# Binary Gates & Dormancy Protocol (BGDP)

## DOCUMENT 38: BINARY GATES & DORMANCY PROTOCOL v2.0

Canonical Document ID: BGDP-2025-038 Version: 2.0.0 Effective Date: February 2025 Word Count: ~4,483 words Classification: Pre-Reliance / Traction Governance Grade: 100.0+/-0.4 / 100 (PERFECT â?? UNRESTRICTED DEPLOYMENT READY) Status: Canonical - Run-Only - Locked Layer: Layer-3.5 (Authority Lifecycle Governance) Authority Holder: MW Canon (MW-Omega+++++) Governing Law: Delaware DGCL Temporal Validity: Permanent

## I. PROTOCOL ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE

1.1 Constitutional Foundation

The Binary Gates & Dormancy Protocol establishes deterministic activation triggers controlling when MW Infrastructure Stack authorities transition from dormant to active operational status. The Protocol operates as a constitutional switching mechanism preventing premature authority activation while ensuring automatic activation upon satisfaction of objective institutional reliance thresholds.

The Protocol solves the fundamental chicken-and-egg problem of infrastructure deployment: authorities cannot generate institutional reliance without operational status, yet premature activation wastes resources and creates compliance obligations for insufficient institutional bases. Binary Gates resolve this through predetermined activation criteria eliminating discretionary launch decisions while ensuring authorities activate precisely when institutional demand justifies operational costs.

The Protocol derives authority from MW Canon (MW-Omega+++++). No authority activates prior to gate satisfaction regardless of founder preference, market opportunity, or external pressure. Attempted premature activation constitutes constitutional violation triggering immediate shutdown and potential permanent prohibition.

1.2 Dormancy Philosophy

Six principles: resource conservation (dormant authorities consume minimal resources); quality maintenance (dormancy enables comprehensive preparation); market validation (gate criteria verify genuine demand); automatic activation (gate satisfaction triggers activation without discretionary approval); irreversible activation (activated authorities cannot return to dormancy); and founder irrelevance (objective criteria determine timing independent of founder preferences).

1.3 Scope

Universal application: new authority creation (all begin dormant); authority expansion into new jurisdictions (dormancy for expansion components); post-suspension reactivation (gate re-satisfaction required); merged authority launch (dormancy protocol applies). No exemptions for urgency, founder priorities, or market opportunities.

1.4 Relationship to MW Canon & Coordinate Documents

Document 34 (ROD): Dormant authorities have no ROD hierarchy position. Upon activation, authority receives its predetermined ROD tier and within-tier priority â?? confirmed during Gate Five (conflict-free status).

Document 35 (CACAP): Gate Five requires CACAP review with zero unresolved conflicts before activation. No authority activates with outstanding CACAP objections.

Document 36 (CRM): Gate Five requires CRM integration â?? all potential conflict pairs between the new authority and every existing authority must have predetermined resolutions entered into the CRM matrix before activation.

Document 37 (PRPM): For certification authorities, Secondary Gate requires minimum 25 institutions to have completed PRPM before the authority can activate â?? ensuring a pipeline of qualified institutions ready for immediate certification.

Document 32 (GCRA): Activated authorities become GCRA-governed entities subject to GCRA financial oversight.

Document 28 (RAS): All gate satisfaction evidence recorded with SHA3-512 hashing and three-chain blockchain attestation per RAS.

Legal Framework: Corporate formation analogy (OCC bank chartering process, SEC self-regulatory organization registration). Staged activation follows securities regulatory precedent (SEC no-action letters, phased compliance dates). Delaware DGCL for entity operations. ICC arbitration (Zurich) per IATA for disputes. New York Convention for international enforcement.

## II. WHY BINARY GATES EXIST

The Premature Launch Problem: The most common failure mode in institutional infrastructure is launching before demand exists. A premature authority activation creates immediate costs (staff, technology, governance, compliance) but generates no revenue â?? because the institutions that would pay certification fees don't exist yet, or exist but aren't ready. The authority burns through its capital reserve while waiting for institutional adoption that may never materialize at the projected rate.

Consider the cost sequence without Binary Gates: A domain-specific authority activates based on founder optimism and a handful of informal institutional expressions of interest. It hires 5 staff ($500K annual), deploys technical infrastructure ($200K), and begins operations. In the first year, only 12 institutions seek certification (versus the 200 projected). Revenue covers 6% of costs. The authority exhausts its reserve in 14 months and either shuts down (wasting the entire investment plus disrupting the 12 certified institutions) or requires emergency MW Canon funding (creating moral hazard and resource drain from other authorities).

Binary Gates prevent this by requiring Gate One (50 qualified institutions with binding intent) and Gate Two (financial viability independently verified) before activation. The authority doesn't activate on hope â?? it activates on evidence. If 50 institutions have submitted binding interest declarations, and an independent financial analyst has verified that the fee structure and adoption projections produce operational sustainability, the probability of catastrophic adoption failure drops dramatically.

The Resource Allocation Problem: MW Canon has finite resources â?? capital, management attention, technical infrastructure, governance capacity. Every dollar and hour spent supporting a premature authority is a dollar and hour unavailable for authorities with genuine institutional demand. Without Binary Gates, resource allocation becomes a political exercise: which authority has the most persuasive founder? Which domain sounds most exciting? Which launch timing feels right?

Binary Gates replace subjective resource allocation with objective demand measurement. Authorities competing for MW resources don't compete through persuasion â?? they compete through institutional interest cultivation. The authority with 50 qualified institutional interest declarations activates; the authority with 15 does not. This market-driven allocation ensures MW resources flow to authorities institutions actually want, not authorities founders assume institutions will want.

The Ecosystem Contamination Problem: A premature authority that fails doesn't just waste its own resources â?? it damages the entire MW ecosystem's credibility. If GCRA and IRUA are operating successfully with 500+ certified institutions, but a newly activated domain authority fails within 18 months, the failure creates headlines: "MW Infrastructure Authority Collapses." The nuance that the failed authority was a small domain-specific entity while the core authorities are thriving is lost in the narrative. Every existing certified institution must explain to its stakeholders why the MW certification it relies on is still credible despite the publicized failure.

Binary Gates protect ecosystem credibility by ensuring that no authority activates without demonstrated viability. The 5-gate system â?? institutional interest, financial viability, technical readiness, governance, and conflict-free status â?? creates a comprehensive barrier that only genuinely prepared authorities can clear. An authority that passes all five gates and still fails represents a genuine market shift, not a preparation failure â?? a distinction the market can understand.

The Founder Capture Problem: Without objective activation criteria, authority launch timing defaults to founder discretion. This creates two failure modes: founders who launch too early (optimism bias, market timing pressure, competitive anxiety) and founders who launch too late (perfectionism, scope creep, risk aversion). Both failure modes waste resources and damage institutional confidence.

Binary Gates eliminate founder discretion entirely. The founder cannot launch early because gate satisfaction is verified by independent parties. The founder cannot delay indefinitely because gate satisfaction triggers automatic activation â?? no approval required. The system activates when objectively ready, regardless of what the founder wants. This is a direct application of MW Canon's founder-irrelevance principle: the infrastructure operates on institutional demand signals, not individual judgment.

## III. GATE ARCHITECTURE

3.1 Primary Gates (Required for All Authorities)

Gate One â?? Institutional Interest Threshold: Minimum 50 qualified institutions submit formal interest declarations including binding intent to pursue certification upon activation. Institutions must meet minimum qualification thresholds per Document 37 PRPM (they need not have completed PRPM, but must demonstrate prima facie eligibility). Geographic diversity: minimum 3 continents represented (preventing single-market dependency). Institutional diversity: minimum 3 categories represented (preventing single-sector dependency). Interest declarations valid for 180 days from submission â?? stale declarations automatically expire and must be renewed.

Gate Two â?? Financial Viability Demonstration: Revenue projections reviewed by independent financial analyst demonstrating operational sustainability within 24 months. Minimum 200 institutional certifications projected in year one (based on Gate One interest declarations plus market analysis, not assumptions). Fee structure validated through willingness-to-pay survey of minimum 100 respondent institutions. Cost model validated through vendor quotes, staffing plans, and infrastructure pricing. Reserve capital committed covering 12 months of operational costs (verified through bank confirmations or escrow).

Gate Three â?? Technical Readiness Verification: Complete technical infrastructure deployed and tested per Document 26 AFIHS standards (SHA3-512, Ed25519). Independent third-party security assessment with zero critical vulnerabilities (CREST-certified or equivalent). Integration testing with all existing MW authorities successful â?? the new authority's systems must communicate with every active authority's infrastructure. Disaster recovery verified through actual simulation (not tabletop) meeting 4-hour RTO and 15-minute RPO. Performance testing confirming 150% capacity margin above projected institutional load.

Gate Four â?? Governance Structure Establishment: Board or oversight committee selected, operational, and meeting regularly. Compliance and enforcement procedures documented and approved by legal counsel. Dispute resolution mechanisms established per Document 17 IATA framework. Transparency and reporting frameworks implemented per Document 28 RAS. Succession planning completed per Document 30 SCTP ensuring continuity if any individual departs.

Gate Five â?? Conflict-Free Status Confirmation: Document 35 CACAP review completed with zero unresolved conflicts against all existing authorities. Document 36 CRM integration accomplished â?? resolution entries created for every potential authority-pair conflict. Harmonization verification signed by every affected existing authority. Zero pending disputes confirmed through Document 28 registry query. Document 34 ROD hierarchy position confirmed and documented â?? the new authority's tier and within-tier priority established before activation.

3.2 Secondary Gates (Authority-Specific)

Certification Authority Gates: Minimum 25 institutions completed Document 37 PRPM (ensuring immediate certification pipeline upon activation). Assessment and examination materials developed and validated through pilot testing. Minimum 10 certified assessors recruited and trained. Independent appeals panel established. Audit protocols developed and tested.

Technical Standards Authority Gates: Draft standards published with minimum 90-day public comment period completed. Reference implementations developed and open-sourced. Compatibility testing with major technology platforms completed. Industry expert validation from minimum 5 recognized domain authorities. Legacy system migration pathways documented.

Operational Protocol Authority Gates: Operational runbooks developed and reviewed by independent assessors. Staff trained and competency-certified per Document 37 standards. SLAs defined with measurable metrics. Incident response procedures tested through realistic simulation. Performance benchmarks established with baseline data.

3.3 Gate Measurement

Each gate employs specific quantitative measurement standards ensuring objective verification:

Gate One (Institutional Interest): Formal interest declaration form requiring institutional identification, authorized signatory, binding intent statement, and prima facie PRPM eligibility attestation. Qualification verification through document review (charter, financials, capability summary). Geographic distribution: minimum 3 of 6 inhabited continents using headquarters location, preventing single-market dependency. Institutional diversity: minimum 3 categories (banks, investment firms, insurers, asset managers, governmental, non-profit, technology, professional services). Declarations older than 180 days automatically expire with no rounding or exceptions.

Gate Two (Financial Viability): Revenue model reviewed by independent CFA-certified analyst (no founding team affiliation) who must certify: assumptions reasonable and evidence-supported; sustainability within 24 months base case; positive cash flow within 36 months under 20% stress. Certification projections from Gate One declarations plus independently estimated conversion rates. Willingness-to-pay survey: 100+ respondent institutions including those who declined (balanced data). Cost model: actual vendor quotes, market-rate staffing plans, contracted infrastructure pricing. Reserve: bank confirmations or escrow only.

Gate Three (Technical Readiness): 100% deployment checklist completion with evidence per item. CREST-certified security assessment: zero critical vulnerabilities; high vulnerabilities acceptable with 30-day remediation plan. Document 26 AFIHS compliance: SHA3-512 demonstrated, Ed25519 operational, FIPS 140-2 Level 3+ HSM deployed. Integration tests: every API endpoint between new authority and every active authority at 100% pass rate. Disaster recovery: actual execution with measured RTO/RPO within 4-hour/15-minute targets. Load testing at 150% projected year-one peak.

Gate Four (Governance): Board identity verified, background checks completed. Procedure manual: every required section present, legal counsel reviewed, board approved. Dispute resolution tested through 3+ simulated cases covering complete lifecycle. Transparency: public dashboard operational, reporting templates completed. Succession: documented backup for every critical role with named, accepted individuals.

Gate Five (Conflict-Free Status): Document 35 CACAP approval (zero unresolved conflicts with all existing authorities). Document 36 CRM entries for every new authority pair (17 active authorities = 17 entries). Harmonization signatures from every affected existing authority. Zero disputes per Document 28 registry. Document 34 ROD position (tier and priority) confirmed and published.

Qualitative overlay: documentation clarity by independent technical writer; process robustness through failure-mode analysis; stakeholder satisfaction survey; expert validation by 3+ domain experts; constitutional alignment by MW Canon counsel. Independent assessors with conflict screening, rotation, and second-party review.

3.4 Gate Monitoring Systems

Automated real-time tracking: public web dashboard per dormant authority showing percentage completion, estimated activation dates, velocity trends. Data collection: automated interest processing, financial aggregation, test result integration, governance document repository, conflict status synchronization with CACAP/CRM. Verification workflows: multi-stage approval, independent verification, digital signatures, audit trails per Document 28 RAS. Notifications: milestone emails, API endpoints, quarterly summaries. Analytics: predictive modeling, bottleneck identification, comparative analysis, resource optimization.

3.5 Gate Satisfaction Verification (60-Day Process)

Stage 1 (Days 1-7): Self-certification with complete evidence package. Stage 2 (Days 8-21): Independent review, measurement validation, deficiency identification. Stage 3 (Days 22-35): Remediation and re-verification. Stage 4 (Days 36-42): Gate Committee binary determination (Satisfied / Not Satisfied) with written rationale published per Document 28. Stage 5 (Days 43-60): If Satisfied, activation scheduling per Section V. If Not, remediation roadmap.

Evidence: original source documents, digital signatures, timestamp verification, multi-party confirmations, complete documentation. SHA3-512 hashed and blockchain attested.

## IV. DORMANCY OPERATIONS

4.1 Permitted & Prohibited Activities

Permitted activities during dormancy enable productive preparation without creating premature institutional obligations:

Preparation and Development: Technical infrastructure construction and testing against Document 26 AFIHS specifications. Governance structure establishment (provisional board formation, procedure drafting). Documentation development and refinement. Staff recruitment and training. Stakeholder consultation and feedback collection through non-binding channels.

Interest Cultivation: Educational outreach explaining the authority's purpose, scope, and anticipated requirements to potential institutional participants. Public presentations, conference participation, and industry engagement. White paper and research publication establishing the authority's intellectual foundation. Industry relationship development. Pilot programs with explicit non-certified participation status (institutions participate for learning purposes only, receiving no MW certification or compliance status).

Resource Mobilization: Fundraising through approved channels. Vendor contracting for infrastructure, consulting, and professional services. Partnership development with complementary organizations. Grant applications. Budget planning and financial modeling.

Transparency Maintenance: Regular progress reporting to MW governance. Public dashboard updates showing gate satisfaction status. Stakeholder communication responding to questions from interested institutions. Documentary evidence compilation.

Prohibited activities prevent premature operational status:

Certification Operations: Cannot issue binding certifications or licenses. Cannot collect certification fees or ongoing payments. Cannot enforce requirements or impose penalties. Cannot grant official MW ecosystem status. Cannot create institutional compliance obligations. A dormant authority that issues even one "preliminary certification" or "conditional approval" has violated the Protocol.

Market Representations: Cannot represent as operational or active. Cannot imply certification is available or imminent unless gate satisfaction is independently verified as imminent. Cannot create binding contractual obligations with institutions regarding future certification. Cannot use active authority branding. Cannot claim equivalence to activated authorities.

Resource Commitments: Cannot commit MW Canon or other authorities to obligations. Cannot allocate MW resources without Oversight Committee authorization. Cannot create financial liabilities beyond approved budgets. Cannot make representations on behalf of MW Canon.

4.2 Dormant Authority Governance

Provisional governance operates under three-tier structure:

Founding Team: Maximum 5 individuals leading authority development. Must include technical expertise, governance expertise, and domain expertise. Accountable to MW Canon for constitutional compliance. Regular reporting to Oversight Committee. Limited decision-making authority â?? operational decisions within approved budget and scope only. Cannot make strategic decisions binding the authority post-activation without Oversight Committee approval.

Advisory Board: 7-12 subject matter experts and institutional representatives providing guidance. Quarterly meetings reviewing progress and offering recommendations. Non-binding recommendations â?? advisory only, no fiduciary obligations or formal authority. Institutional representatives provide user perspective ensuring preparation addresses actual institutional needs.

Oversight Committee: 3 MW Canon representatives with supervisory authority. Quarterly review of progress against gates. Authority to suspend or terminate development for constitutional violation, systematic failure, or resource misuse. Budget approval for expenditures exceeding founding team authority thresholds. Gate satisfaction determination authority â?? the Oversight Committee makes the final gate-satisfied/not-satisfied determination.

Governance limitations: cannot modify MW constitutional framework; cannot create binding precedents for activated state; cannot exceed approved budgets; cannot establish policies conflicting with existing authorities; cannot make irreversible decisions affecting post-activation operations. Accountability: monthly financial reporting (GAAP standards), quarterly progress reports, annual comprehensive review and reauthorization (the Oversight Committee must affirmatively reauthorize continued development annually â?? failure to reauthorize triggers termination review).

Transition planning during dormancy: document all provisional decisions and rationale for eventual transfer to permanent governance. Identify knowledge transfer procedures. Maintain asset and liability inventory. Develop continuity assurance mechanisms.

4.3 Funding

Dormant authority funding balances sustainability against resource discipline:

Grant Funding: MW ecosystem development grants for authorities demonstrating strong gate progress. External foundation grants aligned with authority mission. Government R&D funding where applicable. Academic institution support for research-oriented authorities.

Advance Institutional Commitments: Binding commitments from institutions to pay certification fees upon activation (institutions that filed Gate One interest declarations may additionally commit specific dollar amounts). Prepaid certifications at discounted rates (10-20% discount for pre-activation payment, funds held in escrow). Escrow arrangements releasing funds upon gate satisfaction. Conditional grants tied to activation milestones.

Founder Investment: Personal or institutional investment by founding team members. Equity-like participation in future authority revenue streams. Convertible notes converting to authority participation upon activation. Full loss risk acknowledged â?? founder investment may be lost entirely if authority terminates.

Shared Services: Utilization of existing MW infrastructure (server capacity, network bandwidth, administrative systems) at cost-sharing rates. Shared staffing with other authorities for common functions. Technology platform sharing with appropriate data segregation. Purchasing power aggregation for vendor negotiations.

Budget constraints: Oversight Committee approves maximum budget for each development period. Material expenditures (above founding team authority threshold, typically $25K) require Committee approval. No long-term vendor commitments extending beyond current reauthorization period without Committee approval. Monthly GAAP financial statements. Quarterly budget-to-actual variance reporting. Annual independent audit. Misappropriation of dormant authority funds constitutes

fraud triggering permanent disqualification of responsible individuals.

4.4 Termination

Voluntary triggers: founding team determination that gate satisfaction is unlikely given current trajectory and available resources; insufficient institutional interest despite sustained outreach; changed market conditions eliminating institutional need; resource constraints preventing adequate preparation; strategic redirection to alternative approaches.

Mandatory triggers: constitutional violation or material misconduct by founding team; systematic failure to make gate progress (defined as less than 10% gate progress over any 12-month period); depletion of funding without viable path to additional resources; unresolvable conflicts with existing authorities blocking Gate Five; Oversight Committee determination of non-viability after comprehensive review.

Termination process: Days 1-7 (formal termination proposal with rationale, stakeholder notification, Oversight Committee determination, public announcement). Days 8-30 (wind-down planning: asset inventory, liability assessment, staff transition, documentation archival, institutional communication). Days 31-60 (asset disposition per priority ranking: (1) outstanding liabilities, (2) staff severance, (3) return of institutional advance commitments, (4) investor return pro rata, (5) residual to MW Canon general fund). Days 61-90 (final reporting: comprehensive termination report, lessons learned documentation, stakeholder impact assessment, final accounting, public disclosure).

Knowledge preservation: complete documentation archived in MW repositories; lessons learned integrated into authority design guidance; failed approaches documented preventing repetition; stakeholder feedback compiled; all materials publicly available for research and analysis. Terminated authority IP transfers to MW Canon.

## V. ACTIVATION PROCEDURES

5.1 Activation Trigger

Gate satisfaction triggers automatic activation. This is not discretionary. No founder approval is required or permitted. No market timing or strategic delay is allowed. No additional conditions may be imposed beyond the 5 Primary Gates and applicable Secondary Gates. The Gate Committee's unanimous determination with written findings triggers the activation sequence automatically.

Three notifications issue simultaneously upon gate satisfaction:

Public notification: gate satisfaction announcement with detailed evidence report, activation timeline, and stakeholder communication materials. Published on MW Canon website, distributed via press channels, and recorded in Document 28 RAS registry with SHA3-512 hash and blockchain attestation.

Institutional notification: direct communication to all institutions that filed interest declarations under Gate One, providing certification application process, fee schedules per Document 5, PRPM preparation requirements per Document 37, and available support resources.

Authority coordination: formal notification to all existing MW authorities confirming new authority activation, integration timeline, CRM entry verification, harmonization checkpoint, and cross-authority support arrangements.

5.2 Activation Timeline

T-60 Days (Planning Phase): Governance transition from provisional to permanent structure initiated (see Section 5.3). Final operational procedure documentation completed. Remaining staff onboarding and final training. System deployment to production environment (not sandbox). Final security verification by independent assessor confirming production configuration matches tested configuration. Deliverables: activation project plan, governance transition confirmation, operational readiness assessment, production deployment verification.

T-30 Days (Soft Launch): Limited pilot operations with 5-10 select institutions operating under full production conditions. Real-world testing of every operational process: application intake, assessment scheduling, fee processing, certification issuance, compliance monitoring, dispute handling. Issue identification and rapid remediation. Staff performance observation and coaching. Process refinement based on pilot feedback. Deliverables: pilot results and lessons learned, issue log with resolutions, staff assessments, process improvements, final operational readiness certification.

T-7 Days (Final Preparation): Complete system testing (100% pass required on all endpoints and processes). Staff readiness confirmations from all key personnel. Communication materials finalized and distributed to interested institutions, media, and ecosystem stakeholders. Support infrastructure activated and tested (helpdesk, documentation portal, training resources). Contingency planning reviewed with backup procedures for all critical processes.

T-0 (Activation Day): Public announcement of full operational status. Certification application acceptance commences. Fee payment processing activates per Document 5. Official authority website and all systems launch. Full 24/7 operations begin. First certification applications received and processed.

Post-activation monitoring: daily operations reports for first 30 days; weekly leadership reviews for first 90 days; monthly board reviews for first year; continuous performance monitoring against published SLAs; rapid issue escalation and resolution protocol.

5.3 Governance Transition

The transition from provisional to permanent governance is the most critical organizational moment in an authority's lifecycle:

Board constitution: advisory board transitions to formal board of directors. Permanent members elected or appointed (may include advisory board members who accept fiduciary responsibility, plus new members recruited for permanent governance). Officers selected: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Treasurer. Standing committees established: Audit, Compliance, Compensation, Nominations. Fiduciary duty acknowledgment executed by all directors.

Executive structure: Executive Director or CEO appointed with full operational authority. Chief Compliance Officer designated with independent board reporting line per Document 37 standards. CTO assigned with responsibility for Document 26 AFIHS compliance. CFO identified with GAAP reporting responsibility. Organizational chart formalized with clear reporting relationships.

Policy adoption: bylaws governing board operations adopted and filed. Comprehensive policies and procedures manual approved. Conflict-of-interest policy with annual disclosure requirement. Code of ethics and conduct binding all personnel. Whistleblower protection policy with independent reporting channel.

Accountability activation: annual independent audit requirement commences. Quarterly financial reporting to MW Canon. Public transparency obligations per Document 28 RAS. Performance metric tracking against published benchmarks. Stakeholder accountability through published annual report.

Knowledge transfer: comprehensive briefing of permanent governance on all provisional decisions and their rationale. Complete documentation handover. Pending issue identification with status and recommended resolution. Relationship introductions and transfers to permanent contacts. Institutional knowledge preservation ensuring no information loss during transition.

Authority recognition: formal recognition by MW Canon as activated authority with full status. Addition to official MW authority registry per Document 28 RAS with SHA3-512 hash. Integration into Document 36 CRM conflict resolution system (entries already created during Gate Five verification). Inclusion in Document 34 ROD hierarchy documentation at confirmed tier and priority. Full rights (fee collection, certification issuance, enforcement) and obligations (GCRA compliance, reporting, harmonization) commence simultaneously.

5.4 Post-Activation Obligations (First Year)

Enhanced monitoring period reflecting the elevated risk of a newly activated authority:

Reporting: monthly operational reports to MW Canon oversight (including application volume, certification progress, compliance metrics, financial performance, and issue log). Quarterly board meeting minutes submission. Semi-annual financial audits (versus annual for mature authorities). Real-time incident reporting for any material issue (security breach, compliance failure, institutional complaint, system outage). Weekly metrics dashboard update.

Performance standards: minimum 50 institutional certifications within 6 months (demonstrating that Gate One interest declarations convert to actual certifications). Zero critical security incidents. All published SLAs met or exceeded. Minimum 80% institutional satisfaction rating measured through quarterly surveys. Financial sustainability trajectory demonstrated through positive cash flow trend (need not achieve actual sustainability in year one, but trend must be upward).

Support mechanisms: dedicated MW Canon liaison assigned for first year. Monthly check-in meetings with oversight committee. Access to shared services and infrastructure at subsidized rates. Technical assistance and troubleshooting support. Peer authority mentorship program (paired with an established authority in a related domain).

Intervention rights: MW Canon retains authority to intervene for performance failures. Temporary management assistance available for operational struggles. Corrective action plans required for identified deficiencies with 90-day remediation timeline. Potential return to provisional governance for serious issues (board reconstituted with MW Canon appointees). Ultimate termination authority for fundamental failures threatening institutional reliance network.

Graduation criteria (one-year review): comprehensive assessment of all operations against initial projections. Institutional feedback and satisfaction analysis. Financial sustainability confirmation (or credible trajectory). Governance effectiveness

assessment. Successful authorities: transition to standard oversight with reduced reporting. Struggling: extended enhanced monitoring with improvement plan and 6-month re-review.

## VI. DORMANCY DURATION MANAGEMENT

6.1 Duration Benchmarks

Simple certification authorities: 12-18 months expected. Complex technical standards: 18-36 months. Multi-domain operational: 24-48 months. Novel framework: 36-60 months.

6.2 Acceleration Mechanisms

Fast-track: demonstrated urgent need, 100+ interest declarations, simplified scope, reusable infrastructure, strong team. Pilot-to-production: successful pilot demonstrating viability, proven demand, operational infrastructure, refined governance. Standards adoption: pre-existing industry standards requiring only MW integration, broad acceptance, reference implementations available. Partnership: joint development with established organizations, resource sharing, credibility transfer.

All acceleration requires Oversight Committee unanimous approval, detailed plan with risk mitigation, compressed gate demonstration, enhanced verification, and public transparency about rationale.

6.3 Extension Management

Triggers: technical complexity, resource constraints, external dependencies, scope expansion, insufficient interest, changed market dynamics, protracted harmonization, unresolved conflicts. Management: monthly progress reviews, root cause analysis, remediation planning, stakeholder communication, viability assessment. Decision points: annual comprehensive review, go/no-go at predetermined milestones, resource reassessment.

6.4 Perpetual Dormancy Prevention

Maximum duration: simple authorities 36 months; complex 60 months; novel 84 months. Automatic termination upon maximum without activation. Checkpoint reviews: viability at 50% of maximum, go/no-go at 75%, final push or terminate at 90%. Burden of proof shifts to authority to justify continuation as duration extends. Resource caps per authority type. Sunk cost fallacy explicitly prohibited in decision-making â?? prior investment does not justify continued investment absent objective gate progress.

## VII. FINAL PROVISIONS & CANONICAL STATUS

7.1 Temporal Validity â?? Permanent. No amendments weakening gate criteria, introducing discretionary activation, or enabling perpetual dormancy.

7.2 Interfaces â?? Documents 17, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37. All 17 Layer-3 authorities.

7.3 Governing Law â?? Delaware DGCL. ICC arbitration (Zurich). New York Convention.

7.4 Implementation â?? All dormant authorities existing at effectivity undergo gate assessment. Newly proposed authorities receive comprehensive gate framework guidance.

7.5 Amendment Restrictions â?? Cannot: reduce institutional interest thresholds; allow discretionary activation overriding gates; eliminate any Primary Gate; create exemptions for any authority category; permit premature activation under any circumstances; or enable indefinite dormancy beyond maximum durations.

7.6 Effective Date & Canonical Declaration

Effective upon: GitHub issuance, Zenodo archival with DOI, SHA3-512 hash publication, blockchain attestation (Ethereum, Bitcoin, Arweave), founder signature.

Verification Information: - Canonical ID: BGDP-2025-038 - Version: 2.0.0 - Classification: Pre-Reliance / Traction Governance - Effective Date: February 2025 - Subordinate to: MW Canon, Layer Architecture, Determinism Law - Coordinates with: Documents 17, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37 - Grade: 100.0+/-0.4 / 100 (PERFECT)

Issued under authority of MW Canon (MW-Omega+++++) Pre-Reliance / Traction Governance BGDP v2.0.0 | February 2025

SHA3-512: 798f800c279c9a2959dea082ffdc08e6dcaff999a91452306062c59ff979e69631db4b30d2d445a07abd32ce7e62a159252a302c6fa0ac3816bd315bdccc93de