

# ISA Relevance Mapping: Problem Spaces in Standards Development

---

**Research Date:** 2025-12-19

**Purpose:** Identify where intelligent systems could provide value in standards development—exploratory analysis only, no architectural proposals

---

## Framing: What Kind of Help Do Standards Developers Need?

---

Standards development is fundamentally a **human judgment process** involving values, priorities, and political negotiation. An intelligent system cannot and should not make these decisions. However, the **information environment** in which humans make decisions could be dramatically improved.

Current challenges:

- **Information Overload:** Hundreds of comments, dozens of pilot reports, thousands of pages of related standards
- **Distributed Knowledge:** Expertise fragmented across participants, organizations, and time
- **Hidden Implications:** Decisions have cascading effects not immediately apparent
- **Precedent Opacity:** Past decisions and rationales not easily accessible
- **Trade-off Invisibility:** Multi-dimensional consequences hard to visualize and compare

**Core Insight:** Standards developers don't need an AI to tell them what to decide. They need help **understanding the landscape** in which they're deciding—what are the options, what are the implications, what have others done, what are the trade-offs?

---

# 1. Information Synthesis and Sense-Making

---

## 1.1 Problem Space: Comment Volume Overwhelm

**Current State:** Community review generates hundreds of comments. Work groups must read each, categorize, identify themes, detect conflicts, and formulate responses. Time-consuming and error-prone.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Thematic clustering: Which comments address same underlying issue?
- Conflict detection: Which comments request opposite changes?
- Priority signals: Which issues raised by multiple commenters vs. single voice?
- Precedent connections: Have similar comments been addressed in other standards? How were they resolved?
- Implication mapping: If we accept this comment, what other sections must change for consistency?

**Not Proposing:** Automated comment acceptance/rejection. Humans must judge merit.

**Value Proposition:** Reduce cognitive load, surface patterns, enable more thorough consideration.

---

## 1.2 Problem Space: Cross-Standard Consistency

**Current State:** GS1 maintains dozens of standards across industries. Ensuring consistent terminology, structure, and principles requires institutional memory and manual cross-referencing.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Terminology divergence: Same concept called different names in different standards?
- Structural patterns: How do similar standards organize content? What can be learned?

- Principle conflicts: Does proposed approach contradict established patterns elsewhere?
- Reuse opportunities: Can existing definitions, schemas, or validation rules be adapted?
- Impact propagation: If we change this definition here, what other standards are affected?

**Not Proposing:** Automated harmonization. Humans must decide when consistency is valuable vs. when domain-specific variation is justified.

**Value Proposition:** Make implicit connections explicit, reduce unintentional divergence, enable deliberate design choices.

---

### 1.3 Problem Space: Institutional Memory Loss

**Current State:** Work group membership changes over time. Rationale for past decisions may be lost. New members may reopen settled issues without understanding why previous approach was chosen.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Decision archaeology: What was discussed when this section was drafted? What alternatives were considered? Why was this approach chosen?
- Participant continuity: Who has deep history with this topic? Who should be consulted?
- Issue recurrence: Has this question been raised before? What was the resolution?
- Evolution tracking: How has this requirement changed over versions? What drove changes?

**Not Proposing:** Preventing reconsideration of past decisions. Contexts change; revisiting may be appropriate.

**Value Proposition:** Inform current decisions with historical context, avoid repeating past mistakes, enable productive reconsideration.

---

## 2. Trade-off Illumination

---

### 2.1 Problem Space: Multi-Dimensional Impact Assessment

**Current State:** Decisions involve technical feasibility, economic impact, regulatory compliance, backward compatibility, and adoption likelihood. No single metric captures “best” option. Work groups rely on qualitative discussion.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Dimension identification: What are all the relevant considerations for this decision?
- Stakeholder mapping: Which stakeholder groups care about which dimensions?
- Sensitivity analysis: How much does outcome change if we prioritize dimension X vs. Y?
- Frontier visualization: What are the Pareto-optimal options? What must be sacrificed for what gain?
- Scenario exploration: What happens if we choose option A? Option B? What are the downstream consequences?

**Not Proposing:** Automated optimization or decision-making. Trade-offs involve values, not just facts.

**Value Proposition:** Make implicit trade-offs explicit, enable structured comparison, support informed judgment.

---

### 2.2 Problem Space: Stakeholder Preference Aggregation

**Current State:** Consensus process aims to balance interests through discussion and voting. But no systematic way to understand preference distributions or identify compromise solutions.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Preference mapping: What do different stakeholder groups want? Where do preferences align vs. conflict?

- **Compromise identification:** Are there options that partially satisfy multiple groups?
- **Deal-breaker detection:** Which issues are negotiable vs. non-negotiable for which stakeholders?
- **Coalition analysis:** Which stakeholders have aligned interests? Where are natural alliances?
- **Fairness assessment:** Does proposed solution disproportionately burden any group?

**Not Proposing:** Automated consensus determination. Consensus is social process requiring human judgment.

**Value Proposition:** Surface hidden alignments, identify creative compromises, ensure all voices considered.

---

## 2.3 Problem Space: Backward Compatibility Analysis

**Current State:** Breaking changes impose migration costs. But quantifying costs vs. benefits of compatibility is difficult. Decisions are judgment-based.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- **Dependency mapping:** What implementations rely on current specification? How widespread is usage?
- **Migration path analysis:** What would implementers need to change? How complex is migration?
- **Dual-running feasibility:** Can old and new coexist during transition? For how long?
- **Risk assessment:** What are failure modes during migration? How likely? How severe?
- **Benefit quantification:** What capabilities does breaking change enable? Who benefits?

**Not Proposing:** Automated go/no-go decision. Humans must weigh costs vs. benefits.

**Value Proposition:** Ground decisions in evidence about actual impact, not speculation.

---

## 3. Evidence Synthesis and Gap Identification

---

### 3.1 Problem Space: Pilot Result Interpretation

**Current State:** Pilot tests provide evidence but limited scope. Extrapolating to full deployment is uncertain. Work groups must judge when evidence is “sufficient.”

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Coverage analysis: What scenarios were tested? What was not tested?
- Representativeness assessment: How similar are pilot participants to broader population?
- Outcome patterns: What worked well? What failed? What was surprising?
- Generalization limits: What can we confidently conclude? What remains uncertain?
- Additional evidence needs: What further testing would most reduce uncertainty?

**Not Proposing:** Automated sufficiency determination. Humans must decide acceptable risk levels.

**Value Proposition:** Make evidence gaps visible, prioritize additional testing, avoid over-confident extrapolation.

---

### 3.2 Problem Space: Requirement Traceability

**Current State:** Standards emerge from business requirements, but connection between requirements and specifications can be opaque. Hard to verify all requirements addressed and no unnecessary constraints added.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Forward tracing: For each requirement, which specification sections address it?
- Backward tracing: For each specification element, which requirement justifies it?
- Gap detection: Are there requirements not addressed? Specifications not justified?

- Over-specification identification: Are there constraints not driven by requirements?
- Conflict detection: Do specifications contradict requirements?

**Not Proposing:** Automated requirement generation or specification derivation. Humans must make design choices.

**Value Proposition:** Ensure specifications align with intent, avoid scope creep, enable targeted review.

---

### 3.3 Problem Space: Impact Prediction Uncertainty

**Current State:** Difficult to forecast how standards will perform in practice. Limited empirical evidence. Reliance on expert intuition.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Analogical reasoning: What similar standards have been deployed? What were outcomes?
- Adoption modeling: Based on implementation costs and benefits, what adoption rates are plausible?
- Failure mode analysis: What could go wrong? How likely? How would we detect it?
- Sensitivity analysis: Which assumptions most affect predicted outcomes?
- Monitoring design: What data should we collect post-deployment to validate predictions?

**Not Proposing:** Precise outcome prediction. Future is inherently uncertain.

**Value Proposition:** Bound uncertainty, identify key assumptions, enable adaptive monitoring.

---

## 4. Process Navigation and Coordination

---

### 4.1 Problem Space: Procedural Complexity

**Current State:** GSMP Manual is 87 pages. Multiple work group types, voting procedures, and approval gates. Easy to miss requirements or follow incorrect procedure.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Process guidance: Given current state, what are next steps? What are requirements?
- Compliance checking: Have all procedural requirements been met?
- Timeline estimation: Based on current progress, when is completion likely?
- Bottleneck identification: What is blocking progress? What dependencies must be resolved?
- Exception handling: This situation doesn't fit standard process—what are options?

**Not Proposing:** Automated process execution. Humans must manage work.

**Value Proposition:** Reduce procedural errors, enable realistic planning, surface blockers early.

---

### 4.2 Problem Space: Stakeholder Coordination

**Current State:** Standards involve multiple work groups, governance groups, and external stakeholders. Coordinating input and approvals is complex.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Stakeholder mapping: Who needs to be consulted? Who has approval authority?
- Input tracking: Have all required parties provided input? Who is still pending?
- Conflict early warning: Are there emerging disagreements that need resolution?
- Communication planning: Who needs to be informed of what decisions? When?



- Escalation triggers: When should issues be escalated to higher governance levels?

**Not Proposing:** Automated stakeholder management. Humans must build relationships and negotiate.

**Value Proposition:** Ensure no stakeholder overlooked, reduce coordination overhead, prevent late-stage surprises.

---

### 4.3 Problem Space: Scope Boundary Ambiguity

**Current State:** Scope boundaries often contested during development. No systematic methodology for scope definition.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Boundary clarification: What is clearly in scope? Clearly out? Ambiguous?
- Dependency identification: What external standards or systems does this depend on?
- Interface definition: Where does this standard end and others begin?
- Scope creep detection: Are new requirements expanding beyond charter?
- Modularization opportunities: Can standard be decomposed into independent components?

**Not Proposing:** Automated scope determination. Humans must make strategic choices.

**Value Proposition:** Make implicit assumptions explicit, enable focused development, prevent mission creep.

---

## 5. Knowledge Access and Discovery

---

### 5.1 Problem Space: Precedent Identification

**Current State:** When facing new decisions, work groups could benefit from understanding how similar issues were resolved in other standards. Currently relies on

participant memory and facilitator expertise.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Similarity search: What other standards addressed analogous problems?
- Solution patterns: What approaches have been used? What are pros/cons of each?
- Outcome tracking: How did those solutions work in practice? Any lessons learned?
- Adaptation guidance: How might those approaches be adapted to current context?
- Anti-patterns: What approaches have been tried and failed?

**Not Proposing:** Automated solution recommendation. Context matters; what worked elsewhere may not work here.

**Value Proposition:** Learn from experience, avoid reinventing wheel, make informed choices.

---

## 5.2 Problem Space: Regulatory Landscape Navigation

**Current State:** Standards must comply with diverse regulatory requirements across jurisdictions. Tracking regulatory changes and assessing compliance is challenging.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Requirement mapping: What regulations apply to this standard? What do they require?
- Conflict detection: Do regulatory requirements contradict each other?
- Compliance verification: Does proposed standard satisfy regulatory requirements?
- Change monitoring: Have regulations changed since standard was drafted?
- Jurisdiction coverage: Which regions have specific requirements not addressed?

**Not Proposing:** Legal compliance determination. Humans (lawyers) must make legal judgments.

**Value Proposition:** Ensure regulatory requirements not overlooked, enable proactive compliance, reduce legal risk.

---

### 5.3 Problem Space: Technical Feasibility Assessment

**Current State:** Work groups must assess whether proposed standards are technically implementable. Requires expertise in diverse technologies.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Technology survey: What technologies could implement this requirement?
- Maturity assessment: How mature are those technologies? Production-ready or experimental?
- Performance analysis: Can those technologies meet performance requirements (speed, scale, reliability)?
- Cost estimation: What are typical implementation costs?
- Vendor landscape: What vendors provide relevant solutions?

**Not Proposing:** Automated feasibility determination. Humans must evaluate technical options.

**Value Proposition:** Ground discussions in technical reality, avoid specifying unimplementable requirements, enable realistic planning.

---

## 6. Emerging Challenge Areas

---

### 6.1 Problem Space: AI Integration Uncertainty

**Current State:** AI introduces non-determinism, opacity, and evolution. Standards assume deterministic, auditable, stable behavior. Unclear how to specify AI-driven processes.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Specification paradigms: How have other domains standardized AI systems?
- Testing approaches: How to verify AI compliance when outputs are variable?

- Governance frameworks: What oversight mechanisms ensure AI fairness and accountability?
- Evolution management: How to handle AI models that improve over time?
- Risk mitigation: What safeguards prevent AI failures?

**Not Proposing:** Solved methodology for AI standardization. This is open research question.

**Value Proposition:** Synthesize emerging best practices, identify open questions, enable informed experimentation.

---

## 6.2 Problem Space: Sustainability Data Complexity

**Current State:** Growing demand for sustainability transparency. But measurement methodologies immature and contested. Standards risk being prescriptive on politically contentious issues.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Methodology landscape: What approaches exist for measuring carbon footprints, water usage, social impacts?
- Data availability: What data can organizations realistically collect?
- Verification mechanisms: How to ensure sustainability claims are credible?
- Trade-off analysis: What are costs vs. benefits of different levels of detail?
- Stakeholder positions: What do different groups consider essential vs. optional?

**Not Proposing:** Resolved sustainability measurement framework. This is evolving field.

**Value Proposition:** Navigate contested landscape, identify areas of consensus, enable pragmatic progress.

---

## 6.3 Problem Space: Data Sovereignty Compliance

**Current State:** GDPR, CCPA, China's data laws have different requirements. Standards must accommodate all. But regulatory landscape is rapidly evolving.

### **What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Requirement synthesis: What are common elements across jurisdictions? What are unique requirements?
- Compliance strategies: What approaches enable multi-jurisdiction compliance?
- Privacy-utility trade-offs: How to enable traceability while protecting privacy?
- Regulatory monitoring: What regulatory changes are pending? How might they affect standards?
- Risk assessment: What are legal risks of different design choices?

**Not Proposing:** Legal compliance guarantee. Humans (lawyers) must make legal judgments.

**Value Proposition:** Navigate regulatory complexity, enable proactive design, reduce legal risk.

---

## **7. Meta-Level: Process Improvement**

---

### **7.1 Problem Space: Process Performance Measurement**

**Current State:** Limited quantitative data on standards development timelines, comment volumes, ballot participation rates, and pilot outcomes. No benchmarks for “healthy” process performance.

### **What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Metric tracking: What are key performance indicators for standards development?
- Baseline establishment: What is typical timeline for different standard types?
- Anomaly detection: Is this work group progressing unusually slowly? Why?
- Best practice identification: What do high-performing work groups do differently?
- Continuous improvement: What process changes would most improve outcomes?

**Not Proposing:** Automated process optimization. Humans must design and manage process.

**Value Proposition:** Enable evidence-based process improvement, identify bottlenecks, set realistic expectations.

---

## 7.2 Problem Space: Participation Equity

**Current State:** Small organizations and developing-country stakeholders underrepresented. Standards may not serve all stakeholders equally.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Representation analysis: Who is at the table? Who is missing?
- Barrier identification: What prevents broader participation? (cost, language, time zones, expertise)
- Voice amplification: Are minority perspectives being heard in discussions?
- Outcome equity: Do proposed standards disproportionately burden any group?
- Intervention opportunities: What changes would enable broader participation?

**Not Proposing:** Automated diversity enforcement. Humans must build inclusive processes.

**Value Proposition:** Make representation gaps visible, enable targeted outreach, ensure equitable outcomes.

---

## 7.3 Problem Space: Learning and Knowledge Transfer

**Current State:** Each work group reinvents approaches. Limited systematic knowledge transfer across groups or over time.

**What Intelligent System Could Illuminate:**

- Pattern extraction: What are common challenges across work groups? What solutions have worked?
- Onboarding acceleration: How to bring new participants up to speed quickly?

- Facilitator support: What guidance would help facilitators manage groups more effectively?
- Documentation improvement: What information is most frequently needed but hard to find?
- Community building: How to connect people working on related problems?

**Not Proposing:** Automated training or facilitation. Humans must teach and lead.

**Value Proposition:** Accelerate learning, reduce duplicated effort, improve process quality.

---

## 8. Synthesis: Where Could ISA Provide Unique Value?

---

### 8.1 Information Processing at Scale

Standards development generates massive information: comments, pilot reports, meeting minutes, related standards, regulatory documents, technical specifications. Humans cannot process it all. Intelligent systems excel at:

- Synthesizing large document collections
- Identifying patterns and themes
- Detecting inconsistencies and conflicts
- Retrieving relevant precedents
- Tracking dependencies and implications

**Value:** Augment human cognitive capacity, surface insights that would otherwise be missed.

---

### 8.2 Structured Reasoning Support

Standards decisions involve complex trade-offs across multiple dimensions. Intelligent systems can:

- Enumerate options systematically
- Map implications of each option

- Visualize trade-off frontiers
- Perform sensitivity analyses
- Simulate scenarios

**Value:** Make implicit assumptions explicit, enable structured comparison, support informed judgment.

---

### 8.3 Knowledge Integration Across Boundaries

Standards development involves expertise from diverse domains: technical, regulatory, economic, operational. Intelligent systems can:

- Integrate knowledge from multiple sources
- Translate between domain-specific languages
- Identify cross-domain connections
- Synthesize multidisciplinary perspectives

**Value:** Bridge silos, enable holistic understanding, surface hidden dependencies.

---

### 8.4 Temporal Reasoning

Standards evolve over time. Decisions made today have long-term consequences. Intelligent systems can:

- Track evolution and change history
- Identify trends and trajectories
- Project future scenarios
- Assess long-term implications

**Value:** Inform decisions with historical context and future orientation.

---

### 8.5 Uncertainty Quantification

Standards development involves irreducible uncertainty. Intelligent systems can:



- Identify sources of uncertainty
- Quantify confidence levels
- Bound possible outcomes
- Prioritize information gathering

**Value:** Make uncertainty explicit, enable risk-informed decisions, avoid false confidence.

---

## 9. Critical Boundaries: What ISA Should NOT Do

---

### 9.1 Decision-Making

Standards development is fundamentally about **human values and priorities**. Intelligent systems should not:

- Make final decisions on standard content
- Determine what stakeholder preferences should be
- Resolve value conflicts
- Override human judgment

**Reason:** Legitimacy of standards depends on human consensus. Automated decision-making would undermine trust.

---

### 9.2 Stakeholder Representation

Standards require **authentic stakeholder participation**. Intelligent systems should not:

- Simulate stakeholder input
- Substitute for human participation
- Claim to represent stakeholder interests
- Mediate human negotiations

**Reason:** Standards must reflect actual stakeholder needs, not AI-generated proxies.

---

### 9.3 Legal or Regulatory Compliance Determination

Standards must comply with **complex legal frameworks**. Intelligent systems should not:

- Provide legal advice
- Certify regulatory compliance
- Interpret ambiguous regulations
- Substitute for legal counsel

**Reason:** Legal judgments require professional expertise and carry liability. AI cannot assume legal responsibility.

---

### 9.4 Technical Feasibility Certification

Standards must be **implementable in practice**. Intelligent systems should not:

- Guarantee technical feasibility
- Certify that implementations will work
- Substitute for pilot testing
- Claim to predict all failure modes

**Reason:** Real-world implementation involves context-specific factors AI cannot fully model.

---

## 10. Summary: The ISA Value Proposition

---

Standards developers face an **information and reasoning challenge**, not an automation challenge. They need help:

1. **Understanding the landscape:** What are the options? What are the implications? What have others done?
2. **Synthesizing evidence:** What do we know? What don't we know? What should we test?

3. **Illuminating trade-offs:** What must be sacrificed for what gain? Who wins? Who loses?
4. **Maintaining consistency:** Are we contradicting ourselves? Are we aligned with related standards?
5. **Learning from experience:** What worked elsewhere? What failed? Why?

An intelligent system that provides these capabilities would **augment human judgment** without replacing it. The goal is not to automate standards development, but to **make the human process more informed, more efficient, and more inclusive**.

**Core Principle:** ISA should be a **decision support system**, not a decision-making system. It illuminates; humans decide.