End of contribution case record form

## Participant feedback interview guide

For in-depth interviews after the pilot to understand participants' actual experiences.

Participant Feedback Interview Guide

Continued on the next source page.

## Basic interview information

Interviewee: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview date: \_\_\_\_\_

Community: [ ] A [ ] B [ ] C

Length of participation: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Note-taker: \_\_\_\_\_

## Understanding and perceptions

1. How did you initially understand the “Contribution Value System”? Was it what you imagined?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Did your understanding change after joining the pilot?

\_\_\_\_\_

## User experience

3. Did declaring contributions go smoothly? What difficulties did you encounter?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Did the assessment process feel fair? Were there times when it felt unfair?

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Did you receive feedback or thanks from others? How did it feel?

\_\_\_\_\_

## Motivation for participating

6. Why did you initially want to join the pilot? Do you still have the same motivation?

\_\_\_\_\_

7. How has your enthusiasm for participating changed over these six months?

Continued on the next source page.

## Feelings and concerns

8. Have you ever felt “morally coerced” by this system?

---

9. Have you worried about privacy? What specifically concerned you?

---

10. Was there a moment when you felt uncomfortable or thought something was not quite right about the system?

---

## Value and meaning

11. Has participating in this pilot been personally meaningful? What have you gained?

---

12. Do you think the system is meaningful for the community? Why?

---

## Suggestions for improvement

13. If asked for your single most important suggestion for improvement, what would you say?

---

14. If the pilot continues, would you want to keep participating?

---

## Open question

15. Is there anything else you want to say that we have not asked about?

Continued on the next source page.

Interview duration: Approximately 30–45 minutes

Interview method: ☐ In person ☐ Video ☐ Telephone

End of participant feedback interview guide

## Appendix Important contacts and resources

### Pilot team contacts

| Role              | Contact | Responsibility                           |
|-------------------|---------|------------------------------------------|
| Pilot lead        | [TBD]   | Overall coordination and major decisions |
| Technical support | [TBD]   | System-use problems                      |
| Ethics adviser    | [TBD]   | Ethical issues and complaints            |

### Emergencies

If you discover:

- A serious privacy violation
- Suspected fraud or false declarations
- Any situation making you feel your personal safety is threatened

Contact immediately: [Pilot lead's contact details].

### Resource links

- Contribution Value System Whitepaper, full version: [Link TBD]
- Online declaration system: [Link TBD]
- Frequently asked questions: [Link TBD]
- Contribution-classification reference guide: [Link TBD]

### Closing words

Thank you for becoming one of the Contribution Value System's first explorers.

This system is imperfect. Nobody can design a perfect system. But we believe that “real attempts” are more valuable than “perfect theories.”

Every declaration, assessment, and piece of feedback you provide helps us improve it.

If you have any questions, confusion, or even dissatisfaction during the pilot, please speak up. These genuine voices are the most important basis for improving the system.

Together, let us make altruistic actions visible.

If this pilot makes you feel “I can live this way too,” it has already begun to serve its true purpose. If more and more people come to feel “We can all live this way,” the new world will cease to be merely imagined. Together, we will live it into existence.

Contribution Value System Pilot Implementation Handbook v1.0.3

Companion document: Contribution Value System Whitepaper v1.7.6 Official Release

Version date: May 2026

## Reading guidance and personalized further reading

P05-CV-003 | v1.0.4-H1 | Early conceptual draft on value recognition, fair incentives, and participation feedback

### This document's role in the system

Preserve early exploration of how different social behaviors are recognized as contributions, how assessment affects feelings of fairness, how incentives avoid distortion, how objections and exit are accommodated, and how forms and feedback are designed.

### Special note mainstream social behavior is not excluded

Contribution Value is not established only for activities that do not earn money, are unobtrusive, or lack positions or power. Nor is it against markets, wealth, positions, or power. Market operations, professional work, earning income, public communication, holding positions, organizational management, and responsible exercise of power during startup and transition may also create genuine contributions that can be recorded. What matters is actual value, responsibility, outcomes, reduced harm, maintenance of shared systems, and long-term externalities. Money-making, reputation, positions, and power are neither automatic proof of contribution nor grounds for exclusion.

### Current boundaries

Participant numbers, periods, scales, thresholds, roles, and resource arrangements are historical examples. Future experiments must not seek only non-mainstream contributions or directly equate mainstream success with contribution.

### Continue reading

Return to the foundational design | Contribution Value System Whitepaper

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

Return to conceptual engineering | Contribution Value System Conceptual Engineering Plan

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

Toward real life | The Living Civilization Trilogy

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

Overall relationships | Contribution Value The Foundation of Value Recognition and Operation in a New Civilization

<https://www.civitas.top/en/overview/contribution-resource-governance/>

Contributions differ in magnitude, not in source. Record genuine value, responsibility, and consequences without prejudging them by labels of wealth, reputation, position, or power.