

CONDITIONAL IMPACT OVERVIEW

Global Public Good Impact Overview

Conditional pathways from τ -Theory to planetary systems

Thorsten Fuchs • Anna-Sophie Fuchs

May 8, 2026 • canonical v1.0 • White Paper

AUDIENCE

Public-good readers, domain reviewers, journalists, research strategists, policy-adjacent readers, foundations, supporters, open-science readers, and institutional readers

READING TIME

75–105 minutes

STATUS

Canonical v1.0

CANONICAL ROUTE

<https://panta-rhei.site/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/>

SHORT ROUTE

<https://prrp.site/wp005>

LICENSE

CC-BY-4.0

Correspondence: thorsten@panta-rhei.site

READER STANCE

How to read this overview

Result → Verification & Review → Translation Layer → Domain Uptake → Consequence

CLAIM DISCIPLINE

This Global Public Good Impact Overview consolidates conditional public-good scenario maps. It does not claim achieved impact, deployment readiness, policy adoption, institutional acceptance, domain validation, product availability, operational readiness, public-good delivery, or certified impact. Every pathway remains conditional on upstream Results, verification and review status, translation assumptions, domain-specific benchmarking, governance assessment, and actual domain uptake.

READER ROUTE

First-contact readers should read Parts I–II before any portfolio chapter. Domain reviewers can read Part III, then the relevant dossier routes and reviewer checklist. Journalists should read the claim boundary and safe/unsafe claim module before quoting. Technical reviewers should move upstream from every impact statement into Results, Verify, Corpus, Publications, and the dossier source routes.

ROUTES AND INSPECTION

Canonical route: <https://panta-rhei.site/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/>

Short route: <https://prrp.site/wp005>

Inspection route: <https://panta-rhei.site/impact/global-public-good/>

License: CC-BY-4.0

CONTENTS

1	Impact as Conditional Public-Relevance Layer	3
2	The Translation Chain	5
3	The Portfolio System	7
4	Recurring Unlock Mechanisms	14
5	Benchmark and Governance Architecture	16
6	Inspection and Use	18
7	Dossier Reading Grammar	21
8	Portfolio Review Agenda	23
9	Catalog, Interdependencies, and Routes	26

§ 1 | Impact as Conditional Public-Relevance Layer

The Impact lane exists because a program that makes claims about mathematics, physics, life, mind, formal systems, and planetary systems owes readers more than an internal proof route. It also owes a disciplined account of what could matter if the upstream work survived inspection. The obligation is public, but it is not promotional. A public-good pathway is not evidence for the theory. It is a downstream question that becomes meaningful only after upstream claims are kept within their proper inspection surfaces.

The live Impact doctrine is the controlling sentence for this white paper: *Impact is conditional: no consequence is stronger than the Results, verification status, translation assumptions, and domain uptake on which it depends.* WP005 preserves that doctrine as a rule of reading. A portfolio may name agriculture, water, climate, energy, health, disaster resilience, ocean systems, biodiversity, pollution, weather, or solar systems. That naming does not move any claim into the world by itself. It only says that, under a chain of conditions, a certain consequence pathway could become worth investigating.

KEY CLAIM • CONDITIONAL RELEVANCE

The Impact lane is a public accountability surface. It helps readers ask where a claim would matter if the upstream route held. It does not make the upstream route hold.

1.1 Why impact belongs in the research obligation

The Panta Rhei Research Program is intentionally inspectable before it asks for belief. WP001 explains the program as a public research observatory; WP002 summarizes the theory; WP003 explains TauLib; WP004 describes inspection architecture. WP005 completes that orientation by asking what public-good domains would become relevant if a pathway survived the prior surfaces.

There are two risks in suppressing an Impact layer. The first is

opacity: readers can see high-scope theoretical claims but not why they would matter outside the manuscript. The second is overstatement: readers or commentators may infer impact claims that the program has not made. A public Impact lane avoids both errors by making the conditionality explicit. It says where the stakes could lie, but also where the burden of proof still lies.

1.2 Global Public Good as the outermost stratum

The Global Public Good surface is the outermost Impact stratum. It is outermost because the chain from theory to consequence is longest there. A weather forecast, a water-network model, a disease-surveillance map, a grid dispatch tool, a restoration-priority model, or a humanitarian trigger cannot be inferred directly from the existence of a formal construction. Each would require a domain translation layer, benchmark suites, shadow-mode comparison, independent domain review, governance assessment, institutional capacity, and actual uptake.

For that reason, the Global Public Good page states that these are not deployment claims. They are scenario maps. The public projection currently contains 11 conditional public-good portfolios and 44 Public-Good Briefings / Impact Dossiers. Each dossier is a publication-ready artifact, but publication-ready does not mean deployment-ready. The release status says that the PDF is downloadable, internally consistent, and claim-safe. It does not say that the relevant domain accepts the model, that a system exists, or that any public-good delivery has occurred.

1.3 Eleven portfolios at a glance

The 11 portfolios are a way of seeing the coupled public-good projection, not a claim that the theory has already solved 11 domains. Each portfolio collects a family of possible translation pathways and their review burdens.

Portfolio	Domain family	Count	Core public-good question	Primary unlock mechanisms
Agriculture	Food, Life & Health Systems	5	translating better agro-climate-water-biology intelligence into lower crop loss, improved water productivity, earlier pest and disease warnings, stronger anticipatory action, and faster climate-resilient crop design.	weather-soil-crop twins; irrigation allocation; pest and disease early warning; seasonal planning
Biodiversity / Restoration	Food, Life & Health Systems	1	translating better coupled ecological intelligence into stronger restoration targeting, functional connectivity, blue-green habitat resilience, earlier stress warnings, and more accountable biodiversity finance.	restoration targeting; ecological monitoring; functional connectivity; biodiversity-finance verification
Climate	Climate, Atmosphere & Weather Systems	4	making the climate system's causal tree more legible so that mitigation, adaptation, finance, infrastructure, and international coordination can align with the true critical path of risk.	causal climate risk maps; mitigation/adaptation prioritization; finance and coordination diagnostics
Disaster	Climate, Atmosphere & Weather Systems	4	translating better hazard physics into earlier warnings, more resilient lifelines, and forecast-linked anticipatory action across multi-hazard disaster domains.	trigger quality; anticipatory logistics; lifeline resilience; multi-hazard early warning

Portfolio	Domain family	Count	Core public-good question	Primary unlock mechanisms
Energy	Energy & Solar Systems	5	exploring whether a verified tau-informed energy-system model could become relevant to grid reliability and dispatch, DER and storage orchestration, fusion and fission digital twin research, and whole-system energy planning.	grid and reactor twins; DER orchestration; fusion/fission benchmark ladders; system planning
Ocean	Water & Ocean Systems	4	exploring whether a shared ocean-state model could become relevant to trade, climate decarbonization, blue food systems, search and rescue, and marine stewardship simultaneously.	ocean-state twins; maritime routing; blue-food intelligence; marine emergency response
One Health	Food, Life & Health Systems	4	exploring whether an integrated environmental-biological-operational model could become relevant to disease early warning, health-system resilience, environmental surveillance, food safety, and precision public health simultaneously.	environment-pathogen-health coupling; wastewater surveillance; food-safety exposure pathways
Pollution / Circularity	Pollution & Circular Economy	4	translating better physical intelligence about emissions, toxic pathways, waste flows, plastics leakage, and material dynamics into lower exposure, cleaner cities, stronger remediation, better waste operations, and circular-system redesign.	pollutant pathway models; exposure intelligence; waste-flow maps; circular-system redesign
Solar	Energy & Solar Systems	5	translating better solar-weather-grid physics into lower reserve costs, faster DER interconnection, stronger critical-load resilience, and solar-synchronized flexible demand.	solar-weather-grid forecasting; DER visibility; resilience planning; flexible demand synchronization
Water / WASH	Water & Ocean Systems	5	translating better water-system physics into safer drinking water, fewer network losses, stronger sanitation and reuse, better basin allocation, and improved WASH continuity in the places where vulnerability is highest.	water-network twins; source-quality warning; basin allocation; WASH continuity and reuse
Weather	Climate, Atmosphere & Weather Systems	3	making weather, climate intelligence, and disaster early warning materially better - from extreme-event forecasting and flood impact translation to wildfire/smoke intelligence, grid-weather coupling, drought planning, and climate adaptation.	bounded-error weather forecasting; aviation and logistics routing; contrail and extreme-event intelligence

The table should be read with one negative rule: portfolio interconnection does not amplify certainty. It amplifies the need for discipline. If water, weather, agriculture, One Health, and disaster systems are coupled, then a mistake in one translation layer can propagate into another. The right conclusion is not that impact is broader than expected. The right conclusion is that benchmarking, governance, and review become more important.

1.4 The no-shortcut rule

Every pathway in WP005 obeys the same no-shortcut rule. A public-good statement cannot skip from theory to consequence.

It cannot skip from a formal object to a policy claim. It cannot skip from a scenario map to adoption. It cannot skip from an internally coherent dossier to domain validation. The path must pass through Results, Verify, translation, domain review, governance, and uptake.

That rule is intentionally conservative. It protects the reader, but it also protects the research. If a pathway is worth investigating, it should be strong enough to survive a transparent route. If it is not strong enough to survive that route, it should be weakened, revised, or retired.

§ 2 | The Translation Chain

The controlling chain for the Impact lane is Result → Verification & Review → Translation Layer → Domain Uptake → Consequence. It is not a slogan. It is an ordering discipline. Consequence

is the final term, not the first. Every earlier term can fail, and each failure changes what may responsibly be said downstream.

STAGE	OWNER SURFACE	WHAT IT MEANS	WHAT CAN FAIL	INSPECT
Result	Results	A stated consequence, prediction, theorem-adjacent outcome, recovery claim, or falsification-facing record.	The result may be unsupported, too broad, poorly scoped, or superseded.	/results/
Verification & Review	Verify	The route where formal, source, trust-budget, falsification, and review burdens are made inspectable.	Trust budget may weaken; bridge claims may be under-specified; external review may reject the route.	/verify/
Translation Layer	Corpus / domain dossier	A domain-specific model, data interface, metric family, benchmark suite, and workflow hypothesis.	Translation may be under-specified, unfair to incumbent systems, data-poor, or technically infeasible.	/impact/
Domain Uptake	Domain institutions	The real-world capacity, governance, incentives, and procedures that would have to receive a model.	A domain may not want, trust, govern, procure, operate, or legally use the proposed layer.	Dossier routes
Consequence	Impact	A public-good outcome that could only follow if all prior stages held.	The consequence may not materialize, may be outweighed by harms, or may fail equity and safety tests.	/impact/global-public-good/

2.1 Verification before translation

No impact claim can outrun Results and Verify. If a Result is provisional, impact language must be provisional. If a bridge claim is disclosed as a bridge claim, impact language must not pretend it is a formal theorem. If TauLib proves a represented formal obligation, impact language must not turn that into empirical truth, semantic adequacy, institutional acceptance, or public benefit.

The live Global Public Good page states the rule plainly: if any upstream link weakens, the public-good claim weakens with it. This white paper treats that sentence as a release invariant. It applies to every portfolio and every dossier. It is especially important for high-stakes domains such as health, water, disaster response, aviation, nuclear systems, grid reliability, and climate adaptation.

2.2 Translation layers

A translation layer is where an upstream claim would have to become a domain object. In a dossier, that usually means a

proposed model family, a reference dataset or observational interface, a benchmark suite, a set of failure modes, a governance frame, and a route by which domain experts can reject or constrain the proposal. Translation is not cosmetic. It is where most public-good claims either become testable or fall apart.

The translation layer has at least six burdens. It must specify the domain model, not merely name a domain. It must identify the data and measurement interfaces. It must compare itself with incumbent systems. It must define benchmarks that can fail. It must state governance and safety boundaries. It must name the institutional workflow in which the model would be tested, if ever testing became appropriate.

2.3 The evidence and benchmark ladder

WP005 uses a conservative ladder from upstream theory language to possible deployment/adoption language. Current public-good dossiers are not presented as L8. Most remain at scenario-map and translation-specification stages.

STAGE	NAME	MINIMUM BURDEN	CURRENT BOUNDARY
L0	Upstream theory claim	The relevant T Theory, Registry, monograph, Result, or TauLib route is identified.	Not an impact claim.
L1	Result remains supported through Verify	The relevant Result and verification status are visible and current.	Impact language cannot be stronger than this status.
L2	Domain translation model specified	A model family, variables, scope, and non-scope are named.	Still a scenario map.
L3	Benchmark suite defined	Metrics, baselines, and incumbent comparisons are specified.	No performance claim yet.
L4	Shadow-mode comparison	Retrospective or parallel testing compares the model to existing practice.	No operational authority.
L5	Independent domain review	Domain experts review scope, baselines, failure modes, and evidence.	No endorsement implied unless explicit.
L6	Governance and safety assessment	Equity, labor, privacy, safety, misuse, procurement, and accountability are assessed.	No deployment decision.
L7	Institutional pilot decision	A responsible institution chooses a bounded pilot under governance.	A pilot is not adoption.
L8	Deployment / adoption, if ever warranted	An institution adopts a validated and governed model in practice.	WP005 does not claim L8.

2.4 Governance, safety, and equity

Public-good relevance is not enough. A model can be accurate and still be misused. A forecast can improve average skill and still harm a vulnerable group. A water, health, or disaster trigger can shift burdens onto people who have no voice in the system. A grid or aviation model can create safety risks if it is treated as authoritative before it has earned that status. A biodiversity or

climate-finance model can produce false accountability if monitoring is weak.

For that reason, the dossier system treats governance as part of the translation chain rather than as a public-relations afterthought. Benchmarking asks whether a model works. Governance asks whether it can be used responsibly, by whom, for whose benefit, with what accountability, and under what right to refuse.

§ 3 | The Portfolio System

The portfolio system is the middle layer between the single Impact doctrine and the 44 dossier-level arguments. It lets readers see the scope without losing the claim boundary. A portfolio says: here is a domain family where a translation pathway could become worth investigating. It does not say: the pathway is validated, available, adopted, or ready to deploy.

Each portfolio below follows the same grammar: public-good question, current briefing count, primary unlock mechanisms, critical review need, and dossier routes. The lists are generated from the current site Impact data and the private source-of-truth enrichment files that produced the publication-ready dossiers.

3.1 Agriculture

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better agro-climate-water-biology intelligence into lower crop loss, improved water productivity, earlier pest and disease warnings, stronger anticipatory action, and faster climate-resilient crop design.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Agriculture?

Briefing count. 5.

Primary unlock mechanisms. weather-soil-crop twins; irrigation allocation; pest and disease early warning; seasonal planning.

Critical review need. agronomic benchmark review, smallholder access, extension workflow governance.

Portfolio readout. Agriculture is a good test of whether the Impact layer can keep together immediate operational decisions and long-cycle biological change. The dossiers move from daily advisory windows to irrigation, pest and disease warning, seasonal planning, and crop-biology design. The common thread is not a claim that a better agricultural system exists. It is the hypothesis that weather, water, soil, crop, pathogen, livestock, and food-security signals may need one inspectable translation layer.

Boundary. The main boundary is local realism. Farm systems differ by climate, crop, capital, tenure, extension capacity, water rights, and data access. A pathway that looks plausible in a global scenario can still fail in a district, cooperative, irrigation scheme, or livestock system. Agriculture therefore needs agronomic benchmarks, equity review, smallholder access review, and comparison with incumbent advisory systems before any stronger language is warranted.

- **Tau for Climate-Smart Irrigation, Soil Moisture, and Water Productivity.** Model: weather-soil-water-crop irrigation advisory twin. First benchmark: irrigation timing, net irrigation requirement, and water-productivity guidance against WaPOR, AquaCrop, and incumbent extension advisories. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/climate-smart-irrigation-soil-moisture-water-productivity/.

- **Tau for Crop Biology, Breeding, Photosynthesis Engineering, and Targeted Gene Design.** Model: crop-physiology, photosynthesis, and breeding-design translation model. First benchmark: trait-response and photosynthesis-efficiency predictions against field-trial and breeding-program baselines. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/crop-biology-breeding-photosynthesis-gene-design/.

- **Tau for Pest, Disease, and Livestock-Stress Early Warning.** Model: weather-pest-disease-livestock stress early-warning twin. First benchmark: outbreak, vector, heat-stress, and livestock-risk alerts against public surveillance and advisory records. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/pest-disease-livestock-stress-early-warning/.

- **Tau for Seasonal Planning, Disaster Anticipation, and Food-System Resilience.** Model: seasonal climate-food-system resilience planning twin. First benchmark: seasonal crop, food-security, and disruption-risk scenarios against FEWS NET, national crop forecasts, and disaster-loss records. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/seasonal-planning-disaster-anticipation-food-system-resilience/.

- **Tau-Grade Operational Agro-Weather Intelligence.** Model: weather-soil-crop-operations advisory twin. First benchmark: spray/no-spray, harvest, irrigation, frost, heat, and field-access windows against incumbent advisory products. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/operational-agro-weather-intelligence/.

3.2 Biodiversity / Restoration

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better coupled ecological intelligence into stronger restoration targeting, functional connectivity, blue-green habitat resilience, earlier stress warnings, and more accountable biodiversity finance.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Biodiversity / Restoration?

Briefing count. 1.

Primary unlock mechanisms. restoration targeting; ecological monitoring; functional connectivity; biodiversity-finance verification.

Critical review need. ecological baselines, monitoring integrity, finance and restoration accountability.

Portfolio readout. Biodiversity / Restoration is represented by one dossier, but it has high connective weight. It links ecological monitoring, restoration targeting, functional connectivity, nature-positive investment, and public accountability. The pathway asks whether better coupled ecological intelligence could make restoration claims more testable and less rhetorical.

Boundary. The boundary is evidential integrity. Biodiversity finance and restoration claims are especially vulnerable to weak baselines, proxy metrics, and performative monitoring. Any pathway would have to survive field evidence, remote-sensing limits, ecological expertise, local stewardship, and finance-accountability review before it could support public-good language beyond scenario mapping.

- **τ for Biodiversity Finance, Monitoring, Restoration Verification, and Nature-Positive Investment Prioritization.** Model: biodiversity monitoring, restoration, and finance-verification twin. First benchmark: restoration verification, habitat-condition, and finance-outcome signals against remote sensing, field audit, and biodiversity indicator baselines. Route: `/publications/research-briefings/public-good/biodiversity-finance-monitoring-restoration-verification/`.

3.3 Climate

A conditional public-good portfolio for making the climate system's causal tree more legible so that mitigation, adaptation, finance, infrastructure, and international coordination can align with the true critical path of risk.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Climate?

Briefing count. 4.

Primary unlock mechanisms. causal climate risk maps; mitigation/adaptation prioritization; finance and coordination diagnostics.

Critical review need. climate-model comparison, uncertainty discipline, finance and policy non-prescription.

Portfolio readout. Climate is the portfolio where causal legibility is the central mechanism. The dossiers do not claim to replace climate science or official assessment processes. They ask whether a tau-informed translation layer could make driver attribution, regional adaptation, ocean/cryosphere risk, and policy sequencing more inspectable under bounded uncertainty.

Boundary. The boundary is authority. Climate pathways sit beside mature institutions, model intercomparison projects, national planning processes, and international assessment regimes. WP005 therefore treats climate impact language as especially downstream: any stronger claim would require comparison with official scenarios, uncertainty conventions, adaptation records, finance constraints, and expert review.

- **τ for Carbon-Cycle, Methane, Aerosol, and Sink Intelligence.** Model: coupled atmosphere-land-ocean-biosphere driver-intelligence twin. First benchmark: methane plume attribution, regional source-sink decomposition, and MRV reconciliation against official systems. Route: `/publications/research-briefings/public-good/carbon-cycle-methane-aerosol-sink-intelligence/`.

- **τ for Climate Policy Optimization, Investment Prioritization, and International Coordination.**

Model: multi-sector climate-policy and investment-prioritization twin. First benchmark: policy-package ranking and marginal-abatement prioritization against official scenarios and national investment plans. Route: `/publications/research-briefings/public-good/climate-policy-optimization-investment-prioritization-international-coordination/`.

- **τ for Regional Adaptation Planning and Sectoral Impact Intelligence.**

Model: regional climate-impact and sector-exposure translation twin. First benchmark: sectoral loss, exposure, and adaptation-option rankings against national adaptation plans and observed impact records. Route: `/publications/research-briefings/public-good/regional-adaptation-sectoral-impact-intelligence/`.

- **τ for Oceans, Cryosphere, Tipping Elements, and Long-Range Resilience.**

Model: ocean-cryosphere tipping-risk and resilience-readout twin. First benchmark: sea-level, cryosphere, ocean-heat, and tipping-signal diagnostics against IPCC, WMO, and Copernicus baselines. Route: `/publications/research-briefings/public-good/oceans-cryosphere-tipping-long-range-resilience/`.

3.4 Disaster

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better hazard physics into earlier warnings, more resilient lifelines, and forecast-linked anticipatory action across multi-hazard disaster domains.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Disaster?

Briefing count. 4.

Primary unlock mechanisms. trigger quality; anticipatory logistics; lifeline resilience; multi-hazard early warning.

Critical review need. false-alarm/missed-event metrics, humanitarian governance, adverse-outcome accountability.

Portfolio readout. Disaster pathways are about time, warning, and action under pressure. The dossiers cluster around anticipatory action, flood and landslide hazards, wildfire/smoke/heat, critical infrastructure, and public-service continuity. The mechanism is trigger quality: earlier action only helps if the trigger is accurate enough, governed enough, and usable by the people who carry the response burden.

Boundary. The boundary is adverse outcome accountability. A false alarm can waste scarce capacity; a missed event can cost lives; an unfair trigger can shift risk onto communities with the least power. Disaster pathways therefore require false-alarm/missed-event metrics, humanitarian governance, lifeline-specific exercises, and explicit responsibility for what happens when the model is wrong.

- **Tau for Anticipatory Action, Humanitarian Logistics, and Climate-Risk Finance.** Model: anticipatory-action, humanitarian logistics, and climate-risk finance twin. First benchmark: trigger timing, pre-positioning, and payout decision quality against historical humanitarian response and forecast-based finance cases. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/anticipatory-action-humanitarian-logistics-climate-risk-finance/>.
- **Tau for Critical Infrastructure, Emergency Operations, and Public-Service Continuity.** Model: critical-infrastructure emergency-operations and public-service continuity twin. First benchmark: service-outage, cascading-failure, and continuity-plan forecasts against incident records and emergency exercises. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/critical-infrastructure-emergency-operations-public-service-continuity/>.
- **Tau for Flood, Coastal Surge, Flash Flood, and Landslide Resilience.** Model: compound flood, surge, flash-flood, and landslide hazard twin. First benchmark: inundation, landslide susceptibility, exposure, and warning lead-time against official hazard maps and event archives. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/flood-coastal-surge-landslide-resilience/>.
- **τ for Wildfire, Smoke, Heat, and Compound-Extreme Health Protection.** Model: wildfire-smoke-heat and compound-extreme health-protection twin. First benchmark: fire-weather, smoke exposure, heat-risk, and public-health alert quality against official warning and health-outcome records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/wildfire-smoke-heat-compound-extreme-health-protection/>.

3.5 Energy

A conditional public-good portfolio for exploring whether a verified tau-informed energy-system model could become relevant to grid reliability and dispatch, DER and storage orchestration, fusion and fission digital twin research, and whole-system energy planning.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Energy?

Briefing count. 5.

Primary unlock mechanisms. grid and reactor twins; DER orchestration; fusion/fission benchmark ladders; system planning.

Critical review need. grid, nuclear, fusion, market, and safety-domain review before any operational use.

Portfolio readout. Energy gathers some of the most technically diverse dossiers: bulk-grid reliability, DER and distribution planning, fusion twins, advanced fission, and integrated energy-system planning. The shared question is whether law-faithful twins and coupled-system planning could make energy decisions more reliable, more inspectable, and more robust under

high renewable penetration and safety-critical constraints.

Boundary. The boundary is safety and institutional authority. Grid, nuclear, fusion, market, and planning systems already operate under strict technical and regulatory regimes. No energy dossier should be read as operational advice. Any pathway would require domain benchmarks, safety review, regulator-facing evidence, market and labor analysis, and clear separation between exploratory modeling and real operations.

- **Tau for DER Orchestration, Storage, Flexible Demand, Microgrids, and T&D Planning.** Model: DER, storage, flexible-demand, microgrid, and T&D planning twin. First benchmark: hosting capacity, flexibility dispatch, and resilience planning against utility planning tools and feeder measurements. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/der-storage-flexible-demand-microgrids-td-planning/>.
- **Tau-Grade Grid Digital Twins, Reliability, Dispatch, and Resilience.** Model: bulk-grid reliability, dispatch, and resilience twin. First benchmark: contingency, dispatch, outage, and restoration decisions against system-operator simulations and historical events. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/grid-digital-twins-reliability-dispatch-resilience/>.
- **τ for Advanced Fission Safety, Operations, Licensing, and Fleet Modernization.** Model: advanced-fission safety, operations, licensing, and fleet-modernization twin. First benchmark: safety-case, thermal-hydraulic, degradation, and operations decision support against regulator-accepted and plant-data baselines. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/advanced-fission-safety-operations-licensing-fleet-modernization/>.
- **τ for Fusion Digital Twins, Plasma Control, Heat Exhaust, and ITER → DEMO → Commercialization.** Model: law-faithful plasma, control, heat-exhaust, and machine-design twin. First benchmark: IMAS-compatible scenario, disruption, divertor, and synthetic-diagnostic tasks against ITER/EUROfusion benchmark workflows. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/fusion-digital-twins-plasma-control-heat-exhaust-iter-demo/>.
- **τ for Integrated Energy-System Planning, Market Design, Investment Prioritization, and International Coordination.** Model: integrated energy-system planning, market-design, and investment-coordination twin. First benchmark: capacity expansion, flexibility, reliability, and market-design outputs against official energy-system planning scenarios. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/integrated-energy-system-planning-market-design-investment-coordination/>.

3.6 Ocean

A conditional public-good portfolio for exploring whether a shared ocean-state model could become relevant to trade, climate decarbonization, blue food systems, search and rescue, and marine stewardship simultaneously.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Ocean?

Briefing count. 4.

Primary unlock mechanisms. ocean-state twins; maritime routing; blue-food intelligence; marine emergency response.

Critical review need. maritime, ecosystem, safety, and climate-domain benchmarking.

Portfolio readout. Ocean pathways connect logistics, climate, food, emergency response, and stewardship. The portfolio asks whether shared ocean-state intelligence could improve maritime routing, blue-food resilience, cleanup prioritization, search and rescue, and marine decarbonization without splitting the ocean into unrelated operational silos.

Boundary. The boundary is observation and governance. Ocean systems are sparse, dynamic, jurisdictionally complex, and ecologically fragile. A useful pathway would need comparison with observation networks, AIS and port data, fisheries and aquaculture baselines, ecological constraints, safety protocols, and marine-governance regimes.

- **τ and Blue Food Systems.** Model: blue-food, aquaculture, fisheries, and marine-ecosystem intelligence twin. First benchmark: stock, habitat, farm-risk, and food-system outputs against fisheries, aquaculture, and marine observation baselines. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/blue-food-systems-marine-ecosystem-intelligence/>.
- **τ and Climate-Smart Shipping.** Model: shipping decarbonization, wind-corridor, routing, and port-energy twin. First benchmark: route emissions, wind-assist opportunity, port-delay, and fuel-use outputs against AIS, weather, and port-operation baselines. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/climate-smart-shipping-decarbonization-wind-corridors/>.
- **τ and Ocean Stewardship, Cleanup, and Marine Emergency Response.** Model: ocean stewardship, cleanup, drift, and marine-emergency response twin. First benchmark: debris drift, spill response, cleanup prioritization, and emergency logistics against incident and observation records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/ocean-stewardship-cleanup-marine-emergency-response/>.
- **τ and the Ocean Logistics Opportunity.** Model: ocean logistics, maritime routing, port-flow, and green-corridor twin. First benchmark: ETA, congestion, route-emissions, and port-flow predictions against AIS and port-call data.

Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/ocean-logistics-maritime-routing-port-flow-green-corridors/>.

3.7 One Health

A conditional public-good portfolio for exploring whether an integrated environmental-biological-operational model could become relevant to disease early warning, health-system resilience, environmental surveillance, food safety, and precision public health simultaneously.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in One Health?

Briefing count. 4.

Primary unlock mechanisms. environment-pathogen-health coupling; wastewater surveillance; food-safety exposure pathways.

Critical review need. public-health, veterinary, environmental, privacy, and equity review.

Portfolio readout. One Health is where environmental, animal, human, and operational signals must be read together. The dossiers cover vector-borne disease, zoonotic spillover, AMR and wastewater surveillance, food safety, and physiology-aware prevention. The possible public-good value lies in making cross-boundary exposure and transmission pathways more legible before crises become visible in clinical systems.

Boundary. The boundary is trust. Health-relevant pathways involve privacy, surveillance, stigma, equity, clinical uncertainty, and public authority. No One Health dossier is medical advice or public-health policy. Every pathway would require public-health, veterinary, environmental, ethics, privacy, and community review before it could move beyond scenario analysis.

- **Tau for AMR, Wastewater/Environmental Surveillance, and Environmental Transmission Intelligence.** Model: wastewater-environment-clinical One Health transmission twin. First benchmark: wastewater AMR signal attribution, storm/flood pathway prediction, and intervention-ranking against sentinel surveillance. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/amr-wastewater-environmental-transmission-intelligence/>.
- **Tau for Food Safety, Livestock/Wildlife Interface, and Community Exposure Intelligence.** Model: food-safety, livestock, wildlife-interface, and community-exposure twin. First benchmark: contamination, spillover, and exposure-risk alerts against food-safety, veterinary, and public-health surveillance records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/food-safety-livestock-wildlife-community-exposure/>.
- **Tau-Grade One Health Early Warning for Vector-Borne Disease, Zoonotic Spillover, and Climate-Sensitive Outbreaks.** Model: vector-borne disease, zoonotic spillover,

climate-sensitive outbreak early-warning twin. First benchmark: vector suitability, spillover-risk, and outbreak-warning lead time against surveillance and climate records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/one-health-vector-zoonotic-spillover-climate-outbreaks/>.

- **τ for Precision Public Health, Physiology-Aware Prevention, and Safer Therapeutics / Response Optimization.** Model: precision public-health, physiology-aware prevention, and response-optimization twin. First benchmark: risk stratification, prevention targeting, and response optimization against public-health cohort and intervention baselines. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/precision-public-health-physiology-prevention-safer-therapeutics/>.

3.8 Pollution / Circularity

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better physical intelligence about emissions, toxic pathways, waste flows, plastics leakage, and material dynamics into lower exposure, cleaner cities, stronger remediation, better waste operations, and circular-system redesign.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Pollution / Circularity?

Briefing count. 4.

Primary unlock mechanisms. pollutant pathway models; exposure intelligence; waste-flow maps; circular-system redesign.

Critical review need. exposure, remediation, compliance, labor, and environmental justice review.

Portfolio readout. Pollution / Circularity focuses on hidden pathways: air pollution, toxic releases, emissions attribution, waste flows, plastics leakage, and remediation priorities. The recurring mechanism is causal pathway mapping across media and institutions: source, transport, exposure, compliance, cleanup, and circular redesign.

Boundary. The boundary is environmental justice and enforcement realism. A model can reveal exposure without creating remediation capacity. It can identify a source without solving labor, legal, or compliance questions. These pathways therefore require monitoring evidence, community safeguards, regulator review, labor and justice assessment, and explicit anti-greenwashing discipline.

- **τ for Chemicals, Toxic Releases, Lead/PFAS/Heavy Metals, Water-Soil-Air Plume Intelligence, and Remediation.** Model: toxic-release, PFAS, heavy-metal, plume, and remediation-prioritization twin. First benchmark: plume extent, exposure pathway, and remediation prioritization against monitoring, incident, and cleanup records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/chemicals-toxic-releases-lead-pfas-heavy-metals-plume-remediation/>.

- **τ for Industrial, Transport, and Agricultural Emissions Attribution, Compliance, and High-Return Abatement Targeting.** Model: industrial, transport, and agricultural emissions-attribution and compliance twin. First benchmark: source attribution, compliance triage, and abatement ranking against inventories, sensor networks, and enforcement records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/industrial-transport-agricultural-emissions-attribution-compliance-abatement/>.

- **τ -Grade Clean-Air Digital Twins, Exposure Intelligence, and Urban/Regional Health Protection.** Model: clean-air digital twin and exposure-intelligence model. First benchmark: exposure, source-contribution, and intervention-priority outputs against monitoring networks and health-risk baselines. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/clean-air-digital-twins-exposure-intelligence/>.

- **τ for Waste Systems, Plastics Leakage, Litter Interception, Municipal/Industrial Waste Operations, and Zero-Waste Transitions.** Model: waste-system, plastics leakage, litter-interception, and zero-waste transition twin. First benchmark: leakage, collection, sorting, diversion, and intervention-priority outputs against municipal and industrial waste records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/waste-systems-plastics-leakage-zero-waste/>.

3.9 Solar

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better solar-weather-grid physics into lower reserve costs, faster DER interconnection, stronger critical-load resilience, and solar-synchronized flexible demand.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Solar?

Briefing count. 5.

Primary unlock mechanisms. solar-weather-grid forecasting; DER visibility; resilience planning; flexible demand synchronization.

Critical review need. grid-code, distribution-utility, resilience, and consumer-safeguard review.

Portfolio readout. Solar is the portfolio where weather, grid physics, distributed assets, storage, flexible demand, and resilience converge. The dossiers ask whether solar-weather-grid intelligence could reduce uncertainty in bulk dispatch, behind-the-meter visibility, microgrid planning, asset protection, and load synchronization.

Boundary. The boundary is grid integration. Forecasting value depends on operators, market rules, feeders, telemetry, standards, and consumer safeguards. Solar pathways cannot be evaluated only by theoretical forecast quality. They need grid-

code review, utility data, operational baselines, resilience tests, privacy safeguards, and consumer-protection constraints.

- **Tau-Grade Solar Forecasting for Bulk-Grid Operations and Market Dispatch.** Model: bulk-grid solar forecasting, dispatch, and market-integration twin. First benchmark: solar forecast, ramp, curtailment, and dispatch-quality outputs against system-operator and market data. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/bulk-grid-solar-forecasting/>.
- **τ for Distributed PV Visibility and Distribution-Grid Orchestration.** Model: distributed PV visibility and distribution-grid orchestration twin. First benchmark: behind-the-meter visibility, feeder hosting capacity, voltage, and orchestration outputs against feeder telemetry. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/distributed-pv-visibility-distribution-grid-orchestration/>.
- **τ for PV Asset Protection, Storm-Hardening, and Long-Term System Planning.** Model: PV asset-protection, storm-hardening, and long-term planning twin. First benchmark: storm damage, degradation, availability, and resilience planning against asset, weather, and insurance records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/pv-asset-protection-storm-hardening-long-term-planning/>.
- **τ for Solar-Plus-Storage, Microgrids, and Critical-Infrastructure Resilience.** Model: solar-plus-storage, microgrid, and critical-infrastructure resilience twin. First benchmark: islanding, load-shed, restoration, and resilience metrics against microgrid tests and outage records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/solar-storage-microgrids-critical-infrastructure-resilience/>.
- **τ for Solar-Synchronized Flexible Demand and Grid Logistics.** Model: solar-synchronized flexible-demand and grid-logistics twin. First benchmark: load shifting, curtailment reduction, and logistics scheduling against meter, market, and fleet-operation data. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/solar-synchronized-flexible-demand-grid-logistics/>.

3.10 Water / WASH

A conditional public-good portfolio for translating better water-system physics into safer drinking water, fewer network losses, stronger sanitation and reuse, better basin allocation, and improved WASH continuity in the places where vulnerability is highest.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Water / WASH?

Briefing count. 5.

Primary unlock mechanisms. water-network twins; source-quality warning; basin allocation; WASH continuity and reuse.

Critical review need. water-quality, utility, sanitation, basin, and vulnerable-setting review.

Portfolio readout. Water / WASH is a direct public-good portfolio because water failures become health, food, dignity, and continuity failures. The dossiers cover source and treatment warning, distribution networks, basin allocation, WASH continuity, wastewater, stormwater, sanitation, and reuse. The shared mechanism is a water-system twin with explicit quality, pressure, allocation, and service-continuity burdens.

Boundary. The boundary is vulnerability. Water and sanitation pathways affect people who often cannot choose their infrastructure. Any proposed model must be tested against utility records, quality monitoring, basin data, humanitarian WASH constraints, public-health safeguards, and accountability for service inequity.

- **Tau-Grade Drinking-Water Source, Treatment, and Quality Early Warning.** Model: drinking-water source, treatment, quality, and early-warning twin. First benchmark: source-water risk, treatment response, and quality-event warning against monitoring, treatment, and incident records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/drinking-water-source-treatment-quality-early-warning/>.
- **τ for Distribution Networks, Leakage, Pressure, and Service Continuity.** Model: water distribution leakage, pressure, and service-continuity twin. First benchmark: leak detection, pressure management, outage, and non-revenue-water outputs against utility telemetry and work-order records. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/distribution-networks-leakage-pressure-service-continuity/>.
- **τ for River-Basin, Groundwater, Drought-Flood Allocation, and Water Productivity.** Model: river-basin, groundwater, drought-flood allocation, and water-productivity twin. First benchmark: allocation, drought/flood tradeoff, groundwater stress, and water-productivity outputs against basin records and satellite products. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/river-basin-groundwater-drought-flood-allocation-water-productivity/>.
- **τ for WASH in Health Facilities, Schools, Camps, and Climate-Vulnerable Settlements.** Model: WASH service continuity twin for health facilities, schools, camps, and climate-vulnerable settlements. First benchmark: service interruption, quality, access, and emergency-response outputs against WASH facility and humanitarian service data. Route: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/wash-health-facilities-schools-camps-climate-vulnerable-settlements/>.
- **τ for Wastewater, Stormwater, Sanitation, and Circular Water Reuse.** Model: wastewater, stormwater, sanitation, and circular-reuse twin. First benchmark: overflow, reuse quality, treatment performance, and circular-water

outputs against utility, rainfall, and monitoring records. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/wastewater-stormwater-sanitation-circular-reuse/.

3.11 Weather

A conditional public-good portfolio for making weather, climate intelligence, and disaster early warning materially better - from extreme-event forecasting and flood impact translation to wildfire/smoke intelligence, grid-weather coupling, drought planning, and climate adaptation.

Public-good question. If upstream Results and translation assumptions survived review, what would become worth testing in Weather?

Briefing count. 3.

Primary unlock mechanisms. bounded-error weather forecasting; aviation and logistics routing; contrail and extreme-event intelligence.

Critical review need. meteorological skill, aviation safety, emergency-management, and climate-service review.

Portfolio readout. Weather is both its own portfolio and an upstream dependency for many others. The dossiers focus on mainstream aviation weather, new aerial logistics, and climate-smart aviation. They ask whether bounded-error weather intelligence could improve routing, safety, delay recovery, contrail avoidance, and service continuity.

Boundary. The boundary is safety-critical certification. Aviation and aerial logistics cannot accept speculative model authority. Weather pathways require meteorological skill tests, aviation-safety review, operational simulations, adverse-event records, regulatory constraints, and a clear non-deployment boundary until independent evidence says otherwise.

- **Tau-Grade Aviation Weather Intelligence for Mainstream Aviation.** Model: aviation weather, routing, turbulence, icing, and airport-flow twin. First benchmark:

route, delay, turbulence, icing, and convective-weather decisions against aviation weather and operations records. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/aviation-weather-intelligence/.

- **τ and New Aerial Logistics.** Model: new aerial logistics, AAM, airship, humanitarian, and remote-service twin. First benchmark: weather-window, payload, route-risk, and service-continuity outputs against remote logistics and emergency-response records. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/new-aerial-logistics-aam-airships-humanitarian-remote/.
- **τ -Enabled Climate-Smart Aviation.** Model: climate-smart aviation, contrail avoidance, routing, and decarbonization twin. First benchmark: contrail-risk, route-emissions, delay, and fuel-burn tradeoffs against weather, flight, and climate-impact baselines. Route: /publications/research-briefings/public-good/climate-smart-aviation-contrail-routing-decarbonization/.

3.12 Reading across portfolios

The public-good portfolios are not isolated columns. Weather intelligence affects disaster triggers, agricultural planning, aviation safety, grid operations, water allocation, and wildfire/smoke exposure. Water and WASH interact with agriculture, One Health, climate adaptation, disaster resilience, and pollution. Energy and solar interact with climate mitigation, critical infrastructure resilience, weather forecasting, and industrial systems. Ocean systems connect climate, food, shipping, biodiversity, and emergency response.

This coupling is one reason WP005 exists as a synthesis. A reader who encounters only one dossier may see a domain question. A reader who sees all 44 can see a recurring systems question: could a more faithful, bounded-error, reviewable model family improve public decisions across coupled domains if upstream conditions held? The correct answer is not yes. The correct answer is that the question is now structured enough to test, challenge, weaken, or retire.

§ 4 | Recurring Unlock Mechanisms

The 44 dossiers differ by domain, but they repeat a smaller set of mechanisms. Those mechanisms are the main editorial object of WP005. They explain why the same upstream research pro-

gram could become relevant to apparently distant public-good domains without claiming that any such relevance has been achieved.

MECHANISM	CONDITIONAL ROLE	TYPICAL DOMAINS	FAILURE PRESSURE
Law-faithful digital twins	A domain system is represented as a structurally faithful, bounded-error, inspectable model rather than as an opaque forecast or dashboard.	Weather, water, agriculture, grid, fusion, fission, ocean, health-environment systems.	If the twin cannot beat incumbent baselines or expose its uncertainty, the pathway weakens.
Bounded-error forecasting	A forecast becomes useful only if uncertainty, false alarms, missed events, and lead time are measured.	Hazards, weather, wildfire, floods, aviation, grid weather, seasonal food security.	If the error envelope is unclear or worse than current practice, no public-good claim follows.
Coupled-system intelligence	The model treats domains as connected rather than isolated: food-water-energy, climate-disaster-finance, One Health, ocean-trade-climate.	Climate, disaster, One Health, ocean, water, agriculture, energy.	Coupling can magnify error; governance and benchmark design must follow the coupling.
Trigger and allocation quality	The pathway improves the timing, location, or prioritization of action under uncertainty.	Forecast-based finance, logistics, irrigation, grid dispatch, emergency response.	A better model is not enough if triggers are unfair, late, unsafe, or institutionally unusable.
Causal risk maps	A pathway makes critical paths and upstream dependencies more legible.	Climate adaptation, pollution pathways, restoration targeting, infrastructure failures, health exposure.	If causal attribution is speculative or not benchmarked, the map must remain exploratory.
Shadow-mode benchmark ladders	A proposal is compared with incumbent systems before any operational authority is considered.	All portfolios, especially safety-critical domains.	Skipping shadow mode turns a scenario into an overclaim.
Simulation-to-governance pathways	Technical outputs are translated into accountable decisions with review, audit, equity, and refusal routes.	Water, health, disaster, energy, climate finance, biodiversity, pollution.	Without governance, technical quality can become public risk.
Translation-layer construction	Formal or theoretical claims are converted into domain models, data interfaces, metrics, and workflows.	All 44 dossiers.	If translation is not specified, the impact pathway is only a topic label.

4.1 Mechanism inspection caselets

Law-faithful digital twins. A digital-twin pathway is strongest when it names the state variables, coupling structure, observation interfaces, coarse-graining choices, and error envelope. The energy and solar portfolios make this burden visible in grid, DER, fusion, fission, and asset-protection pathways. The water and agriculture portfolios make it visible in source, treatment, distribution, irrigation, soil, crop, and pest systems. The reviewer should ask whether “twin” means an inspectable model family or merely a metaphor. If it is only a metaphor, the pathway should be weakened.

Bounded-error forecasting. A forecast pathway must be judged by more than headline accuracy. In aviation, the relevant question may be route safety, delay recovery, turbulence risk, icing, convective avoidance, or contrail tradeoffs. In disaster, it may be trigger lead time, false alarms, missed events, and lo-

gistics consequences. In agriculture, it may be spray windows, frost warning, harvest timing, irrigation timing, or livestock heat stress. A forecast that does not expose its own error cannot carry public-good authority.

Coupled-system intelligence. Coupling is powerful because many public failures are failures between systems: climate and finance, weather and infrastructure, water and health, ocean and trade, pollution and exposure, solar and grid operations. But coupling also creates more ways to be wrong. A coupled model can import uncertainty from one system into another, disguise a weak link, or make a decision look more complete than it is. Reviewers should therefore ask which coupling is measured, which is inferred, and which remains a planning assumption.

Trigger and allocation quality. Trigger pathways are attractive because they translate information into action. They are also ethically sensitive. A forecast-based finance trigger that pays out too

late may fail its humanitarian purpose; one that pays out too often may exhaust resources or create mistrust. A water-allocation trigger may improve aggregate productivity while hurting a downstream community. A grid-dispatch trigger may improve cost while shifting risk to critical loads. Trigger quality must therefore be evaluated with decision consequences, not only model scores.

Causal risk maps. Causal maps are useful when they show where a risk comes from and where intervention might matter. Climate adaptation, pollution pathways, biodiversity restoration, One Health exposure, and infrastructure resilience all depend on such maps. But a causal map can become dangerous when it turns uncertain attribution into apparent authority. The benchmark question is not whether the map is elegant. It is whether the map predicts, explains, or prioritizes better than a domain baseline under disclosed uncertainty.

Shadow-mode benchmark ladders. Shadow mode is the series' antidote to premature deployment language. The model can be tested without authority. It can produce recommendations that no one follows. It can be scored against actual events. It can fail harmlessly. This is especially important in public-health, aviation, grid, disaster, nuclear, water-quality, and humanitarian pathways. Readers should become suspicious whenever a dossier-like pathway jumps from scenario language directly to pilot language without a shadow-mode burden.

Simulation-to-governance pathways. Simulation becomes public-good relevant only if someone can govern its outputs. That requires public authority, professional responsibility, affected-stakeholder visibility, audit logs, threshold controls, roll-back, appeals, and refusal routes. A model that helps a technical team but cannot be explained to the institution that would carry the consequence is not ready for uptake. In WP005, governance is not a decoration on impact; it is a precondition for stronger claims.

Translation-layer construction. The translation layer is the most common place for overclaiming because it is where theory language meets domain language. A phrase such as " τ for water" or " τ for climate-smart aviation" can sound larger than the actual proposal. The responsible translation layer shrinks it: this model, these variables, this data interface, this benchmark, this governance burden, this failure protocol. The shrinkage is not a loss. It is what makes public inspection possible.

4.2 Law-faithful twins are not products

Many dossiers use the language of twins: grid twins, reactor twins, water twins, weather-soil-crop twins, ocean-state twins, disease-environment twins, and pollution-pathway twins. This is useful language only if it remains bounded. The claim is not that a product exists. The claim is that, under the τ assumption, a domain-specific model could be specified and benchmarked as

a candidate translation layer.

The same warning applies to "law-faithful." In WP005, law-faithful does not mean externally accepted, empirically validated, or operationally safe. It means that the proposed model would have to preserve the relevant structure well enough to make its own errors, approximations, and coarse-grainings inspectable.

4.3 Forecasting and trigger quality

The most practical public-good dossiers often reduce to a trigger question: when should an alert, allocation, dispatch, intervention, inspection, or finance release occur? Disaster, weather, water, agriculture, aviation, wildfire, grid, and humanitarian pathways all depend on triggers. Better trigger quality can mean more lead time, fewer false alarms, fewer missed events, or better resource positioning. It can also mean the opposite if the model is badly governed.

This is why trigger pathways require benchmark ladders. A forecast that looks impressive in prose must be compared against actual baselines, retrospective events, incumbent advisory systems, and adverse-outcome records. Without that comparison, the pathway remains a hypothesis.

4.4 Coupled systems and causal maps

The portfolio system repeatedly points to coupled systems. Climate affects water, agriculture, energy, health, biodiversity, disaster risk, and ocean systems. Pollution interacts with health, water, labor, compliance, and urban planning. Solar and energy systems interact with weather, grid reliability, market design, flexible demand, and critical infrastructure. One Health binds environmental, animal, human, food, and public-health systems.

Coupling is attractive because many public-good failures are cross-domain failures. But coupling is also dangerous because it can hide error. The stronger the coupling, the more explicit the causal risk map must be. Readers should ask what is upstream, what is downstream, what is inferred, what is measured, and what would falsify the proposed linkage.

4.5 Simulation-to-governance

The final recurring mechanism is not technical; it is institutional. A model that could improve a forecast or allocation still has to pass through public authority, procurement, safety review, affected-stakeholder assessment, labor effects, privacy review, and accountability. Some domains should reject models that are technically interesting but socially unsafe. Others may require years of shadow-mode comparison before any pilot is reasonable.

WP005 therefore treats governance as part of the mechanism taxonomy. The public good is not the model. The public good, if ever realized, would be a governed decision pathway in which the model has earned a bounded role.

§ 5 | Benchmark and Governance Architecture

The Global Public Good layer becomes useful only when it turns consequence language into a benchmarkable burden. Without that conversion, public-good prose is too easy to inflate. A phrase such as “could improve warning quality” is not yet a public-good claim. It becomes testable only when the dossier says which warnings, against which baseline, over which events, for which affected people, with what false-alarm and missed-event costs, and under whose authority.

The same structure applies across the series. An irrigation pathway needs weather, soil, crop, water, and farm-operation benchmarks. A disaster pathway needs trigger, logistics, and adverse-

outcome benchmarks. A health pathway needs surveillance, privacy, equity, and clinical or public-health review. An energy pathway needs reliability, safety, grid-code, market, and operator benchmarks. The benchmark is where the conditional scenario becomes vulnerable to evidence.

5.1 Benchmark families

The 44 dossiers use different domain vocabularies, but their benchmark needs can be grouped into common families. This grouping is important because it lets reviewers compare distant portfolios without pretending the domains are the same.

BENCHMARK FAMILY	WHAT IT TESTS	TYPICAL EVIDENCE	FAILURE MODE
Skill and forecast	Whether the proposed model improves prediction, warning, routing, attribution, or state estimation.	Historical events, official forecasts, incumbent advisories, sensor records, satellite products, utility telemetry.	The model performs no better than current practice or hides uncertainty.
Decision quality	Whether a better model would improve the actual decision, not only a technical metric.	Trigger records, dispatch logs, water allocation decisions, emergency exercises, extension advice, market simulations.	A technically better output does not improve the operational choice.
Safety and adverse outcomes	Whether use could create harm through false alarms, missed events, automation bias, unsafe recommendations, or brittle behavior.	Incident records, safety cases, red-team review, stress tests, edge cases, retrospective failures.	The model creates unacceptable safety risk even if average performance improves.
Equity and access	Whether benefits, burdens, errors, and costs are distributed fairly.	Community data, vulnerable-setting audits, smallholder access, labor effects, WASH and health equity records.	The pathway improves aggregate metrics while worsening inequity.
Governability	Whether a responsible institution can audit, constrain, procure, reject, and operate the pathway.	Legal authority, procurement rules, accountability processes, data agreements, public-interest review.	No accountable owner can govern the model.
Incumbent comparison	Whether the pathway improves on existing systems rather than an imagined blank slate.	Official products, operational tools, extension systems, public-health surveillance, utility and aviation systems.	The dossier underestimates incumbent capability or cost.

5.2 Shadow mode as the default next step

For most public-good pathways, the first responsible empirical step would be shadow mode. Shadow mode means that a model is run beside existing practice without authority. It can be wrong without changing a real decision. It can be scored against incumbent systems. It can expose data gaps, governance burdens, interface failures, and false confidence before any pilot is contemplated.

Shadow mode is especially important where decisions are high-stakes or time-sensitive. In disaster response, it can compare triggers against past events and response timelines. In grid operations, it can compare dispatch and reliability scenarios against operator simulations. In water systems, it can compare alerts against quality events, pressure records, and work orders. In health surveillance, it can compare signals against privacy-preserving sentinel data. In aviation, it can compare route, de-

lay, turbulence, icing, and contrail tradeoffs against operational records without changing flights.

This is why WP005 avoids any rhetoric of “rollout.” The useful near-term question is not how to deploy. It is how to specify the first shadow-mode test well enough that a domain expert can reject it.

5.3 Governance before pilot language

Governance is not a final checkbox after performance improves. It changes what performance means. A warning system that improves average lead time but produces unacceptable false alarms for the poorest communities is not a clean success. A pollution model that identifies exposure but creates surveillance harms is not a clean success. A grid model that improves an optimization target while shifting risk to critical-load users is not a clean success. A biodiversity-finance model that makes monitoring

cheaper but easier to game is not a clean success.

Governance should therefore be part of the first benchmark design. The dossier should ask who can be harmed, who can contest the output, who can audit the model, who owns the data, who sets thresholds, what happens when outputs are wrong, and whether affected groups can refuse or shape the use. A public-good scenario that cannot answer those questions should remain a scenario.

5.4 Portfolio-specific governance burdens

The governance burden differs by portfolio. Agriculture needs smallholder, extension, land-tenure, water-rights, and market-access sensitivity. Biodiversity and restoration need community stewardship, field evidence, anti-greenwashing, and finance accountability. Climate needs uncertainty discipline and respect for assessment institutions. Disaster needs humanitarian accountability and responsibility for false alarms and missed events. Energy and solar need safety, grid-code, market, and operator review. Ocean needs maritime safety, jurisdictional authority, fisheries governance, and ecological caution. One Health needs privacy, stigma, public-health ethics, veterinary review, and community trust. Pollution and circularity need environmental justice, labor, regulatory, and enforcement realism. Water/WASH needs public-health, service equity, utility, sanitation, and vulnerable-setting review. Weather and aviation need meteorological skill and safety-critical certification discipline.

This diversity prevents a single generic "impact" claim. WP005 can name common mechanisms, but the governance test remains domain-specific. The repeated portfolio grammar is a way to keep those two truths together.

5.5 What a first benchmark packet should contain

If a pathway moved from scenario map toward a real benchmark packet, the packet should contain at least the following elements:

1. A narrowly scoped decision problem, such as flood-trigger timing, solar forecast ramp error, water-quality warning, feeder hosting capacity, or wastewater surveillance attribution.
2. A source route back to the relevant Result, Verify surface, Corpus object, TauLib status, publication artifact, or dossier assumption.
3. A baseline set of incumbent systems, official products, or historical decision records.

4. A metric set that includes accuracy, uncertainty, false alarms, missed events, lead time, decision quality, and adverse outcomes where relevant.
5. A data-rights and privacy statement.
6. A governance statement naming the responsible reviewer, affected stakeholders, safety constraints, and refusal rights.
7. A shadow-mode protocol that prevents the model from controlling real decisions.
8. A weakening and retirement protocol.

This packet is intentionally more boring than an impact story. That is its virtue. It is the form in which a scenario becomes inspectable by people who do not owe the theory trust.

5.6 Funding and support without overclaiming

Foundations, supporters, and institutional readers may care about public-good pathways before domain validation is complete. That is legitimate, provided the support is framed correctly. The responsible support object is not "deploy this impact." It is "make the pathway testable": improve source traceability, benchmark design, domain review, translation tooling, data interfaces, governance analysis, and public inspection.

This distinction matters because support can create pressure to overclaim. WP005 therefore treats funding language as part of the same claim discipline. A supporter can help create an inspection route. A supporter cannot convert a scenario into a delivered public good by wanting it to be one.

5.7 The public-good burden

The public-good burden is heavier than the technical burden. A pathway has to be true enough, useful enough, governable enough, safe enough, fair enough, and institutionally receivable enough. Failing any one of those tests can weaken or retire the pathway. That does not make the Impact lane weak. It makes it honest.

The benefit of publishing the 44 dossiers is therefore not that the program can claim 44 impacts. It is that 44 possible public-good pathways now have a public shape that can be questioned. The benefit of WP005 is that those shapes can be read as one disciplined conditional system.

§ 6 | Inspection and Use

WP005 is meant to be used. It gives different readers a disciplined way to move from an impact phrase to the surfaces that can support, weaken, or retire it. The same pathway should look different to a first-contact reader, a domain reviewer, a journalist, a funder, and a technical reviewer because each has a different burden.

6.1 Audience routes

First-contact readers. A first-contact reader should not begin with the most interesting domain. They should first understand the doctrine of conditionality. The correct path is: claim boundary, Impact chain, portfolio overview, and then one dossier. This prevents a common misunderstanding: reading the existence of a climate, health, water, or energy dossier as evidence that the program has already delivered something in that domain. The first-contact reader's question is not "has this impact happened?" It is "what would have to be true before this pathway could responsibly be investigated?"

Domain reviewers. A domain reviewer should begin with the relevant portfolio and then immediately move into the dossier's benchmark and governance sections. The reviewer does not need to accept the theory in order to evaluate whether the domain translation is coherent. They can ask whether the baseline is current, whether incumbent systems are treated fairly, whether the proposed metrics would matter, whether data exist, whether safety and equity burdens are visible, and what would retire the pathway. Domain review is allowed to be negative. A negative review can improve the public record by weakening a scenario that should not be carried forward.

Technical reviewers. A technical reviewer should move upstream. The Impact lane is downstream of Results, Verify, Corpus, TauLib, and Publications. If a dossier depends on a formal, mathematical, physical, or bridge claim, the technical reviewer

should inspect the upstream route rather than debating the impact language alone. They should ask whether the claim is formalized, whether it is a bridge, whether it is empirical, whether TauLib owns any part of the burden, and what the trust-budget disclosure says. A technical rejection upstream propagates downstream.

Journalists and editors. Journalists should read the safe/unsafe claim table before quoting any impact pathway. The most accurate headline is rarely the most dramatic one. "Panta Rhei publishes conditional public-good scenario maps across 11 portfolios" is accurate. "T Theory solves climate, water, or energy" is not. Editors should preserve the difference between publication, inspection, review, adoption, and achieved impact. If a story cannot preserve that difference, the story is not ready.

Foundations, supporters, and public-interest readers. Supporters may reasonably care about pathways before they are validated. The appropriate object of support is the inspection route: source cleanup, benchmark design, domain review, translation tooling, governance analysis, and publication infrastructure. The inappropriate object is an impact claim. WP005 makes it possible to support the creation of evidence without pretending that the evidence already exists.

Institutional readers. Institutional readers should treat WP005 as a public orientation artifact. It is not procurement advice, investment advice, technical advice, safety advice, medical advice, legal advice, or policy advice. Its value is to make possible questions explicit. If an institution later wanted to examine a pathway, the next responsible step would be a scoped benchmark and governance packet, not a deployment decision.

6.2 How to inspect a public-good pathway

NO.	CHECK	QUESTION
1	Identify the dossier	Which portfolio and dossier own the pathway? Does the reader have the exact landing route?
2	Read the claim boundary	Does the dossier deny deployment, product, validation, policy, and certified-impact claims?
3	Find upstream Results	Which Result, monograph, Registry, or TauLib surface would have to hold?
4	Check Verify status	What is formalized, what is a bridge, what is empirical, and what remains unreviewed?
5	Name translation assumptions	What model, data interface, metric, and domain workflow are being proposed?
6	Locate benchmarks	What incumbent systems, retrospective cases, and error measures would be used?
7	Inspect governance	Who could be harmed, who would decide, who can audit, and who can refuse?
8	Ask what would weaken it	What would falsify, downgrade, or retire the pathway?
9	Check uptake requirements	What institutional capacity, legal authority, and operational context would be needed?
10	Only then discuss relevance	Public-good relevance is downstream of the prior nine checks.

6.3 How to read the 44 dossiers

The dossiers are intentionally repetitive. Repetition is a feature. Each dossier has a safe-harbor page, claim/non-claim boundary, release metadata, source and landing routes, executive summary, scope, opportunity baseline, working τ assumptions, structured opportunity map, translation ladder, governance guardrails, benchmark suite, and accountability addendum. A reader should not skip the claim boundary and jump to the most interesting domain paragraph. The boundary is part of the artifact.

The dossiers also separate full-source HTML pages from PDF dossiers. The HTML pages make the public route inspectable; the PDFs make the route citable and offline. Neither form is a product, implementation plan, procurement document, medical or legal advice, engineering recommendation, safety case, regulatory filing, financial advice, or certified impact assessment.

6.4 Domain reviewer checklist

Domain reviewers should read WP005 with permission to say no. A rejection is not a failure of the observatory. It is one of the functions the observatory exists to make possible.

NO.	CHECK	QUESTION
1	Baseline fairness	Are incumbent systems represented fairly and with current baselines?
2	Metric adequacy	Do the proposed metrics capture the domain's real decision burden?
3	Data reality	Are the needed observations, records, privacy permissions, and data quality plausible?
4	Uncertainty discipline	Are uncertainty, false alarms, missed events, and adverse outcomes explicit?
5	Scope boundaries	Is the domain scope narrow enough for a benchmarkable first test?
6	Governance fit	Could the pathway be governed by an accountable institution without bypassing affected stakeholders?
7	Safety and misuse	Could the same model create harm, exclusion, surveillance, false confidence, or unsafe automation?
8	Retirement criteria	Does the dossier say what would weaken or retire the pathway?

6.5 Journalist safe and unsafe claims

language into outcome language.

Science journalists and public communicators need a different kind of checklist. The main risk is converting conditional scenario

CLAIM TYPE	SAFE FORMULATION	UNSAFE FORMULATION
Portfolio existence	Panta Rhei has published conditional scenario maps across 11 public-good portfolios and 44 public-good dossiers.	Panta Rhei has delivered impact across 11 public-good domains.
Release status	The dossiers are publication-ready PDFs with domain review pending and deployment not claimed.	The dossiers are deployment-ready plans or adopted systems.
Impact doctrine	The Impact layer is downstream of Results, Verify, translation, domain review, governance, and uptake.	The theory implies public-good consequences directly.
Technology language	The dossiers discuss possible law-faithful twins and benchmark pathways.	The program has products, operational tools, or certified digital twins available.
Institutional language	The documents identify what institutions would need to inspect.	Institutions endorse, accept, procure, or implement the approach.

6.6 What weakens or retires a pathway

Impact pathways should be easy to weaken. That is not rhetorical modesty; it is the condition of useful public inspection. A pathway weakens if the upstream Result changes status, if Verify exposes a stronger trust-budget burden, if the translation model cannot be specified, if the benchmark suite is unfair or too weak, if incumbent systems outperform the proposal, if domain experts

reject the model, if governance risk is unacceptable, if the data interface is unavailable, or if institutional uptake is not possible.

A pathway can also be retired for nontechnical reasons. A model might be too easy to misuse, too expensive to govern, too fragile under distribution shift, too opaque for public authority, or too inequitable in its effects. In those cases, the public-good value of the observatory is the visible retirement, not the preservation of the claim.

§ 7 | Dossier Reading Grammar

The 44 Public-Good Briefings are not miniature versions of WP005. They are domain-specific inspection packets. Their value depends on a repeated internal grammar: claim boundary, source route, opportunity baseline, working τ assumptions, structured pathway, evidence and translation ladder, governance guardrails, benchmark suite, and accountability addendum. This section makes that grammar explicit so readers can inspect one dossier without mistaking it for a product brief or policy proposal.

7.1 Safe harbor and release discipline

The safe-harbor page is not legal ornament. It is the first substantive page of each dossier. It tells the reader what the document claims, what it does not claim, and where the release sits in the translation ladder. In the current public release, the standard posture is publication-ready PDF, domain review pending, deployment not claimed. That posture should constrain every later paragraph.

A reader should treat the safe-harbor page as a checksum on interpretation. If a later sentence sounds stronger than the safe-harbor boundary, the boundary wins. If a third-party summary says the dossier is a deployment roadmap, the boundary contradicts it. If a domain reader asks whether the dossier is advice, the boundary says no. This is one reason the PDF release exists: the claim posture is portable, not hidden in a web page.

7.2 Executive summary

The executive summary of a dossier answers a narrower question than the portfolio does. A portfolio asks what kind of public-good domain is being mapped. A dossier asks what one pathway would be if it became testable. In a water dossier, that may be a source-treatment-quality warning pathway. In an energy dossier, it may be a grid or reactor twin. In a One Health dossier, it may be an environmental transmission or surveillance pathway.

The summary should therefore be read as an entry point, not as evidence. It compresses the scenario and names why the pathway could matter. It does not establish that the pathway works. The evidence burden is carried later by translation assumptions, benchmark suites, governance guardrails, and inspection routes.

7.3 Scope and reader orientation

The scope section is where the dossier should become smaller. It names what the pathway includes and what it leaves outside. This narrowing is important because public-good language can otherwise become almost unlimited. "Water" is too big to test. "Leak detection, pressure management, outage prediction, and service continuity against utility telemetry and work-order records" is much closer to a testable first path.

Readers should reward narrow scope. A dossier that refuses to solve the whole domain is usually more inspectable than one that promises system-wide transformation. Scope is also where domain reviewers can ask whether the first test is the right test.

Sometimes the most attractive public-good story is not the most responsible benchmark.

7.4 Opportunity baseline

The opportunity baseline explains why the domain problem matters before the τ assumption is introduced. In WP005, this baseline is not used to magnify claims. It is used to prevent free-floating relevance language. A drought, pollution, aviation, disease, grid, ocean, or disaster pathway should start with the real decision burden it is trying to make inspectable.

The baseline also anchors incumbent comparison. If an existing warning system, model, extension service, grid tool, public-health surveillance system, or regulatory process already performs well, the dossier must respect that. A public-good pathway becomes interesting only if it can be compared fairly with what institutions already use.

7.5 Working τ assumptions

The working τ assumptions are not a license to skip verification. They are a way to state the conditional premise. A dossier may ask: if the relevant upstream τ claims survived inspection, what domain translation would become worth specifying? That premise should remain visible throughout the document.

The distinction matters because the Impact lane is not a proof layer. A dossier can responsibly explore what would follow under an assumption while still making clear that the assumption is upstream, inspectable, and contestable elsewhere. Readers should look for the route back to Results, Verify, Corpus, TauLib, and the anchor documents rather than treating the dossier as a standalone scientific foundation.

7.6 Structured opportunity map

The structured opportunity map is where a domain pathway becomes operationally legible without becoming operationally authorized. It usually lists decisions, model functions, data interfaces, possible users, and failure modes. Its job is to make the scenario inspectable: where would information enter, where would decisions occur, what would the model output, who would be affected, and how would errors be found?

The map should be concrete enough to criticize. If a pathway cannot name decisions, baselines, or users, it is still a topic rather than a scenario. If it names them too confidently, it risks becoming a deployment claim. The middle position is the correct one: enough structure for review, enough humility to remain conditional.

7.7 Benchmark suite and shadow mode

The benchmark suite is the point at which public-good language starts becoming testable. A good benchmark suite names incumbent systems, historical cases, error measures, decision metrics, and adverse-outcome checks. It does not only ask whether a

model is accurate in a technical sense. It asks whether the model would improve the decision that matters, under realistic constraints, compared with the best available baseline.

Shadow mode is the preferred next step in safety-sensitive domains. In shadow mode, a model is run retrospectively or in parallel without authority. It can be wrong without harming a real decision. It can be compared with official forecasts, utility tools, public-health surveillance, humanitarian triggers, water-quality records, or aviation operations. Only after shadow-mode evidence exists can stronger pilot language even be considered.

7.8 Governance guardrails

Governance guardrails name the nontechnical burdens: privacy, safety, equity, labor effects, procurement constraints, accountability, community consent, professional responsibility, regula-

tory authority, and the right to reject a model. They are not secondary to the science. In many public-good domains, they are the difference between a potentially helpful pathway and an unacceptable one.

The dossiers therefore ask readers to evaluate not only whether a pathway could work, but whether it could be responsibly governed. A pathway may be retired because governance cannot be made adequate. That is not a weakness of the release model. It is one of the strongest reasons to publish the pathway as an inspectable scenario rather than as a product claim.

7.9 Retirement and weakening matrix

PRESSURE	SIGNAL	RESPONSE	OWNER SURFACE
Upstream Result weakens	A Result changes status, a construction route is revised, or a bridge claim becomes less secure.	Downgrade or retire all dependent public-good language.	Results / Verify
Translation fails	The domain model, data interface, metric, or workflow cannot be specified.	Return the pathway to exploratory status or remove it from the portfolio.	Impact / dossier
Benchmark fails	Incumbent systems outperform the proposal, or error rates are unsafe.	Preserve the evidence and weaken the pathway.	Dossier / domain review
Governance fails	Privacy, safety, equity, labor, regulatory, or affected-stakeholder burdens are unacceptable.	Retire the pathway even if technical performance is interesting.	Engage / domain institutions
Uptake impossible	No responsible institution can lawfully or practically test the pathway.	Keep as theoretical relevance only; no pilot language.	Impact / Publications

7.10 Why this grammar matters

The repeated dossier grammar is one of the inspection guarantees of the Impact lane. It lets a reader compare agriculture with energy, water with aviation, pollution with One Health, and biodiversity with climate without flattening the domains. Each dossier

can be read on its own terms, but the same release discipline applies across the series.

That is the point of WP005 as an anchor document. It does not replace the dossiers. It makes their shared grammar explicit, so that readers can move between the portfolio overview and the dossier details without losing the conditionality discipline.

§ 8 | Portfolio Review Agenda

The 44 dossiers are deliberately written as conditional maps. The next question is therefore not “which portfolio sounds most important?” but “what kind of review would make this portfolio more honest?” WP005 treats portfolio review as a staged public agenda: first specify the translation layer, then name the benchmark, then expose the governance burden, then decide whether the pathway should advance, narrow, weaken, or retire.

8.1 Review should begin with the easiest refusal

Each portfolio should be reviewed by asking what would make it fail. This is counterintuitive but efficient. If a water pathway has no plausible utility records, if a health pathway cannot protect privacy, if an aviation pathway cannot be tested without safety authority, or if a finance pathway would shift risk onto vulnerable communities, then the pathway should be narrowed before any technical enthusiasm is allowed to accumulate. A public-good observatory is most valuable when it makes refusal cheap, visible, and specific.

The easy refusal is not the same as a hostile reading. It is a disciplined first pass. It asks whether the dossier has a reviewable owner surface, whether a domain reviewer could name a benchmark, whether incumbent systems are visible, and whether the consequence chain contains a link that is obviously missing. If the answer is yes, the correct response is not to defend the claim. The correct response is to revise the route.

8.2 Agriculture

Agriculture review should start with locality. A global agro-weather or irrigation pathway can look plausible in aggregate while failing at the scale where decisions are actually made: crop, district, field, cooperative, extension service, or water-rights regime. The first useful review packet would therefore compare a narrow advisory task against incumbent services. Spray windows, frost warning, irrigation timing, livestock heat stress, or seasonal food-security signals are all possible starting points. The governance burden is access: smallholders, tenant farmers, and under-resourced extension systems must not become afterthoughts.

8.3 Biodiversity and restoration

Biodiversity / Restoration should be reviewed through evidence integrity before finance language. A restoration or nature-positive pathway is weak if it relies on proxy metrics that cannot survive field scrutiny. The first review question is whether habitat condition, functional connectivity, restoration progress, or finance-outcome signals can be measured without greenwashing. The governance burden is stewardship: local ecological knowledge, land rights, monitoring durability, and finance accountability matter as much as model skill.

8.4 Climate

Climate review should start by respecting existing institutions. A τ translation layer cannot displace official assessment, model intercomparison, national planning, or adaptation processes. It can only become useful if it clarifies a bounded task: driver attribution, methane or aerosol diagnosis, regional adaptation prioritization, ocean/cryosphere risk, or sequencing of policy packages under uncertainty. The first benchmark should compare with official scenarios, public observation systems, or retrospective planning records. The governance burden is authority: no dossier should sound like a policy prescription.

8.5 Disaster

Disaster review should begin with adverse outcomes. A trigger that acts too late, too often, in the wrong place, or without accountable decision authority can create harm even when its forecast score improves. The first review packet should therefore include false alarms, missed events, lead time, logistics consequences, allocation fairness, and responsibility for wrong decisions. Flood, surge, wildfire, heat, critical-infrastructure, and anticipatory-action pathways should be tested as decision chains, not as isolated predictions.

8.6 Energy

Energy review should be split by safety regime. Bulk grids, DER orchestration, fusion research, fission safety, and integrated energy planning do not share a single review authority. The first benchmark for a grid pathway may be contingency, dispatch, hosting-capacity, or restoration performance; for fusion it may be scenario, disruption, heat-exhaust, or synthetic-diagnostic tasks; for fission it may be safety-case, degradation, operations, or licensing support. The governance burden is strict separation between exploratory modeling and operational authority.

8.7 Ocean

Ocean review should start with observation limits. Maritime routing, blue food, shipping decarbonization, cleanup, emergency response, and stewardship all depend on sparse and uneven data. The first useful review packet should name which observation streams are public, which are proprietary, which are missing, and which ecological timescales prevent near-term claims. The governance burden is jurisdiction: ports, vessels, fisheries, aquaculture, protected areas, cleanup actors, and emergency services operate under different authorities.

8.8 One Health

One Health review should begin with trust. Environmental, animal, human, wastewater, food-safety, and clinical signals can be powerful when read together, but they also raise privacy, surveillance, stigma, and equity risks. The first benchmark should be a bounded early-warning or attribution task that does not require

operational authority. Reviewers should ask whether community safeguards, ethics review, data minimization, and public-health accountability are present before any stronger pathway language is allowed.

8.9 Pollution and circularity

Pollution / Circularity review should start with exposure and remedy. A model that identifies a plume, source, waste flow, or emissions pathway may still leave affected communities without remediation, enforcement, or compensation. The first benchmark should compare attribution, exposure, compliance, leakage, or intervention-priority outputs with monitoring records, incident records, and regulator-facing baselines. The governance burden is environmental justice: visibility without remedy can become another form of extraction.

8.10 Solar

Solar review should begin at the grid edge. Forecasting value depends on operators, market rules, feeder telemetry, inverter behavior, storage, behind-the-meter visibility, consumer safeguards, and resilience context. A bulk-grid solar forecast is not the same kind of object as a microgrid resilience pathway or flexible-demand logistics pathway. The first benchmark should therefore name the operating scale and incumbent comparison: system operator, distribution utility, asset owner, critical facility, or consumer program.

8.11 Water / WASH

Water / WASH review should begin with vulnerability and continuity. Drinking water, distribution networks, basin allocation, WASH in facilities and camps, wastewater, stormwater, sanitation, and reuse all affect people who often cannot choose their infrastructure. The first benchmark should compare model outputs with monitoring, telemetry, work-order, incident, rainfall, basin, and service-continuity records. The governance burden is public responsibility: quality, pressure, access, dignity, and emergency continuity must be visible.

8.12 Weather

Weather review should start with safety certification and downstream use. Aviation weather, new aerial logistics, and climate-smart aviation cannot be evaluated only by better forecasts. The relevant question is whether route, delay, turbulence, icing, convective, contrail, payload, and service-continuity decisions improve under accountable conditions. The first benchmark should be shadow-mode, safety-aware, and regulator-respectful. Until then, the pathway is a scenario map, not operational advice.

8.13 Sequencing the review agenda

The public-good series should not try to review all 44 dossiers with equal depth at once. A responsible sequence would choose a small number of pathways where public data, incumbent baselines, governance partners, and adverse-outcome criteria

can be specified clearly. Weather, water-quality warning, agro-weather advisories, grid forecasting, wastewater surveillance, and pollution-plume attribution may be easier to stage than domains where evidence is sparse, authority is fragmented, or risks are slow-moving.

The sequence should also include deliberate negative cases. A pathway that is retired after review can be as valuable as a pathway that advances, because it teaches the observatory what kind of impact language is too loose. WP005 should therefore be read as a starting agenda for public scrutiny, not as a list of promises. The durable achievement is not that 44 pathways are claimed. It is that 44 pathways are available to inspect, weaken, improve, or retire.

8.14 Cross-series work package 1: source-to-claim trace

The first shared work package is not a domain model. It is a trace. Every public-good sentence should be traceable to a source route, an upstream Result, a translation assumption, a dossier paragraph, or a deliberate editorial boundary. This is especially important because impact language is easy to remember and hard to police after it leaves the page. A compact phrase such as "water-system twin" or "climate-smart aviation" can travel faster than the conditions that make it responsible.

A source-to-claim trace would identify the exact owner surface for each stronger phrase. Some phrases should route to Results, some to Verify, some to the Impact lane, some to a dossier, some to a public source page, and some to a future benchmark plan. If no owner surface exists, the phrase should be weakened. If the owner surface is too broad, the phrase should be narrowed. If the phrase depends on a chain of surfaces, the chain should be visible. This is the same discipline that makes WP001 an observatory overview and WP004 an inspection blueprint: public trust begins with routeability.

The work product is intentionally simple: a table of claim, route, status, dependency, and weakening condition. It does not require a new theory claim. It requires editorial courage. The easiest way for public-good language to become misleading is to let attractive phrasing outrun its route. The trace prevents that drift.

8.15 Cross-series work package 2: benchmark design

The second shared work package is benchmark design. The dossiers already name first benchmarkable tests, but a true benchmark packet is more demanding. It would specify incumbent systems, datasets, historical cases, metrics, failure thresholds, uncertainty disclosure, adverse-outcome categories, and the procedure for deciding that a pathway has failed. The packet should make it possible for a reviewer to say, before any model is built, what evidence would count.

Benchmark design should avoid two opposite mistakes. The first mistake is a benchmark so vague that any improvement can be declared meaningful. The second mistake is a benchmark so

artificial that it tests an easy proxy instead of the real decision burden. A flood benchmark that ignores evacuation logistics, a water benchmark that ignores service continuity, a health benchmark that ignores privacy, a grid benchmark that ignores operator constraints, or a pollution benchmark that ignores remediation cannot carry much public-good weight.

The benchmark packet should also include incumbent respect. In many domains, existing institutions already operate sophisticated systems under difficult conditions. A public-good pathway is not made credible by caricaturing them. The correct comparison is against current practice, current constraints, and current public evidence. If the proposed translation layer does not improve on that comparison, the honest outcome is weakening.

8.16 Cross-series work package 3: governance and affected-stakeholder review

The third shared work package is governance. WP005 treats governance as part of the mechanism, not as a compliance note at the end. Many public-good domains are public precisely because they involve people who cannot simply opt out: patients, communities near pollution sources, people dependent on water systems, farmers exposed to weather shocks, travelers in safety-critical systems, and residents affected by infrastructure failures. A model can improve one metric while making another burden less visible.

Governance review should therefore name who decides, who is affected, who can refuse, who can appeal, who audits, who bears the cost of error, and who benefits if the pathway works. It should also identify misuse modes. A pollution pathway can become surveillance; a health pathway can become stigma; a disaster pathway can shift resources unfairly; a finance pathway can encode exclusion; an energy pathway can shift risk to critical loads; a water pathway can hide inequity behind efficiency. These are not external concerns. They are part of the public-good claim.

Affected-stakeholder review does not mean that every dossier must become a participatory process before it can be published. The current release is a scenario map. But it does mean that no pathway should advance beyond scenario language without asking who would live with the consequences. This is where many technically plausible pathways may be narrowed or retired.

8.17 Cross-series work package 4: release maintenance

The fourth shared work package is release maintenance. A public-good canon has to be maintained like infrastructure. Routes change, dossiers are revised, benchmarks improve, source pages are corrected, PDFs are replaced, and public readers may cite older versions. If that maintenance is invisible, the program will eventually create confusion even when the underlying work improves.

The maintenance packet should include dated releases, check-sums, page counts, canonical landing routes, short routes, deprecation notes, supersession language, and a record of why a dossier changed. A stronger version should not erase a weaker one without explanation. A retired pathway should not vanish without a visible reason. A corrected claim should point back to the correction surface. Public-good work benefits from memory.

This is also why WP005 should not be treated as the whole Impact lane. It is a portable anchor for one release. The website is the living observatory. The publications catalog is the integrity layer. The dossiers are the domain projection layer. Results, Verify, Corpus, and Engage are the upstream and challenge layers. The system works when readers can move among these surfaces without guessing which one owns the current truth.

8.18 Advance, pause, or retire

A portfolio advances only when its review burden becomes sharper. Advancement does not mean stronger rhetoric. It means better routes, better benchmarks, better governance, better domain contact points, better uncertainty disclosure, and clearer refusal criteria. In that sense, a narrower dossier can be more advanced than a broader one. Precision is progress.

A portfolio pauses when a key dependency is missing but the pathway remains worth watching. Missing public data, unclear institutional authority, immature benchmarks, sparse observations, unresolved privacy questions, or inadequate source traceability can all justify a pause. A paused pathway should not be marketed as almost ready. It should say what is missing.

A portfolio retires when its premise fails, its benchmark fails, its governance burden is unacceptable, its institutional route is not receivable, or its public language cannot be made safe. Retirement is not embarrassment. It is one of the marks of an inspectable program. A research observatory earns trust not by never weakening claims, but by weakening them where the public record requires it.

§ 9 | Catalog, Interdependencies, and Routes

This section gathers the dense inspection surfaces: the full 44-dossier catalog, the route table, the interdependency map, a compact glossary, and the route index. It is intentionally mechanical. The point is to make the public-good projection auditable as a set of artifacts rather than memorable only as a narrative.

9.1 Full 44-dossier catalog

The catalog uses compact IDs for readability. The source map in this directory records the corresponding public-good briefing IDs and source slugs. Every row has the same release posture: conditional public-good scenario analysis, publication-ready PDF, domain review pending, deployment not claimed.

ID / PORTFOLIO	DOSSIER	CONDITIONAL PATHWAY	BENCHMARK / GOVERNANCE NEED
AGRI-02 Agriculture	Tau for Climate-Smart Irrigation, Soil Moisture, and Water Productivity	Conditional pathway centered on weather-soil-water-crop irrigation advisory twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	irrigation timing, net irrigation requirement, and water-productivity guidance against WaPOR, AquaCrop, and incumbent extension advisories
AGRI-05 Agriculture	Tau for Crop Biology, Breeding, Photosynthesis Engineering, and Targeted Gene Design	Conditional pathway centered on crop-physiology, photosynthesis, and breeding-design translation model; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	trait-response and photosynthesis-efficiency predictions against field-trial and breeding-program baselines
AGRI-03 Agriculture	Tau for Pest, Disease, and Livestock-Stress Early Warning	Conditional pathway centered on weather-pest-disease-livestock stress early-warning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	outbreak, vector, heat-stress, and livestock-risk alerts against public surveillance and advisory records
AGRI-04 Agriculture	Tau for Seasonal Planning, Disaster Anticipation, and Food-System Resilience	Conditional pathway centered on seasonal climate-food-system resilience planning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	seasonal crop, food-security, and disruption-risk scenarios against FEWS NET, national crop forecasts, and disaster-loss records
AGRI-01 Agriculture	Tau-Grade Operational Agro-Weather Intelligence	Conditional pathway centered on weather-soil-crop-operations advisory twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	spray/no-spray, harvest, irrigation, frost, heat, and field-access windows against incumbent advisory products
BIOD-05 Biodiversity/Restoration	τ for Biodiversity Finance, Monitoring, Restoration Verification, and Nature-Positive Investment Prioritization	Conditional pathway centered on biodiversity monitoring, restoration, and finance-verification twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	restoration verification, habitat-condition, and finance-outcome signals against remote sensing, field audit, and biodiversity indicator baselines
CLIM-02 Climate	Tau for Carbon-Cycle, Methane, Aerosol, and Sink Intelligence	Conditional pathway centered on coupled atmosphere-land-ocean-biosphere driver-intelligence twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	methane plume attribution, regional source-sink decomposition, and MRV reconciliation against official systems
CLIM-05 Climate	Tau for Climate Policy Optimization, Investment Prioritization, and International Coordination	Conditional pathway centered on multi-sector climate-policy and investment-prioritization twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	policy-package ranking and marginal-abatement prioritization against official scenarios and national investment plans
CLIM-03 Climate	Tau for Regional Adaptation Planning and Sectoral Impact Intelligence	Conditional pathway centered on regional climate-impact and sector-exposure translation twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	sectoral loss, exposure, and adaptation-option rankings against national adaptation plans and observed impact records
CLIM-04 Climate	τ for Oceans, Cryosphere, Tipping Elements, and Long-Range Resilience	Conditional pathway centered on ocean-cryosphere tipping-risk and resilience-readout twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	sea-level, cryosphere, ocean-heat, and tipping-signal diagnostics against IPCC, WMO, and Copernicus baselines
DISA-05 Disaster	Tau for Anticipatory Action, Humanitarian Logistics, and Climate-Risk Finance	Conditional pathway centered on anticipatory-action, humanitarian logistics, and climate-risk finance twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	trigger timing, pre-positioning, and payout decision quality against historical humanitarian response and forecast-based finance cases
DISA-04 Disaster	Tau for Critical Infrastructure, Emergency Operations, and Public-Service Continuity	Conditional pathway centered on critical-infrastructure emergency-operations and public-service continuity twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	service-outage, cascading-failure, and continuity-plan forecasts against incident records and emergency exercises
DISA-02 Disaster	Tau for Flood, Coastal Surge, Flash Flood, and Landslide Resilience	Conditional pathway centered on compound flood, surge, flash-flood, and landslide hazard twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	inundation, landslide susceptibility, exposure, and warning lead-time against official hazard maps and event archives
DISA-03 Disaster	τ for Wildfire, Smoke, Heat, and Compound-Extreme Health Protection	Conditional pathway centered on wildfire-smoke-heat and compound-extreme health-protection twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	fire-weather, smoke exposure, heat-risk, and public-health alert quality against official warning and health-outcome records
ENER-02 Energy	Tau for DER Orchestration, Storage, Flexible Demand, Microgrids, and T&D Planning	Conditional pathway centered on DER, storage, flexible-demand, microgrid, and T&D planning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	hosting capacity, flexibility dispatch, and resilience planning against utility planning tools and feeder measurements

ID / PORTFOLIO	DOSSIER	CONDITIONAL PATHWAY	BENCHMARK / GOVERNANCE NEED
ENER-01 Energy	Tau-Grade Grid Digital Twins, Reliability, Dispatch, and Resilience	Conditional pathway centered on bulk-grid reliability, dispatch, and resilience twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	contingency, dispatch, outage, and restoration decisions against system-operator simulations and historical events
ENER-04 Energy	τ for Advanced Fission Safety, Operations, Licensing, and Fleet Modernization	Conditional pathway centered on advanced-fission safety, operations, licensing, and fleet-modernization twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	safety-case, thermal-hydraulic, degradation, and operations decision support against regulator-accepted and plant-data baselines
ENER-03 Energy	τ for Fusion Digital Twins, Plasma Control, Heat Exhaust, and ITER → DEMO → Commercialization	Conditional pathway centered on law-faithful plasma, control, heat-exhaust, and machine-design twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	IMAS-compatible scenario, disruption, divertor, and synthetic-diagnostic tasks against ITER/EUROfusion benchmark workflows
ENER-05 Energy	τ for Integrated Energy-System Planning, Market Design, Investment Prioritization, and International Coordination	Conditional pathway centered on integrated energy-system planning, market-design, and investment-coordination twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	capacity expansion, flexibility, reliability, and market-design outputs against official energy-system planning scenarios
OCEAN-03 Ocean	τ and Blue Food Systems	Conditional pathway centered on blue-food, aquaculture, fisheries, and marine-ecosystem intelligence twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	stock, habitat, farm-risk, and food-system outputs against fisheries, aquaculture, and marine observation baselines
OCEAN-02 Ocean	τ and Climate-Smart Shipping	Conditional pathway centered on shipping decarbonization, wind-corridor, routing, and port-energy twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	route emissions, wind-assist opportunity, port-delay, and fuel-use outputs against AIS, weather, and port-operation baselines
OCEAN-04 Ocean	τ and Ocean Stewardship, Cleanup, and Marine Emergency Response	Conditional pathway centered on ocean stewardship, cleanup, drift, and marine-emergency response twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	debris drift, spill response, cleanup prioritization, and emergency logistics against incident and observation records
OCEAN-01 Ocean	τ and the Ocean Logistics Opportunity	Conditional pathway centered on ocean logistics, maritime routing, port-flow, and green-corridor twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	ETA, congestion, route-emissions, and port-flow predictions against AIS and port-call data
ONEH-03 One Health	Tau for AMR, Wastewater/Environmental Surveillance, and Environmental Transmission Intelligence	Conditional pathway centered on wastewater-environmental clinical One Health transmission twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	wastewater AMR signal attribution, storm/flood pathway prediction, and intervention-ranking against sentinel surveillance
ONEH-04 One Health	Tau for Food Safety, Livestock/Wildlife Interface, and Community Exposure Intelligence	Conditional pathway centered on food-safety, livestock, wildlife-interface, and community-exposure twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	contamination, spillover, and exposure-risk alerts against food-safety, veterinary, and public-health surveillance records
ONEH-01 One Health	Tau-Grade One Health Early Warning for Vector-Borne Disease, Zoonotic Spillover, and Climate-Sensitive Outbreaks	Conditional pathway centered on vector-borne disease, zoonotic spillover, climate-sensitive outbreak early-warning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	vector suitability, spillover-risk, and outbreak-warning lead time against surveillance and climate records
ONEH-05 One Health	τ for Precision Public Health, Physiology-Aware Prevention, and Safer Therapeutics / Response Optimization	Conditional pathway centered on precision public-health, physiology-aware prevention, and response-optimization twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	risk stratification, prevention targeting, and response optimization against public-health cohort and intervention baselines
POLL-03 Pollution/Circularity	Tau for Chemicals, Toxic Releases, Lead/PFAS/Heavy Metals, Water-Soil-Air Plume Intelligence, and Remediation	Conditional pathway centered on toxic-release, PFAS, heavy-metal, plume, and remediation-prioritization twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	plume extent, exposure pathway, and remediation prioritization against monitoring, incident, and cleanup records
POLL-02 Pollution/Circularity	Tau for Industrial, Transport, and Agricultural Emissions Attribution, Compliance, and High-Return Abatement Targeting	Conditional pathway centered on industrial, transport, and agricultural emissions-attribution and compliance twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	source attribution, compliance triage, and abatement ranking against inventories, sensor networks, and enforcement records
POLL-01 Pollution/Circularity	Tau-Grade Clean-Air Digital Twins, Exposure Intelligence, and Urban/Regional Health Protection	Conditional pathway centered on clean-air digital twin and exposure-intelligence model; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	exposure, source-contribution, and intervention-priority outputs against monitoring networks and health-risk baselines
POLL-04 Pollution/Circularity	τ for Waste Systems, Plastics Leakage, Litter Interception, Municipal/Industrial Waste Operations, and Zero-Waste Transitions	Conditional pathway centered on waste-system, plastics-leakage, litter-interception, and zero-waste transition twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	leakage, collection, sorting, diversion, and intervention-priority outputs against municipal and industrial waste records
SOLR-01 Solar	Tau-Grade Solar Forecasting for Bulk-Grid Operations and Market Dispatch	Conditional pathway centered on bulk-grid solar forecasting, dispatch, and market-integration twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	solar forecast, ramp, curtailment, and dispatch-quality outputs against system-operator and market data

ID / PORTFOLIO	DOSSIER	CONDITIONAL PATHWAY	BENCHMARK / GOVERNANCE NEED
SOLR-02 Solar	τ for Distributed PV Visibility and Distribution-Grid Orchestration	Conditional pathway centered on distributed PV visibility and distribution-grid orchestration twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	behind-the-meter visibility, feeder hosting capacity, voltage, and orchestration outputs against feeder telemetry
SOLR-04 Solar	τ for PV Asset Protection, Storm-Hardening, and Long-Term System Planning	Conditional pathway centered on PV asset-protection, storm-hardening, and long-term planning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	storm damage, degradation, availability, and resilience planning against asset, weather, and insurance records
SOLR-03 Solar	τ for Solar-Plus-Storage, Microgrids, and Critical-Infrastructure Resilience	Conditional pathway centered on solar-plus-storage, microgrid, and critical-infrastructure resilience twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	islanding, load-shed, restoration, and resilience metrics against microgrid tests and outage records
SOLR-05 Solar	τ for Solar-Synchronized Flexible Demand and Grid Logistics	Conditional pathway centered on solar-synchronized flexible-demand and grid-logistics twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	load shifting, curtailment reduction, and logistics scheduling against meter, market, and fleet-operation data
WATR-01 Water/WASH	Tau-Grade Drinking-Water Source, Treatment, and Quality Early Warning	Conditional pathway centered on drinking-water source, treatment, quality, and early-warning twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	source-water risk, treatment response, and quality-event warning against monitoring, treatment, and incident records
WATR-02 Water/WASH	τ for Distribution Networks, Leakage, Pressure, and Service Continuity	Conditional pathway centered on water distribution leakage, pressure, and service-continuity twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	leak detection, pressure management, outage, and non-revenue-water outputs against utility telemetry and work-order records
WATR-04 Water/WASH	τ for River-Basin, Groundwater, Drought-Flood Allocation, and Water Productivity	Conditional pathway centered on river-basin, groundwater, drought-flood allocation, and water-productivity twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	allocation, drought/flood tradeoff, groundwater stress, and water-productivity outputs against basin records and satellite products
WATR-05 Water/WASH	τ for WASH in Health Facilities, Schools, Camps, and Climate-Vulnerable Settlements	Conditional pathway centered on WASH service continuity twin for health facilities, schools, camps, and climate-vulnerable settlements; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	service interruption, quality, access, and emergency-response outputs against WASH facility and humanitarian service data
WATR-03 Water/WASH	τ for Wastewater, Stormwater, Sanitation, and Circular Water Reuse	Conditional pathway centered on wastewater, stormwater, sanitation, and circular-reuse twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	overflow, reuse quality, treatment performance, and circular-water outputs against utility, rainfall, and monitoring records
WTHR-01 Weather	Tau-Grade Aviation Weather Intelligence for Mainstream Aviation	Conditional pathway centered on aviation weather, routing, turbulence, icing, and airport-flow twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	route, delay, turbulence, icing, and convective-weather decisions against aviation weather and operations records
WTHR-03 Weather	τ and New Aerial Logistics	Conditional pathway centered on new aerial logistics, AAM, airship, humanitarian, and remote-service twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	weather-window, payload, route-risk, and service-continuity outputs against remote logistics and emergency-response records
WTHR-02 Weather	τ-Enabled Climate-Smart Aviation	Conditional pathway centered on climate-smart aviation, contrail avoidance, routing, and decarbonization twin; public-good value would require benchmarkable improvement, transparent uncertainty, domain review, and governance control.	contrail-risk, route-emissions, delay, and fuel-burn tradeoffs against weather, flight, and climate-impact baselines

9.2 Dossier routes and release posture

ID	Status	Pages	Landing route	Source route
AGRI-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	36	public-good/climate-smart-irrigation-soil-moisture-water-productivity	impact/climate-smart-irrigation-soil-moisture-water-productivity
AGRI-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	33	public-good/crop-biology-breeding-photosynthesis-gene-design	impact/crop-biology-breeding-photosynthesis-gene-design
AGRI-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/pest-disease-livestock-stress-early-warning	impact/pest-disease-livestock-stress-early-warning
AGRI-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	34	public-good/seasonal-planning-disaster-anticipation-food-system-resilience	impact/seasonal-planning-disaster-anticipation-food-system-resilience

ID	Status	Pages	Landing route	Source route
AGRI-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	33	public-good/operational-agro-weather-intelligence	impact/operational-agro-weather-intelligence
BIOD-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	36	public-good/biodiversity-finance-monitoring-restoration-verification	impact/biodiversity-finance-monitoring-restoration-verification
CLIM-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/carbon-cycle-methane-aerosol-sink-intelligence	impact/carbon-cycle-methane-aerosol-sink-intelligence
CLIM-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	29	public-good/climate-policy-optimization-investment-prioritization-international-coordination	impact/climate-policy-optimization-investment-prioritization-international-coordination
CLIM-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	28	public-good/regional-adaptation-sectoral-impact-intelligence	impact/regional-adaptation-sectoral-impact-intelligence
CLIM-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/oceans-cryosphere-tipping-long-range-resilience	impact/oceans-cryosphere-tipping-long-range-resilience
DISA-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	39	public-good/anticipatory-action-humanitarian-logistics-climate-risk-finance	impact/anticipatory-action-humanitarian-logistics-climate-risk-finance
DISA-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	37	public-good/critical-infrastructure-emergency-operations-public-service-continuity	impact/critical-infrastructure-emergency-operations-public-service-continuity
DISA-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	36	public-good/flood-coastal-surge-landslide-resilience	impact/flood-coastal-surge-landslide-resilience
DISA-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/wildfire-smoke-heat-compound-extreme-health-protection	impact/wildfire-smoke-heat-compound-extreme-health-protection
ENER-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	33	public-good/der-storage-flexible-demand-microgrids-td-planning	impact/der-storage-flexible-demand-microgrids-td-planning
ENER-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	24	public-good/grid-digital-twins-reliability-dispatch-resilience	impact/grid-digital-twins-reliability-dispatch-resilience
ENER-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/advanced-fission-safety-operations-licensing-fleet-modernization	impact/advanced-fission-safety-operations-licensing-fleet-modernization
ENER-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/fusion-digital-twins-plasma-control-heat-exhaust-iter-demo	impact/fusion-digital-twins-plasma-control-heat-exhaust-iter-demo
ENER-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	34	public-good/integrated-energy-system-planning-market-design-investment-coordination	impact/integrated-energy-system-planning-market-design-investment-coordination
OCEN-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/blue-food-systems-marine-ecosystem-intelligence	impact/blue-food-systems-marine-ecosystem-intelligence
OCEN-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	34	public-good/climate-smart-shipping-decarbonization-wind-corridors	impact/climate-smart-shipping-decarbonization-wind-corridors
OCEN-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	36	public-good/ocean-stewardship-cleanup-marine-emergency-response	impact/ocean-stewardship-cleanup-marine-emergency-response
OCEN-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/ocean-logistics-maritime-routing-port-flow-green-corridors	impact/ocean-logistics-maritime-routing-port-flow-green-corridors
ONEH-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	36	public-good/amr-wastewater-environmental-transmission-intelligence	impact/amr-wastewater-environmental-transmission-intelligence
ONEH-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	38	public-good/food-safety-livestock-wildlife-community-exposure	impact/food-safety-livestock-wildlife-community-exposure
ONEH-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/one-health-vector-zoonotic-spillover-climate-outbreaks	impact/one-health-vector-zoonotic-spillover-climate-outbreaks
ONEH-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/precision-public-health-physiology-prevention-safer-therapeutics	impact/precision-public-health-physiology-prevention-safer-therapeutics
POLL-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	37	public-good/chemicals-toxic-releases-lead-pfas-heavy-metals-plume-remediation	impact/chemicals-toxic-releases-lead-pfas-heavy-metals-plume-remediation
POLL-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/industrial-transport-agricultural-emissions-attribution-compliance-abatement	impact/industrial-transport-agricultural-emissions-attribution-compliance-abatement

ID	Status	Pages	Landing route	Source route
POLL-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	39	public-good/clean-air-digital-twins-exposure-intelligence	impact/clean-air-digital-twins-exposure-intelligence
POLL-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	34	public-good/waste-systems-plastics-leakage-zero-waste	impact/waste-systems-plastics-leakage-zero-waste
SOLR-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	27	public-good/bulk-grid-solar-forecasting	impact/bulk-grid-solar-forecasting
SOLR-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	33	public-good/distributed-pv-visibility-distribution-grid-orchestration	impact/distributed-pv-visibility-distribution-grid-orchestration
SOLR-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	28	public-good/pv-asset-protection-storm-hardening-long-term-planning	impact/pv-asset-protection-storm-hardening-long-term-planning
SOLR-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	32	public-good/solar-storage-microgrids-critical-infrastructure-resilience	impact/solar-storage-microgrids-critical-infrastructure-resilience
SOLR-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	34	public-good/solar-synchronized-flexible-demand-grid-logistics	impact/solar-synchronized-flexible-demand-grid-logistics
WATR-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	25	public-good/drinking-water-source-treatment-quality-early-warning	impact/drinking-water-source-treatment-quality-early-warning
WATR-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/distribution-networks-leakage-pressure-service-continuity	impact/distribution-networks-leakage-pressure-service-continuity
WATR-04	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	30	public-good/river-basin-groundwater-drought-flood-allocation-water-productivity	impact/river-basin-groundwater-drought-flood-allocation-water-productivity
WATR-05	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	29	public-good/wash-health-facilities-schools-camps-climate-vulnerable-settlements	impact/wash-health-facilities-schools-camps-climate-vulnerable-settlements
WATR-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	29	public-good/wastewater-stormwater-sanitation-circular-reuse	impact/wastewater-stormwater-sanitation-circular-reuse
WTHR-01	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/aviation-weather-intelligence	impact/aviation-weather-intelligence
WTHR-03	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	37	public-good/new-aerial-logistics-aam-airships-humanitarian-remote	impact/new-aerial-logistics-aam-airships-humanitarian-remote
WTHR-02	publication-ready PDF; domain review pending; deployment not claimed	35	public-good/climate-smart-aviation-contrail-routing-decarbonization	impact/climate-smart-aviation-contrail-routing-decarbonization

9.3 Portfolio interdependencies

INTERDEPENDENCY CLUSTER	WHY IT MATTERS	DISCIPLINE
Weather – Disaster – Water/WASH – Agriculture – One Health	Weather and hydrology shape warnings, irrigation, food-system resilience, disease ecology, WASH continuity, and emergency response.	Benchmark chains must track cross-domain propagation of false alarms, missed events, and inequitable allocation.
Energy – Solar – Climate – Disaster	Energy-system planning, grid reliability, solar variability, climate mitigation, and disaster resilience share weather and infrastructure dependencies.	Operational use would require grid-code, safety, market, and resilience governance before any pilot.
Ocean – Climate – Biodiversity – Food systems	Ocean state, blue food, climate tipping, marine logistics, and restoration pathways share observation and stewardship burdens.	Ecological baselines and marine governance must precede any public-good consequence claim.
Pollution/Circularity – One Health – Water/WASH – Urban systems	Exposure pathways cross air, water, soil, waste, disease, sanitation, and labor systems.	Public health, environmental justice, privacy, and compliance review are inseparable from technical benchmarks.
Climate – Finance – Disaster – Agriculture	Risk finance, anticipatory action, adaptation planning, and food-system resilience all depend on trigger quality and uncertainty disclosure.	No model should become a finance trigger without shadow-mode comparison and accountable governance.

9.4 How to read the interdependency map

The interdependency map is not an attempt to make one large super-claim. It is an attempt to prevent the opposite error: treating each public-good pathway as if it lived alone. Most public problems do not respect portfolio boundaries. Weather affects aviation, shipping, wildfire, flood, agriculture, grid dispatch, solar forecasting, WASH continuity, disease ecology, and humanitarian logistics. Water affects food, health, pollution, disaster response, restoration, and energy. Energy systems affect climate, water, critical infrastructure, industrial pollution, and public health. The map lets readers see why a narrow dossier may still require cross-domain review.

Weather–Disaster–Water/WASH–Agriculture–One Health.

This cluster is the clearest example of cascading public relevance. A rainfall forecast can affect flood warning, irrigation timing, livestock stress, crop disease, wastewater overflow, pathogen transport, WASH service continuity, and humanitarian response. The same physical event is read through different public systems. A stronger model in one layer could still fail if another layer lacks data, trust, governance, or capacity. That is why the pathway should be tested as a chain of decisions, not only as a forecast score.

Energy–Solar–Climate–Disaster. This cluster shows how mitigation, reliability, and resilience can pull against each other. Solar forecasting may help dispatch and reserve sizing, but it also interacts with DER visibility, storage, flexible demand, market rules, feeder limits, and storm resilience. Grid and energy-system planning may reduce climate pressure, but critical infrastructure must still survive weather and disaster shocks. A public-good pathway here requires technical skill, but also safety, operator trust, market governance, and clear responsibility for adverse outcomes.

Ocean–Climate–Biodiversity–Food systems. This cluster is slower and more observationally difficult. Ocean-state intelligence can matter for shipping, blue food, climate feedbacks, marine emergency response, restoration, and biodiversity finance. But sparse observation, jurisdictional complexity, long ecological timescales, and finance-accountability risks make this cluster easy to overstate. The correct reading is therefore cautious: the coupling makes the pathway important to inspect, not easy to claim.

Pollution/Circularity–One Health–Water/WASH–Urban systems. This cluster is about hidden pathways. Air, water, soil, waste, chemicals, plastics, heavy metals, pathogens, sanitation, labor, and urban exposure can interact through routes that are hard for any one institution to see. A model might make those

pathways more legible, but legibility can itself create risks: surveillance, enforcement inequity, greenwashing, stigma, or false certainty. The benchmark must therefore include community safeguards and environmental justice review, not only source-attribution performance.

Climate–Finance–Disaster–Agriculture. This cluster is the most tempting to convert into policy language, and therefore the one that needs the strongest guardrails. Climate-risk finance, anticipatory action, food-system resilience, adaptation planning, and disaster triggers all require decisions before certainty is available. Better information could help, but only if the trigger is fair, the uncertainty is disclosed, the payout or allocation rule is accountable, and the affected communities are not reduced to variables in a financial instrument. WP005 treats this cluster as a benchmark-and-governance problem, not as a finance recommendation.

9.5 Open inspection questions

Several cross-cutting questions remain open across the full series. They are not defects to hide; they are exactly the questions a public observatory should surface.

- Which upstream Results most strongly control each public-good pathway, and which pathways should be downgraded first if those Results weaken?
- Which domains have enough public data for shadow-mode comparison, and which would require new data agreements before benchmarking is possible?
- Which incumbent systems are the fair comparison set for each dossier?
- Which pathways are technically interesting but governance-poor, and should therefore remain exploratory even if a model appears skillful?
- Which domains require affected-community review before a benchmark is even designed?
- Which pathways can be tested with retrospective public records, and which would need institutional cooperation?
- Which portfolio interdependencies create compounding value, and which create compounding risk?

These questions make the Impact lane slower, but they also make it cleaner. A public-good scenario that cannot withstand these questions should be weakened before it is repeated.

9.6 Glossary

TERM	USE IN THIS WHITE PAPER
Impact	The conditional public-relevance layer downstream of Results, Verify, translation, domain review, governance, and uptake.
Global Public Good	The outermost Impact stratum: planetary-system and public-good pathways that require the longest chain from theory to consequence.
Public-Good Briefing	A conditional scenario analysis for one domain pathway, released as HTML and PDF, with domain review pending and deployment not claimed.
Translation Layer	The domain-specific model, data interface, benchmark suite, workflow hypothesis, and governance frame needed before a pathway becomes testable.
Domain Uptake	The real institutional capacity, authority, and willingness to receive a governed model. WP005 does not claim it.
Scenario Map	A structured account of what could become worth investigating if upstream and downstream conditions hold.
Law-faithful Twin	A proposed inspectable domain model that would have to preserve relevant structure and disclose its errors; not a product claim.
Benchmark Ladder	The progression from scenario map to specified benchmarks, shadow-mode comparison, review, governance, pilot decision, and possible adoption.
Shadow Mode	Retrospective or parallel comparison against incumbent systems without operational authority.
Deployment Readiness	A downstream institutional status requiring validation, governance, safety, and adoption decisions. WP005 does not claim it.

9.7 Route and citation index

The canonical route for this white paper is [/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/](https://prrp.site/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/). The short route is <https://prrp.site/wp005>; the mnemonic route is <https://prrp.site/wp-impact>.

- Impact lane: </impact/>
- Impact Framework: </impact/impact-framework/>
- Global Public Good: </impact/global-public-good/>
- Public-Good Briefings index: </publications/research-briefings/public-good/>
- Results: </results/>
- Verify: </verify/>
- Corpus: </corpus/>
- Publications: </publications/>
- Engage: </engage/>
- WP001 Program Executive Overview: </publications/anchor-documents/wp001-panta-rhei-research-program-executive-overview/>
- WP002 T Theory Executive Synopsis: </publications/anchor-documents/wp002-t-theory-executive-synopsis/>
- WP003 TauLib Technical Overview: </publications/anchor-documents/wp003-taulib-technical-overview/>

- WP004 Public Research Observatory Blueprint: </publications/anchor-documents/wp004-public-research-observatory-blueprint/>

9.8 Closing discipline

WP005 should leave the reader with a disciplined understanding, not an inflated one. The Global Public Good layer does not claim that impact has happened. It maps what could become worth investigating if upstream Results survive inspection, translation, domain review, governance, and uptake. That is the public value of the layer: it turns possible consequence into an inspectable question.

9.9 Claim-challenge protocol

Readers who want to challenge WP005 should not have to guess where to begin. The most useful challenge is specific, routed, and status-aware.

1. Name the pathway: portfolio, dossier, compact ID, landing route, and the sentence or table row being challenged.
2. Classify the challenge: upstream Result, Verify status, translation assumption, benchmark design, incumbent comparison, governance risk, public communication, or route integrity.
3. State the proposed correction: weaken, retire, narrow scope, add benchmark, add governance warning, fix route, or revise language.
4. Provide the relevant evidence or expert reason. A challenge

can be scientific, technical, domain-specific, ethical, institutional, or editorial.

5. Route the challenge through the public Engage surfaces or repository discussion route rather than treating social-media paraphrase as the source of record.

The program should prefer a precise weakening request over vague praise. A public-good pathway that survives challenge is stronger because it has been made more inspectable. A pathway that fails challenge is still useful if it fails in public and leaves a record that future readers can see.

9.10 Release boundary and future update path

WP005 is a canonical v1.0 release artifact, not a frozen claim that the Impact lane will never change. Its job is to capture the May 2026 public-good projection in a citable form: 11 portfolios, 44 dossiers, one shared conditionality grammar, and a route system that points readers back into the living public observatory. Future releases may add dossiers, retire dossiers, rename routes, improve benchmarks, or weaken language where review requires it. That is not a defect in the release model. It is the reason for making the release boundary explicit.

The website remains the canonical live surface for current navigation and status. This PDF is the offline anchor for the v1.0 argument. If the two ever appear to diverge, readers should check the landing route first, then the Publications manifest, then the relevant Impact, Results, Verify, Corpus, or Engage route. A later

WP005 release should preserve the old artifact as a dated record while making the replacement status visible in the public catalog.

Updates should follow the same claim discipline used here. A new dossier should not enter the catalog merely because a domain sounds important; it should have a defined upstream dependency, translation model, first benchmark, governance burden, and retirement condition. A dossier should be downgraded if its upstream Result weakens, its translation layer cannot be specified, its first benchmark fails, or its governance burden is unacceptable. A retired dossier should leave a visible reason rather than disappear silently.

The route grammar also matters. Short routes such as <https://prrp.site/wp005> and <https://prrp.site/wp-impact> are convenience routes, not a substitute for the canonical landing page. Citations should prefer the canonical route and the dated PDF release metadata. Reviewers should cite the exact sentence, table, portfolio, or dossier ID being challenged, because WP005 is deliberately a large map. A precise route makes correction possible.

Finally, the absence of a DOI or Zenodo deposit in this sprint is intentional. The document is released through the program's public Publications and Site surfaces as a canonical v1.0 anchor. A future archival deposit can be added without changing the scientific posture of this release. Until then, the checksum, file size, page count, manifest entry, and landing route provide the public integrity trail.

How to Cite & References

Citation and source list

HOW TO CITE

Fuchs, Thorsten, and Anna-Sophie Fuchs. *Global Public Good Impact Overview: Conditional pathways from T Theory to planetary systems*. Panta Rhei Research Program, WP005, canonical v1.0, May 8, 2026. Canonical route: <https://panta-rhei.site/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/>. Short route: <https://prrp.site/wp005>. Mnemonic route: <https://prrp.site/wp-impact>.

DOI:

References

- [1] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Water. <https://www.fao.org/water/en/>, 2026. Agriculture and water context.
- [2] Thorsten Fuchs and Anna-Sophie Fuchs. Panta rhei research program: Executive overview. <https://prrp.site/wp001>, 2026. Anchor document WP001, canonical v1.0.
- [3] Thorsten Fuchs and Anna-Sophie Fuchs. Public research observatory blueprint. <https://prrp.site/wp004>, 2026. Anchor document WP004, canonical v1.0.
- [4] Thorsten Fuchs and Anna-Sophie Fuchs. T theory: Executive synopsis. <https://prrp.site/wp002>, 2026. Anchor document WP002, canonical v1.0.
- [5] Thorsten Fuchs and Anna-Sophie Fuchs. Taulib technical overview. <https://prrp.site/wp003>, 2026. Anchor document WP003, canonical v1.0.
- [6] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Ar6 synthesis report: Climate change 2023. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/>, 2023. Climate-risk context.
- [7] International Energy Agency. World energy outlook. <https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2025>, 2025. Energy-system context.
- [8] Panta Rhei Research Program. Corpus. <https://panta-rhei.site/corpus/>, 2026. Registry, Construction Spine, and source corpus routes.
- [9] Panta Rhei Research Program. Global public good. <https://panta-rhei.site/impact/global-public-good/>, 2026. Eleven conditional public-good portfolios.
- [10] Panta Rhei Research Program. Impact. <https://panta-rhei.site/impact/>, 2026. Conditional relevance lane.
- [11] Panta Rhei Research Program. Impact framework. <https://panta-rhei.site/impact/impact-framework/>, 2026. Impact doctrine and inspection framework.
- [12] Panta Rhei Research Program. Public-good briefings. <https://panta-rhei.site/publications/research-briefings/public-good/>, 2026. Forty-four Public-Good Briefings / Impact Dossiers.
- [13] Panta Rhei Research Program. Results. <https://panta-rhei.site/results/>, 2026. Result and prediction/falsification surfaces.
- [14] Panta Rhei Research Program. Verify. <https://panta-rhei.site/verify/>, 2026. Verification, trust budget, and audit surfaces.
- [15] UNESCO. Recommendation on open science. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-science>, 2021. Adopted 23 November 2021.
- [16] United Nations. The 17 goals. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>, 2026. Sustainable Development Goals.
- [17] World Health Organization. One health. <https://www.who.int/health-topics/one-health>, 2026. One Health orientation.
- [18] World Meteorological Organization. Early warnings for all. <https://wmo.int/activities/early-warnings-all>, 2026. Global early-warning initiative.



WHITE PAPER • WP005 • canonical v1.0

Global Public Good Impact Overview

Conditional pathways from τ -Theory to planetary systems

The Panta Rhei Research Program is an independent open research program dedicated to building a coherent theory of reality.

CANONICAL ROUTE

<https://panta-rhei.site/publications/anchor-documents/wp005-global-public-good-impact-overview/>

SHORT ROUTE

<https://prrp.site/wp005>

CODE

github.com/Panta-Rhei-Research

CORRESPONDENCE

thorsten@panta-rhei.site