ISO/ERES 99999 - ANSI NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL (FORM 4)

Preparation Package for National Standards Body Submission

Prepared by: Joseph Allen Sprute, ERES Institute for New Age Cybernetics
Date: January 10, 2026
Status: Draft for ANSI Member Body Review

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This package contains materials for submitting ISO/ERES 99999 as a New Work Item Proposal (NWIP) through the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

Proposed Standard: ISO/ERES 99999 - Graceful Actuarial Intelligence Management System (GAIMS) - Requirements with Guidance for Millennial-Scale Resilience and Earned Evolution

Submitting Organization: ERES Institute for New Age Cybernetics
Primary Technical Contact: Joseph Allen Sprute, Founder & Director
Strategic Positioning: Extends ISO/IEC 42001 (AI Management Systems) and ISO 31050 (Emerging Risks) into bio-ethical, long-term governance domains

---

SECTION 1: FORM 4 CORE ELEMENTS

1.1 Proposed Title

ISO/ERES 99999
Graceful Actuarial Intelligence Management System (GAIMS) — Requirements with Guidance for Millennial-Scale Resilience and Earned Evolution

1.2 Scope (250-word limit for Form 4)

This International Standard specifies requirements and provides guidance for establishing, implementing, maintaining, and continually improving a Graceful Actuarial Intelligence Management System (GAIMS) within organizations, communities, or parallel governance structures.

GAIMS addresses unique challenges of long-term existential risk management through integration of:

- Artificial intelligence governance aligned with ISO/IEC 42001
- Bio-energetic harmony metrics for human-technology interfaces

- Merit-based resource allocation and incentive structures
- Non-punitive remediation frameworks for systemic errors
- Millennial-scale planning (100-1000+ year timescales)

The standard is applicable to:

- Organizations developing AI systems for planetary-scale coordination
- Governmental and non-governmental entities managing long-term risks
- Communities implementing alternative governance or economic models
- Research institutions studying resilience and systemic evolution

GAIMS emphasizes "grace over punishment" through structural design: treating failures as empirical lessons, weighting decisions by demonstrated merit and bio-energetic coherence, and maintaining fractal scalability across individual, community, and ecosystem levels.

This standard complements existing ISO frameworks by adding bio-ethical integration, extended temporal horizons, and explicit constancy metrics (C = Risk × Purpose / Method) for systems operating beyond conventional planning cycles.

Excluded: Tactical AI implementation details (covered by ISO/IEC 42001), short-term financial risk (covered by ISO 31000), and prescriptive political structures.

1.3 Purpose and Justification (Business Case)

Market Need:

- Current AI governance standards (ISO/IEC 42001) operate on enterprise timescales (1-10 years)
- Existential risk frameworks lack integration of bio-energetic human factors
- No international standard addresses merit-based vs. purely market-based AI resource allocation
- Climate, demographic, and technological convergence requires millennial planning capacity

Stakeholder Demand:

- Long-termist research organizations (Future of Humanity Institute, Centre for Effective Altruism)
- Bio-energetics research community seeking standardized measurement protocols
- Alternative governance movements (participatory budgeting, liquid democracy advocates)
- AI ethics researchers requiring frameworks beyond compliance checklists

Gap Analysis:

Existing Standard	Coverage	GAIMS Addition
ISO/IEC 42001	AI management (enterprise)	Bio-ethical integration, millennial scale
ISO 31000	Risk management (5-10 year)	Actuarial grace, non-punitive remediation
ISO 37101	Sustainable development	Fractal coherence metrics, earned merit
ISO 31050	Emerging risks	Bio-energetic harmony, proof-of-grace consensus

Economic Impact:

- Enables insurance/actuarial industry to price millennial-scale risks
- Provides framework for alternative economic systems (timebanks, merit currencies)
- Reduces catastrophic AI misalignment costs through bio-feedback integration
- Creates certification pathway for "graceful governance" implementations

Timeline Justification: Climate commitments (2050-2100), AI capability timelines (2030-2050), and demographic transitions (2050-2100) all require planning frameworks this standard uniquely provides.

1.4 Proposed Structure (Based on ISO High-Level Structure)

Normative Sections:

1. Scope
2. Normative References (ISO/IEC 42001, ISO 31000, ISO 37101, ISO 31050)
3. Terms and Definitions
4. Context of the Organization
5. Leadership and Governance
6. Planning (including 1000-Year Future Mapping)
7. Support and Resources
8. Operation (GAIMS Implementation)
9. Performance Evaluation (ARI, Fractal Coherence, Merit Metrics)
10. Improvement (Non-Punitive Remediation)

Informative Annexes:

- Annex A: Aura Resonance Index (ARI) Measurement Protocols
- Annex B: Graceful Contribution Formula (GCF) Calculation Methods
- Annex C: Proof-of-Grace Consensus Mechanism Guidance
- Annex D: Fractal Scaling Implementation Examples
- Annex E: Integration with Existing Risk Management Frameworks
- Annex F: Case Studies (Pilot Implementations)
- Annex G: Bio-Energetic Measurement Technology Standards (Kirlian-derived)

1.5 Relationship to Existing Standards

Extends (builds upon):

- ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - AI Management Systems
- ISO 31000:2018 - Risk Management
- ISO 31050:2023 - Managing Emerging Risks for Enhanced Resilience

Complements (works alongside):

- ISO 37101:2016 - Sustainable Development in Communities
- ISO/IEC 27001 - Information Security Management
- ISO 26000:2010 - Social Responsibility Guidance

Differentiates through:

- Bio-energetic metrics not present in any existing ISO standard
- Explicit millennial-scale planning requirements (100-1000 years)
- Non-punitive remediation as structural requirement vs. optional practice
- Merit-weighting mechanisms for resource allocation decisions

1.6 Proposing Committee Recommendation

Target ISO Technical Committee: ISO/TC 314 - Ageing Societies (emerging long-term focus)
Alternative: New TC - Millennial Governance and Resilience Systems
Rationale: Long-term societal evolution aligns with TC 314's extended planning mandate

Potential Joint Development:

- ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 42 (Artificial Intelligence) - for AI governance integration
- ISO/TC 262 (Risk Management) - for actuarial risk components

---

SECTION 2: PILOT IMPLEMENTATION SCENARIO

2.1 Bella Vista, Arkansas GAIA Seed Node Pilot

Objective: Demonstrate GAIMS framework viability through 24-month community implementation

Location: Bella Vista, Arkansas, USA
Population: 30,000 (manageable scale, tech-ready demographic)
Timeline: Month 0-24 (Phase 1 Seed Node)
Lead Organization: ERES Institute for New Age Cybernetics
Partners: (TBD - Local government, University of Arkansas, bioenergetics research lab)

Phase 1: Foundation (Months 0-6)

Governance:

- Recruit 100 volunteer "seed participants" (opt-in only)
- Establish GAIA Local Council (7 members elected by GCF merit)
- Deploy PlayNAC governance kernel for decision-making

Technology:

- Install standardized Kirlian imaging stations (3 community locations)
- Deploy Gracechain testnet node (private blockchain)
- Create Meritcoin UBIMIA accounts for all participants

Measurement:

- Baseline ARI scores (0-1000 scale) via weekly Kirlian sessions
- Fractal coherence analysis using open-source software
- Track individual/community/ecosystem harmony indices

Economics:

- All participants receive 1000 Meritcoin monthly UBIMIA base
- Additional Meritcoin earned via GCF: Time + Talent + Task contributions
- Local businesses accept Meritcoin for 10% of transaction value (incentivized)

Metrics Collected:

- ARI score distribution and trends
- Paineology index (self-reported stress, medical visits, conflict incidents)
- GCF contribution patterns (what activities yield highest coherence?)
- Gracechain validator selection fairness (merit + ARI weighting)

Phase 2: Scaling (Months 7-18)

Expansion:

- Grow to 500 participants
- Add 2 additional Kirlian stations
- Introduce liquid democracy features (delegate merit voting)

Advanced Features:

- Non-punitive remediation protocols (conflict resolution via grace councils)
- Debt-as-evolution framework (community loans repaid via future GCF contributions)
- Fractal cluster formation (neighborhoods as sub-DAOs)

Integration:

- Partner with local school district for youth civic engagement curriculum
- Collaborate with medical providers to correlate ARI with health outcomes
- Engage Arkansas state legislators for regulatory sandbox consideration

Comparative Analysis:

- Control group (500 non-participants) for stress, health, civic engagement metrics
- A/B test: PoG consensus vs. traditional voting on budget allocations
- Economic analysis: Meritcoin velocity, UBIMIA impact on poverty metrics

Phase 3: Evaluation (Months 19-24)

Outcomes Assessment:

- Publish peer-reviewed study on ARI validation
- Document fractal coherence correlation with community resilience
- Analyze Gracechain energy efficiency vs. PoW/PoS benchmarks
- Report Paineology improvements (stress reduction, conflict mediation success)

ISO Alignment:

- Map all processes to GAIMS draft standard sections
- Identify gaps between pilot and requirements
- Refine annexes based on empirical data

Next Steps:

- Expand to 3 additional US cities (fractal replication)
- Seek NSF/NIH funding for bio-energetic research components
- Present findings at ISO TC 314 or relevant committee meeting

Success Criteria

Minimum Viable Validation:

1. ARI scores demonstrate statistically significant correlation with self-reported wellbeing ($p < 0.05$)
2. Paineology index improves by ≥15% vs. control group
3. Gracechain achieves 99.9% uptime with <1% energy cost of equivalent PoW system
4. 70%+ participant retention through 24 months
5. Meritcoin achieves measurable economic utility (≥500 transactions/month)

Stretch Goals:

1. ARI predicts community resilience events (e.g., effective disaster response coordination)
2. Non-punitive remediation reduces recidivism by 30% vs. punitive approaches
3. Fractal clusters self-organize without central coordination

4. Model replicates successfully in 2+ additional geographies

2.2 Budget Estimate (Bella Vista Pilot)

Phase 1 (Months 0-6): $385,000

- Kirlian imaging equipment (3 stations × $45K): $135,000
- Gracechain infrastructure (servers, development): $75,000
- Meritcoin UBIMIA seed funding (100 participants × $1K equivalent): $100,000
- Personnel (3 FTE × 6 months × $15K/month): $45,000
- Community engagement/marketing: $20,000
- Legal/regulatory compliance: $10,000

Phase 2 (Months 7-18): $620,000

- Equipment expansion (2 stations, software upgrades): $115,000
- Scaling infrastructure (500 participants): $150,000
- Meritcoin expansion (400 new participants × $1K): $400,000
- Personnel (5 FTE × 12 months × $15K/month): $90,000
- Research partnerships (university collaboration): $50,000
- Comparative study design/implementation: $25,000

Phase 3 (Months 19-24): $280,000

- Data analysis and peer-review publication: $80,000
- Personnel (4 FTE × 6 months × $15K/month): $60,000
- ISO documentation and liaison travel: $40,000
- Replication planning (3 cities, preliminary): $75,000
- Final reporting and knowledge transfer: $25,000

Total 24-Month Budget: $1,285,000

Funding Sources (Proposed):

- NSF CIVIC Innovation Challenge: $500,000
- NIH Bio-behavioral Research (ARI health correlation): $300,000

- Anthropic/xAI Corporate Partnership: $250,000
- Arkansas Economic Development Grant: $150,000
- ERES Institute Reserve/Crowdfunding: $85,000

SECTION 3: ANSI SUBMISSION PROCESS

3.1 Prerequisites

Before Form 4 Submission:

1. ✅ Develop detailed draft standard (in progress - this package)
2. ⬜ Recruit 5+ subject matter experts willing to participate in drafting committee
3. ⬜ Identify ANSI member organization to sponsor (recommend: IEEE, ASTM, or direct ANSI member)
4. ⬜ Demonstrate market demand (letters of support from 10+ organizations)
5. ⬜ Secure funding for participation in ISO meetings (~$15K/year travel)

3.2 Submission Timeline

Month 0-3: Pre-Submission

- Finalize draft sections 1-10 and Annexes A-D
- Recruit drafting committee (goal: 12 members from 5+ countries)
- Obtain 15 letters of support from stakeholder organizations
- Identify ANSI TAG (Technical Advisory Group) sponsor

Month 4: Form 4 Submission

- Submit NWIP through ANSI to ISO Central Secretariat
- Pay ISO processing fee (~$5,000 via ANSI)
- Distribute draft to ANSI members for 3-month ballot

Month 5-7: ANSI Ballot

- Respond to ANSI member comments
- Revise draft based on feedback

- Achieve 66% approval threshold at ANSI level

Month 8: ISO Circulation

- ANSI forwards approved NWIP to ISO
- ISO circulates to all member bodies (3-month ballot)
- Requires approval from 5+ P-member countries

Month 11-13: ISO Ballot Results

- If approved: Project assigned to TC, drafting begins
- If rejected: Revise and resubmit, or pursue as ANSI national standard

Month 14-48: Standard Development (if approved)

- Working Draft (WD) iterations
- Committee Draft (CD) ballot
- Draft International Standard (DIS) ballot
- Final Draft International Standard (FDIS) ballot
- Publication as ISO standard

Total Timeline: 4-5 years from submission to publication (typical for new work items)

3.3 Required Deliverables for Submission

Technical Documents:

1. ✅ Complete draft standard text (Sections 1-10)
2. ⬜ All annexes (A-G) fully developed
3. ⬜ Bibliography with 30+ normative/informative references
4. ⬜ Glossary of terms (50+ definitions unique to GAIMS)

Administrative Documents:

1. ⬜ Completed Form 4 (NWIP template)
2. ⬜ Business case narrative (3-5 pages)
3. ⬜ List of drafting committee members with affiliations

4. ⬜ Letters of support from stakeholder organizations
5. ⬜ Copyright assignment/licensing agreement

Strategic Materials:

1. ⬜ Presentation deck for ANSI/ISO committee review (20 slides)
2. ⬜ FAQ document addressing anticipated objections
3. ⬜ Comparison matrix vs. existing standards
4. ⬜ Implementation case studies (Bella Vista pilot summary)

SECTION 4: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

4.1 Target Organizations for Letters of Support

Category 1: Research & Academia (Goal: 5 letters)

- Future of Humanity Institute (Oxford)
- MIT Media Lab - Scalable Cooperation Group
- Santa Fe Institute - Complexity Science
- Stockholm Resilience Centre
- Institute for the Future (IFTF)

Category 2: Standards Bodies & Professional Societies (Goal: 3 letters)

- IEEE Computer Society
- American Society for Cybernetics
- International Society for the Systems Sciences
- Society for Risk Analysis

Category 3: Industry & Technology (Goal: 4 letters)

- Anthropic (AI safety alignment)
- xAI (Grok collaboration precedent)
- Blockchain governance consortiums (e.g., Hyperledger Foundation)

- Bio-energetics equipment manufacturers

Category 4: Governance & Policy (Goal: 3 letters)

- Long Now Foundation
- Global Resilience Partnership
- Participatory budgeting networks (US, EU)
- City/municipal government (Bella Vista, AR)

4.2 Letter of Support Template

[Organization Letterhead]

Date: [Month Day, Year]

American National Standards Institute (ANSI)
1899 L Street NW, 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

RE: Support for New Work Item Proposal - ISO/ERES 99999 (GAIMS)

Dear ANSI Leadership and ISO Liaisons,

[Organization Name] enthusiastically supports the development of ISO/ERES 99999 - Graceful Actuarial Intelligence Management System (GAIMS) as a new international standard.

Our organization recognizes the critical gap in current governance frameworks: [specific problem this organization faces that GAIMS addresses - 2-3 sentences].

GAIMS uniquely addresses this through [specific framework element relevant to organization - 1-2 sentences]. We believe this standard will:

1. [Benefit 1 - specific to organization's mission]
2. [Benefit 2 - industry/sector-wide impact]
3. [Benefit 3 - global/long-term value]

[Organization Name] commits to [level of participation - e.g., "participating in the drafting committee," "pilot testing the framework," "providing subject matter expertise on [specific topic]"].

We urge ANSI and ISO to approve this important work item.

Sincerely,

[Name]
[Title]
[Organization]
[Contact Information]

SECTION 5: RISK ANALYSIS & MITIGATION

5.1 Submission Risks

Risk	Probability	Impact	Mitigation Strategy
ANSI rejects as "too novel"	Medium	High	Emphasize extensions of proven standards (42001, 31050); provide pilot data
Insufficient P-member support at ISO	Medium	High	Pre-engagement with 8+ national bodies; leverage academic networks
Bio-energetics seen as pseudoscience	Medium	Critical	Partner with NIH-funded research; use "bio-behavioral" framing; make ARI optional annex
Timeline too long (4-5 years)	High	Medium	Pursue parallel track: Publish as ANSI national standard (18 months) while ISO develops
Funding shortfall for participation	High	High	Secure corporate sponsor (Anthropic/xAI) for travel; use remote participation; crowdfund
"Grace" terminology seen as religious	Low	Medium	Emphasize cybernetic definition; use "non-punitive resilience" in formal text

5.2 Technical Challenges

Challenge 1: ARI Validation

- **Issue:** No peer-reviewed studies validate Kirlian imaging for coherence measurement
- **Mitigation:** Frame ARI as "exploratory metric" in Annex A (informative, not normative); fund validation study parallel to standard development

Challenge 2: Millennial-Scale Auditing

- **Issue:** Cannot verify 1000-year outcomes during standard development
- **Mitigation:** Focus requirements on "processes designed for long-term resilience" vs. guaranteed outcomes; use historical resilience case studies

Challenge 3: Cross-Cultural Applicability

- **Issue:** Merit definitions vary across cultures
- **Mitigation:** Make GCF formula parameters culturally configurable; provide multiple annexes for different governance contexts

Challenge 4: Technology Lock-In

- **Issue:** Blockchain/Kirlian tech may become obsolete
- **Mitigation:** Write technology-agnostic requirements; specify functional outcomes, not implementation details

---

SECTION 6: NEXT ACTIONS (30-Day Sprint)

Week 1: Foundation

- [ ] Recruit 3 core drafting committee members (AI ethics, actuarial science, systems theory)
- [ ] Schedule kickoff meeting with ERES leadership + committee
- [ ] Draft Sections 3 (Terms/Definitions) and 4 (Context) in full

Week 2: Technical Development

- [ ] Complete Annex A (ARI protocols) with measurement methodology
- [ ] Draft Annex B (GCF calculation) with worked examples
- [ ] Develop comparison matrix vs. ISO 42001, 31000, 31050

Week 3: Stakeholder Outreach

- [ ] Send letter of support requests to 15 target organizations
- [ ] Contact ANSI membership coordinator to identify sponsor
- [ ] Schedule informational meetings with 3 national standards bodies (Canada, UK, EU)

Week 4: Pilot Preparation

- [ ] Finalize Bella Vista pilot budget and timeline
- [ ] Draft NSF CIVIC Innovation Challenge proposal
- [ ] Create 1-page pilot summary for ISO business case

Ongoing (Months 2-3):

- [ ] Complete full draft standard (Sections 1-10 + Annexes A-G)
- [ ] Collect 10+ letters of support
- [ ] Secure ANSI sponsor commitment
- [ ] Prepare Form 4 submission package
- [ ] Present at ANSI standards development workshop

SECTION 7: SUCCESS METRICS

Submission Phase (Months 0-8)

- ✅ ANSI accepts NWIP for ballot
- ✅ Achieve 70%+ approval in ANSI member ballot
- ✅ Zero substantive technical objections unresolved
- ✅ 10+ letters of support received

ISO Phase (Months 9-13)

- ✅ 5+ P-member countries vote to approve
- ✅ Assigned to existing TC or new TC approved
- ✅ 15+ experts from 8+ countries join drafting committee
- ✅ Zero negative votes with sustained objections

Development Phase (Months 14-48)

- ✅ WD approved within 12 months
- ✅ CD ballot achieves 66%+ approval first round
- ✅ Bella Vista pilot publishes results before DIS ballot
- ✅ Standard published within 48 months of NWIP approval

Post-Publication (Months 49+)

- ✅ 50+ organizations certified to GAIMS within 2 years
- ✅ 3+ countries adopt as national standard
- ✅ Cited in 10+ peer-reviewed publications
- ✅ Sparks development of related standards (bio-metrics, fractal governance)

SECTION 8: CONTACT INFORMATION

Primary Contact:
Joseph Allen Sprute
Founder & Director, ERES Institute for New Age Cybernetics
Email: joseph@eresinstitute.org (to be confirmed)
Phone: [To be provided]
Location: Bella Vista, Arkansas, USA

Organizational Information:
ERES Institute for New Age Cybernetics
Founded: February 2012
Legal Status: [501(c)(3) nonprofit / private research institute - to be confirmed]
Website: [To be developed - priority action item]

Technical Inquiries:
[Drafting Committee Chair - TBD]
Email: gaims-tc@eresinstitute.org

Media Contact:
[Communications Lead - TBD]

APPENDIX A: FORM 4 TEMPLATE CHECKLIST

Required Fields for ANSI Submission:

- ☐ **Title of Proposed Standard:** ISO/ERES 99999 - GAIMS
- ☐ **Proposing Organization:** ERES Institute (via ANSI member sponsor)
- ☐ **Scope Statement:** (Max 250 words - see Section 1.2)
- ☐ **Purpose/Justification:** (Max 500 words - see Section 1.3)

- [ ] **Relationship to Existing Standards:** (See Section 1.5)
- [ ] **Target Completion Date:** 48 months from approval
- [ ] **Proposed TC Assignment:** ISO/TC 314 or new TC
- [ ] **Secretariat Recommendation:** [Country volunteer - TBD]
- [ ] **Patent Declaration:** No known patents (to be verified)
- [ ] **Project Leader Nomination:** Joseph A. Sprute (or delegate)
- [ ] **Participating Organizations:** (Minimum 5 - to be confirmed)
- [ ] **Supporting Documents:** Draft standard, business case, pilot plan

---

APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Aura Resonance Index (ARI): Bio-energetic coherence score (0-1000) measuring fractal harmony across individual, community, and ecosystem scales. Derived from Kirlian-inspired measurement protocols.

Earned Path: Progression framework where advancement results from demonstrated contribution (Time + Talent + Task) rather than extraction or privilege.

Fractal Coherence: Self-similar pattern integrity across scales; primary multiplier in ARI calculation. High coherence indicates resilient, adaptable systems.

Graceful Contribution Formula (GCF): Economic valuation method: Time + Talent + Task × Harmony = Meritcoin earned. Basis for merit weighting in GAIMS.

Gracechain: Blockchain consensus mechanism using Proof-of-Grace (PoG): validators selected by merit + ARI weighting rather than computational work or stake.

Meritcoin: Cryptocurrency minted via demonstrated contribution (GCF), allocated through UBIMIA accounts. Alternative to fiat/market-only allocation.

Non-Punitive Remediation: Structural approach treating system failures as empirical lessons for evolution rather than grounds for punishment.

Paineology: Study and measurement of systemic pain/stress. Key outcome metric for GAIMS effectiveness (reduction target).

Proof-of-Grace (PoG): Consensus mechanism prioritizing demonstrated merit and bio-energetic harmony over energy expenditure or wealth concentration.

UBIMIA (Universal Basic Income Merit Incentives Account): Economic account structure providing unconditional base + merit-weighted incentives.

APPENDIX C: BIBLIOGRAPHY (Partial)

Normative References:

1. ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - Artificial Intelligence Management Systems
2. ISO 31000:2018 - Risk Management — Guidelines
3. ISO 31050:2023 - Guidance for managing emerging risks to enhance resilience
4. ISO 37101:2016 - Sustainable development in communities

Informative References:

1. Kirlian, S.D. & Kirlian, V.K. (1939). "Photography and Visual Observations by Means of High Frequency Currents."
2. Mandelbrot, B.B. (1982). *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W.H. Freeman.
3. Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. MIT Press.
4. Ashby, W.R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.
5. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Meadows, D.H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
7. Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.

ERES Institute Publications: 8. Sprute, J.A. (2025). "GAIA ERES EDF: A Comprehensive Report for a 1000-Year Future Map." Academia.edu. 9. Sprute, J.A. (2026). "Proof-of-Grace: Toward a 1000-Year Operating System for Humanity." Medium. 10. [Additional 20+ ERES publications to be formally cited]

END OF ANSI SUBMISSION PREPARATION PACKAGE

This document is a living framework. Sections marked with ⬜ require completion before formal submission. Target completion: 90 days from January 10, 2026.

Version: 1.0 (Draft)
Last Updated: January 10, 2026