

P06-CITY-004 | Global Civilization Leap Urban Interoperability Research Network

Controlled Public Candidate for stress-testing concepts of cross-city governance | From a unified alliance to voluntary interoperability

V1.1 | 2026-09-03 | Zijun Fu | Civilization Leap Research Group

CONTROLLED PUBLIC RESEARCH RELEASE

Note: This is a controlled rewrite based on the identity/version relationships frozen in C5-A1 and the boundaries concerning facts, rights, jurisdictions and real-world effect frozen in C5-A2. It does not establish that any government, institution, enterprise or city has accepted, authorized, initiated, partnered on or implemented this proposal. All specific experiments, data processing, financial arrangements, connections to public resources and cross-jurisdictional mechanisms require separate review once the actual entities, applicable laws, regulatory permissions, budgets and procedures for affected persons have been established.

1. Redefining the network

This network is not a world government, a court for an alliance of cities, a common currency area or a unified identity system. It is a voluntary research collaboration framework among cities, research institutions and sociotechnical teams. It tests how different jurisdictions can share methods, standards, lessons from failures and limited data interfaces while preserving sovereignty, legal responsibility and the right to withdraw.

2. Five principles of interoperability

Earlier concept	Controlled rewrite
One code for access everywhere	Identity remains managed by each jurisdiction; research is limited to the minimum necessary mutual recognition of credentials
Interchangeable resources	Resource sharing is entirely voluntary, contractual and revocable; it creates no cross-city public entitlements
Free movement of talent	Movement of people remains subject to local immigration, labor, education and professional-qualification rules
Connected data	Minimal data, purpose limitation, legality in each jurisdiction and interfaces that can be stopped
Common understanding of rules	Only non-binding common principles and technical standards are developed; no authority above individual jurisdictions is created

3. Network governance

- Members join and leave voluntarily; there are no privileges for “permanent council members.”
- Each project separately signs terms covering responsibility, data, funding, intellectual property and dispute resolution.
- There is no “Contribution Value-weighted” political power for cities.
- Disputes are referred first to existing contractual, arbitration or court systems; the network has no supreme court of its own.
- All common standards are adopted voluntarily and cannot replace national or regional law.

4. Repositioning UCV

UCV is no longer positioned as a cross-city currency, a store of reserve value, a unified benefit system or a right to govern. If the concept is retained, it serves only as a research designation for a “cross-project contribution-description protocol,” used to compare how different projects record verifiable contributions. Cross-border settlement continues to use existing lawful payment and financial systems.

5. Priority areas for collaboration

- A repository of methods for urban resilience and crisis response.
- Privacy-preserving data interoperability and city information models.
- Low-risk sociotechnical modules in education, ecology, community mutual support, accessibility and public health.
- Mechanisms for auditing, simulation, stopping and accountability in AI governance.
- Publish failure cases, negative results and conditions that prevent transfer, to avoid the myth of a universal “success template.”

6. How to begin

The first phase proposes only a research community and project-registration rules. It does not identify ten major cities as having agreed to join, nor does it presuppose ministerial consultations, a Dubai Declaration, cross-border circulation of UCV or alliance bonds. City names may be used only as examples of potential research settings; actual participation requires direct evidence.

7. Significance for civilization

What genuinely merits testing is not whether a unified system can be established above cities, but whether multiple jurisdictions, cultures and stakeholders can achieve higher-quality cooperation without surrendering fundamental rights or sovereign boundaries. This challenge itself is the core of research on cross-city Civilization Leap.

External evidence and citation boundary

The following sources are used only to verify the real-world context and jurisdictional boundaries explicitly identified in this paper. They do not constitute evidence that the relevant institutions have endorsed, accepted, authorized or implemented this proposal. Retrieval date: 2026-09-03.

[1] ISO 37106:2021 | Sustainable cities and communities. <https://www.iso.org/standard/82854.html> — The standard emphasizes an open, collaborative, citizen-centered urban operating model that is not one-size-fits-all. It provides background for research into “voluntary interoperability while preserving cities’ own institutional boundaries”; it does not support creating a unified identity system, an alliance court or supranational governing authority.

Evidence classification

The theoretical propositions and institutional designs in this paper are the authors’ research claims. Real-world facts are limited to the background supported by the sources above. Future institutional designs, timelines, pilot scales, funding arrangements and policy pathways are scenarios or recommendations, not events that have occurred or authorizations that have been granted.

Version signature

Source-version signature (retained from the source)

Permanent ID: P06-CITY-004

Release status: CURRENT CONTROLLED PUBLIC RESEARCH / PUBLIC RELEASE

Version: V1.1_SIGNED

Signed date: 2026-09-03

Parent candidate SHA-256 (C5-A3): 037d670b274fbf529f46d331ffaf5d9b3dda83cd37fc2a7f09a15c42e062aa69

Signed input SHA-256 (C5-A4): 0d355c2ef0486a89b1bbafd2487eb4d5a567408900b70642c02571546ddbbaed8

Public publication slug: p06-city-004