

Federal Model Policy Submission & Registry Act of 2025

Title I — Short Title; Findings

Section 101. Short Title.

This Act may be cited as the 'Federal Model Policy Submission & Registry Act of 2025'.

Section 102. Findings.

Congress finds the following:

1. Modern artificial-intelligence tools enable individuals and organizations to generate legislative drafts at unprecedented scale and speed.
2. Existing intake mechanisms of Congress and federal agencies were not designed to handle high-volume, machine-generated submissions.
3. Transparent, secure, and equitable processes for receiving, cataloguing, and reviewing public policy proposals strengthen democratic participation and legislative efficiency.
4. Clear attribution, immutable timestamps, standardized metadata, and default open licensing protect intellectual provenance and facilitate efficient triage.
5. Integration with existing e-rulemaking platforms prevents duplication and lowers barriers to participation.
6. Robust privacy, security, anti-gaming, and accessibility safeguards are essential to prevent misuse and maintain public trust.
7. The Registry's infrastructure shall conform to federal cybersecurity standards, including FISMA and FedRAMP, and OMB M-19-16 on modernizing federal IT.
8. Effective incident response protocols and data privacy safeguards aligned with federal cybersecurity frameworks (e.g., NIST SP 800-61) are critical to ensure the Registry's resilience and maintain public trust.

Title II — Definitions

Section 201. Definitions.

In this Act:

1. 'Registry' means the Federal Model Policy Submission Registry established under section 301.
2. 'Model policy submission' means any proposed legislative, regulatory, or policy text, including accompanying explanatory materials, submitted to the Registry for public consideration.

3. 'Submitter' means any person or entity, including automated systems, that transmits a model policy submission to the Registry.
4. 'AI-generated content' means content produced in whole or substantial part by an automated system, as disclosed under section 302(c)(4).
5. 'Metadata' means structured information describing a submission, including topic, urgency, policy area, version identifiers, and language options.
6. 'Registry Administrator' means the official designated under section 701(a) to operate the Registry.
7. 'Similarity score' means the percentage overlap between a submission and existing Registry entries, as calculated under section 402.
8. 'Independent agency' means any agency as defined in 44 U.S.C. § 3502(5), including the SEC, FCC, and other non-executive entities.
9. 'State-Federal Gateway' means a turnkey sub-domain of the Registry made available to state or local governments under section 306.
10. 'Public information collection' under this Act is deemed to impose negligible burden for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act.
11. 'Retention Period' means the minimum duration submissions and related metadata must be preserved, as specified under section 802 and FOIA requirements.
12. 'Data Portability' means the right of submitters to export their own submissions, comments, and ratings in machine-readable formats.
13. 'Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)' means 5 U.S.C. § 552 and related regulations governing public access to federal records.

Title III — Establishment of the Registry & Integration

Section 301. Establishment.

(a) Not later than 180 days after enactment, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, in coordination with the General Services Administration and Login.gov, shall establish and maintain a secure, publicly accessible online database to be known as the Registry, in accordance with FISMA, FedRAMP, and OMB Memorandum M-19-16. (b) The Registry shall provide API access, human-readable interfaces, and a one-click 'Send to Registry' button within Regulations.gov and Federal Register platforms, without charge. (c) The Registry shall support State-Federal Gateways, enabling state and local jurisdictions to host branded sub-domains (e.g., CA.registry.gov) using the same backend.

Section 302. Submission Requirements.

(a) Model policy submissions shall be transmitted in machine-readable text (e.g., Markdown, XML) and may include supplemental files; raw Markdown/PDF uploads shall trigger server-side NLP to suggest metadata. (b) Each submission shall receive an immutable, machine-generated timestamp, unique identifier, and default CC-BY 4.0 license, unless the submitter explicitly elects another license. (c) Required metadata fields: (1) Title, short description, and plain-language summary. (2) Designated policy area(s) from a controlled vocabulary. (3) Urgency rating on a 0–5 scale. (4) Authorship disclosure: AI-generated, human-authored, or hybrid. (5) Persistent external reference: DOI, GitHub commit hash, or SSRN identifier. (6) Language of

submission and machine-translation options for top five non-English languages. (d) Submissions lacking metadata or containing executable files shall be rejected with notice of deficiency. (e) Public information collections under this Act are covered by a Paperwork Reduction Act safe harbor.

(f) Clarification of Platform References. References to specific platforms (e.g., GitHub, SSRN, DOI) in this Act are illustrative only. Any persistent, publicly accessible, and verifiable reference system meeting published technical standards established by the Registry Administrator shall be eligible for use under this Act.

Section 303. Authorship Disclosure.

Knowingly misrepresenting AI versus human authorship constitutes a violation enforceable under section 604.

Section 304. Metadata and Licensing Standards.

The Registry Administrator shall publish open technical standards for metadata formats, versioning, cryptographic signatures, default licensing, and data portability protocols to allow submitters to export records in machine-readable form.

Section 305. Accessibility Requirements.

The Registry shall comply with Section 508, WCAG 2.2 AA, and provide multilingual interfaces and summaries.

Section 306. User Interface Principles.

(a) The Registry shall minimize user friction with intuitive registration and submission workflows. (b) The Registry shall offer customizable notification settings, allowing users to select frequency and delivery channels. (c) The Registry shall provide accessible, context-sensitive guidance and inline help at key workflow stages. (d) The Registry shall support multi-platform access, including responsive web and mobile interfaces. (e) The Registry shall ensure transparency of data handling by publishing retention periods, version histories, and deletion procedures in user-facing interfaces.

Title IV — Submission Workflow and Review Enhancements

Section 401. Automated Triage.

Registry shall perform automated format validation, NLP-driven topic and urgency suggestions, and assign submissions to topical queues.

Section 402. Similarity and Plagiarism Analysis.

- a) The Registry shall compute a similarity score for each new submission against existing entries using automated comparison algorithms.
- (b) Submissions with greater than 95% similarity to any prior entry, without substantive differences, shall be automatically consolidated or rejected, with the rationale logged and a resubmission option provided.
- (c) Automated plagiarism detection tools shall flag unattributed copied material; submitters shall receive notice and an opportunity to remediate or provide attribution.
- (d) The Registry Administrator shall periodically review and update similarity thresholds and algorithms to ensure fairness and accommodate evolving drafting norms and language patterns.

Section 403. Public Comment and Rating.

- (a) After triage, submissions enter a 30-day public comment window.
- (b) Registered users (Login.gov) may comment and assign a 1–5 relevance rating; aggregated, de-biased scores shall be published.

Section 404. Staff Review and Prioritization with Analytics.

- (a) Congressional committees, agency liaisons, and independent agencies shall review submissions ranked by composite priority (urgency, rating, novelty).
- (b) An AI-powered analytics dashboard shall surface novelty insights, PII risks, and alignment with existing statutes to staff.
- (c) Staff shall publish within 60 days a disposition: adoption, pilot, further study, or rejection with rationale.

Section 405. Response Obligations.

Official responses shall be digitally signed, timestamped, linked to the submission record, and integrated back into e-rulemaking dockets where applicable.

Title V — Incentives, Recognition, and Grants

Section 501. Official Citations.

Submissions incorporated into legislation or rulemaking shall receive formal citations in statutory notes or Federal Register notices.

Section 502. Rapid-Pilot Pathway and Interagency Grants.

- (a) High-priority submissions may be selected for pilot programs within relevant agencies and independent agencies.
- (b) The National Science Foundation, in coordination with agency training programs, may award small grants or cloud credits to participating staff under an interagency opt-in incentive.

Section 503. Civic Innovation Grants.

The NSF may award competitive grants to submitters of demonstrably impactful proposals.

Section 504. Annual Awards.

Congress shall recognize up to ten outstanding submissions per fiscal year.

Title VI — Privacy, Security, Anti-Gaming, and Equity

Section 601. Privacy Safeguards.

(a) Automated scanning shall redact PII and CUI prior to publication. (b) Malware and executable files are prohibited and subject to removal.

Section 602. Anti-Spam Measures.

(a) Employ proof-of-humanity tests, rate limits, and anomaly detection. (b) Submissions exceeding daily thresholds may incur escalating verification steps or nominal fees. (c) Reputation gaming detection and weight caps on ratings.

Section 603. Identity Verification.

Verified submitter accounts may be required for elevated submission volumes.

Section 604. Penalties and Enforcement.

(a) Fraudulent submissions or evasion of controls incur civil penalties up to \$50,000 per incident. (b) The Attorney General may seek injunctive relief.

Section 605. Appeals and Anti-Censorship.

(a) Submitters may appeal rejection or consolidation decisions within 30 days to an Independent Appeals Panel comprising representatives from multiple agencies and public stakeholders. (b) No single person, staff member, or organization may unilaterally deny or blacklist submissions en masse; any rejection or consolidation under Section 402(b) requires concurrence of at least two authorized staff and transparent logging of rationale. (c) Appeals Panel determinations are binding administrative actions, and all appeals, decisions, and records shall be publicly published. (d) The Independent Appeals Panel shall comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), including requirements for a public charter, open meetings, and administrative record availability.

Title VII — Oversight and Governance

Section 701. Registry Administrator.

(a) The Archivist of the United States is designated as Registry Administrator. (b) Administrator may hire staff and contract for technical services. (c) The Administrator shall share operational authority with a Co-Administrator designated by the General Services Administration and may appoint a rotating Technical Steward from a qualified nonprofit or academic institution to provide balanced governance oversight.

Section 702. Interagency Council.

(a) An Interagency Policy Innovation Council of designated representatives shall advise on standards, licensing, and updates. (b) Council shall meet at least quarterly; participation by independent agencies is mandatory. (c) The Council shall reserve at least two seats for non-governmental stakeholders, including civil society organizations, academic experts, and state or local government representatives. (d) The Council and its activities shall comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), including charter publication, open meetings, and recordkeeping requirements. (e) Council and Appeals Panel members shall disclose conflicts of interest annually and serve no more than two consecutive three-year terms.

Section 703. Reports to Congress.

Annual reports shall detail usage, review timeliness, equity metrics, funding utilization, and recommended statutory amendments.

Section 704. Rulemaking.

Administrator shall promulgate regulations within 270 days of enactment, to include:

1. Precise metadata and submission standards—field definitions, controlled vocabularies, and markup schemas (Markdown, XML).
2. Triage and review service-level agreements, including maximum response times (e.g., 48 hours for format validation, 30 days for final disposition) and escalation procedures.
3. Appeals process protocols—filing procedures, standard appeal codes, timelines, panel membership, quorum, recusal, and recordkeeping.
4. Security and privacy controls—acceptable cryptographic signature algorithms, PII/CUI redaction procedures, incident-response timelines, and audit-logging requirements.
5. Accessibility and localization criteria—WCAG 2.2 AA conformance tests, supported languages, plain-language summary standards, and mobile interface requirements.
6. Performance metrics and reporting—formulas and data-collection methods for submission volume, system uptime, latency, error rates, and user satisfaction, with public dashboard specifications.
7. Data retention, archival, and FOIA provisions—including retention periods, archival processes, and procedures for deletion and records export under FOIA.

Title VIII — Pilot, Evaluation, and Sunset

Section 801. Pilot Implementation.

Operate as a five-year pilot beginning on registry launch.

Minimum pilot success metrics shall include average time-to-disposition, user satisfaction scores, demographic diversity of submitters, and system uptime percentages, as detailed in the annual report under Section 703.

Section 802. Independent Evaluation.

GAO shall evaluate effectiveness and equity impacts at years two and four.

Section 803. Sunset.

This Act ceases to have effect five years after enactment unless reauthorized.

Title IX — Appropriations

Section 901. Authorization of Appropriations.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2026 and such sums as necessary for Fiscal Years 2027 through 2030.

Title X — Future Considerations

Section 1001. Evolving Submission Methods.

(a) The Registry shall support additional input modalities, including voice-to-text, mobile app, email-to-registry, and multi-modal submissions (e.g., diagrams, GIS data, spreadsheets). (b) The Registry Administrator shall maintain plugin APIs to integrate with emerging platforms, such as decentralized ledgers (blockchain), IPFS, and AI-based drafting environments.

Section 1002. Scalability and Performance.

(a) The Registry shall be architected for auto-scaling to accommodate increasing submission volumes, leveraging cloud-native microservices and serverless functions. (b) Performance metrics (throughput, latency, error rates) shall be published quarterly, with automated alerts for service degradation.

Section 1003. Metadata & Taxonomy Evolution.

(a) A formal process shall allow the controlled vocabulary and metadata schema to be versioned and extended, with community-driven proposals and ratification by the Interagency Council. (b) Backwards compatibility shall be maintained for legacy submissions, with migration tools for older schema versions.

Section 1004. Complex & Collaborative Drafting.

(a) The Registry shall support collaborative editing and branching workflows, tracking contributor roles and change histories. (b) Nested submissions (multi-title bills, attachments, annexes) shall be treated as linked records with referential integrity.

Section 1005. Machine-Learning & AI Integration.

(a) The Registry shall integrate with AI agents to provide real-time drafting assistance, compliance checks (plain-language, legal style), and cross-referencing with existing laws. (b) AI recommendations and model outputs shall be transparent, with clear provenance metadata marking AI intervention.

Section 1006. Continuous Improvement & Sunset Review.

(a) The pilot program shall incorporate agile feedback cycles, with biannual user surveys and stakeholder workshops. (b) GAO evaluations under Section 802 shall include a review of future-proofing measures and recommend updates prior to reauthorization. (c) Independent security and privacy audits, including annual external penetration testing and privacy impact assessments, shall be conducted and findings published.

Title XI — Procurement and Vendor Requirements

Section 1101. Functional Requirements.

Contracts shall define user-journey acceptance criteria for registration, submission, metadata verification, commenting, and appeals, with wireframes or user stories as benchmarks.

Section 1102. Technical and Non-Functional Requirements.

Vendor agreements must require cloud-native, auto-scaling architecture with targets supporting at least 100,000 submissions per month, performance SLAs (95% of API calls <200ms, 99.9% uptime), FedRAMP JAB authorization, and annual penetration testing.

Section 1103. Data Management and Retention.

Contracts shall specify backup, disaster-recovery RTO/RPO targets, encrypted storage standards, data-retention schedules aligned with FOIA/archival policies, and export protocols for data portability.

Section 1104. Testing and Acceptance.

Deliverables must pass unit, integration, security, accessibility (WCAG 2.2 AA), and user-acceptance tests; vendors must demonstrate compliance in dev, staging, and production environments before go-live.

Section 1105. Maintenance, Support, and Updates.

Contracts shall include help-desk SLAs (e.g., P1 response within 4 hours), bug-fix turnaround times, scheduled update windows, rollback procedures, and notification requirements.

Section 1106. Compliance and Audit Rights.

Vendor must submit quarterly compliance reports (FISMA, FedRAMP, WCAG), allow third-party audits, and implement corrective-action plans for any deficiencies.

Section 1107. Training and Documentation.

Vendors shall deliver system-administration manuals, user guides, API documentation, and conduct train-the-trainer programs for federal staff.

Appendix A — Failure/Abuse Modes and Mitigations

Failure Mode	Description	Statutory Mitigation
Bot Flooding	Automated mass submissions overwhelm capacity	Sec. 602 proof-of-humanity, rate limits, fees
Duplicate Drafts	Slightly modified resubmissions clutter registry	Sec. 402 similarity threshold, auto-merge
Plagiarism	Copying without attribution	Sec. 402 plagiarism scan, remediation
Malicious Code	Executable or harmful files embedded	Sec. 601 malware scanning, rejection
Personal Data Leak	Submission contains PII or CUI	Sec. 601 automated redaction, resubmission notice
Reputation Gaming	Manipulating public ratings	Sec. 602 anomaly detection, caps
Accessibility Barriers	Registry unusable by disabled or low-bandwidth users	Sec. 305 WCAG 2.2 AA, multilingual mandates
Disinformation Campaigns	Coordinated false or misleading drafts	Sec. 604 enforcement, advisory flags

Appendix B — User Perspective Risks & Mitigations

User Issue	Impact on Participation	Statutory Safeguard / Improvement
-------------------	--------------------------------	--

Metadata Overload	Users overwhelmed by too many required fields, leading to incomplete submissions	Sec. 302 NLP-suggested metadata with edit-only verification
Unclear Feedback on Rejection	Submitters unclear why submission was rejected, causing frustration	Sec. 605 appeal-right plus standard rejection codes and guidance
Delayed Response Messaging	Lack of timely status updates erodes trust	Sec. 704 rulemaking requires SLAs; dashboard notifications
Language & Accessibility Friction	Non-English and disabled users struggle to navigate the UI	Sec. 305 multilingual UI, WCAG 2.2 AA compliance
Privacy Anxiety	Concerns over public exposure of drafts containing sensitive ideas	Sec. 302 opt-in confidential pre-review mode; auto-redaction logs
Mobile & Low-Bandwidth Constraints	Users on slower connections or mobile devices face upload/download issues	Sec. 301 lightweight mobile interface and offline submission API
Revision Complexity	Difficulty updating prior submissions and tracking versions	Sec. 302 persistent version identifiers and one-click resubmission
Notification Fatigue	Excessive email alerts lead users to ignore important updates	Sec. 704 customizable notification settings in regs
Appeal Process Confusion	Uncertainty about how to initiate or track appeals	Sec. 605 public appeals portal with step-by-step guidance
Trust & Legitimacy Doubts	Users skeptical of automated triage decisions	Sec. 401 transparency logs and public triage rationale summaries