

# BKT 17020:2026 — STS Umbrella Criteria

---

## BKT 17020:2026

---

## STS Umbrella Criteria

---

### The Normative Criteria Document for the Buktika Tika Standard

**Reference Identifier:** BKT 17020:2026 **Version:** 1.0.1 **Supersedes:** BKT 17020:2026 v1.0.0 (2026-06-23) **Status:** First normative edition, corrigendum pass complete **Date:** 2026-06-23 **Working abbreviation:** STS-UC **Full name:** STS Umbrella Criteria **Parent standard:** BKT 17010:2026, Buktika Tika Standard (the founding whitepaper — axioms, lane definitions, and design rationale remain there and are not restated in full here) **Primary domains:** Eco Conservation, Eco Restoration, MDX Human Restoration, EDU Education, Viridian assurance, claims governance, evidence governance **Numbering authority:** BKT 12010:2025 +A1, Buktika Specification Numbering Standard (series 17000-17999, Cross-domain correctness and claims standards; this document occupies the 17020 slot reserved in Section 5.3 of that standard for “Tika definitions and lane taxonomy,” extended here to also carry Parts 3-12 since no further split has yet occurred) **Related Buktika specifications:** see BKT 17010:2026 Section 1B for the full version-pinned register; this document inherits that register without restating it **Related engine:** Tekmerion, Buktika proof and audit engine

---

### Change Record — v1.0.1

This is the cross-consistency pass required by Part 14.2 before first publication: each of the twelve Parts checked against the other eleven for internal contradiction, per the standard’s own change-control rule.

Corrections made:

1. **Wrong subsection citations fixed.** Part 3.2 and Part 5.3 each cited “Part 7.6(12)” for the lane-mixing forbidden claim. Part 7.6 (Additionality) has no numbered items; the correct citation is Part 7.5(12), where the lane-mixing item actually lives. Both citations corrected.
2. **Acceptance authority gap closed.** Part 2.21 defines “Acceptance” as an act performed by a named authorised person, but Part 4’s eligibility lists never named who that person is for each lane, leaving Part 6’s “Admitted” state and the Part 13 conformance test resting on an undefined actor. New Part 4.5 (Acceptance authority) names the certifying authority for each of the four lanes, consistent with existing Buktika role definitions (Field Steward, D5 acceptance authority, MDX programme lead, education lead). The former Part 4.5 (Cross-lane rule) is renumbered to 4.6; no other part of this document referenced it by number, so no further renumbering was required.
3. **Evidence-lapse gap closed.** Part 9 addressed breach by degradation (9.2) but was silent on what happens when a refresh deadline (9.1) passes with no degradation found and no review triggered — leaving a theoretical path for a claim to sit in “Admitted” state indefinitely on stale evidence. New Part 9.4 (Lapse) moves a lapsed object automatically to “Admitted with limits,” requires disclosure of the lapse in any claim made about it, and is added to Part 12.1’s trigger list so the existing suspension-and-correction machinery (notice, recording) applies to lapses as well as breaches.
4. **All remaining Part-to-Part numeric citations checked against the sections they cite** (Part 1.2(1-4), 2.15, 2.20, 2.23, 3.1, 3.3, 4.4(7), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5(6), 7.5(7), 8.2, 8.2(1), 9.1, 12.1, 12.3(1)) and confirmed to resolve correctly; no further defects found.

No change was made to any of the twelve Parts’ substantive rules beyond the three corrections above. Lane definitions, eligibility minimums, evidence tiers, claims boundaries, and the conformance test (Part 13) are otherwise unchanged from v1.0.0.

---

## 0. Relationship to BKT 17010:2026

BKT 17010:2026 is the founding whitepaper. It states the six precedence axioms, names the four lanes, and explains why STS exists. It remains authoritative for that material.

This document, BKT 17020:2026, is the criteria document BKT 17010:2026 Section 18 anticipated: “the first STS criteria document should contain at least the following parts.” Where BKT 17010:2026 said a thing “may include” or “should contain,” this document says what it **does** include and **must** contain, as a pass/fail rule.

Where this document and BKT 17010:2026 appear to conflict, BKT 17010:2026’s axioms govern (Axiom 1: correctness before marketability is not overridden by a criteria document that makes correctness easier to claim). Where this document adds a rule BKT 17010:2026 did not state, the addition is binding from the date of this edition forward and does not retroactively reclassify anything accepted before that date, except as Part 12 (Suspension and correction) allows.

This document does not restate the four lane definitions (Eco Conservation, Eco Restoration, MDX Human Restoration, EDU Education) in full. It assumes BKT 17010:2026 Section 8 as read. It only adds the eligibility, evidence, and claims rules each lane requires to be operable.

---

## Part 1: Scope

**1.1** This document governs all Buktika work that produces a claim — a statement made to a Viridian, auditor, regulator, or the public about ecological condition, restoration outcome, human restoration outcome, or education delivery.

**1.2** This document applies to:

1. Eco Conservation (Sielsgrond and other non-regression objects);
2. Eco Restoration (RP1 through RP7 and other accepted restoration work);
3. MDX Human Restoration (MamaDEX and related human restoration activity);
4. EDU Education (EduTower, Veldskool, and related education activity);
5. Reporter discipline (Section 12 of BKT 17010:2026, and Part 8 below);
6. Viridian claims (statements a Funding Source makes using Buktika evidence);
7. Tekmerion proof trails (the machine-readable record this document’s rules produce).

**1.3** This document does not apply to:

1. internal Buktika operational matters with no external claim attached (for example, internal staffing, internal tooling decisions);
2. matters governed exclusively by a named legal agreement (D2, D3, D5) where that agreement does not itself produce a buyer-facing or auditor-facing claim;
3. ISO-scoped technical methodology that BESCO, the D-set, or another named specification already governs in full — this document governs whether a *claim* drawn from that methodology is correct, not the methodology's internal technical content.

**1.4** A Buktika work item is “in scope” the moment any person intends to use evidence about it to support a claim to a third party. Before that moment, ordinary farm or centre activity is not yet subject to this document.

---

## Part 2: Definitions

The following definitions are binding wherever the defined term is used in a Tika-governed claim, offer pack, or proof trail. A term used inconsistently with its definition here is, by that fact alone, an incorrect claim under Axiom 2 (proof before claim).

**2.1 STS** — the Buktika Tika Standard, comprising BKT 17010:2026 (the founding whitepaper) and BKT 17020:2026 (this criteria document), together with any further parts split out under BKT 12010:2025 +A1 Section 5.3.

**2.2 Tika** — the working name for STS; “correct” in the sense defined by BKT 17010:2026 Section 1: evidence correct, lane correct, claim correct, consent correct, boundary correct.

**2.3 Tekmerion** — the Buktika proof and audit engine that checks a Buktika evidence file against this document's rules and produces a proof trail, exception list, and assurance pack.

**2.4 Eco Conservation** — the lane defined in BKT 17010:2026 Section 8.1: protection and non-regression of ecological value that already exists.

**2.5 Eco Restoration** — the lane defined in BKT 17010:2026 Section 8.2: repair, recovery, planting, erosion control, habitat work, and accepted restoration outcomes.

**2.6 MDX Human Restoration** — the lane defined in BKT 17010:2026 Section 8.3: MamaDEX, family upliftment, dignity work, local income, community services, and human restoration outcomes.

**2.7 EDU Education** — the lane defined in BKT 17010:2026 Section 8.4: EduTower, Veldskool, field learning, nature trails, curricula, farmer education, youth learning, and education evidence packs.

**2.8 Sielsgrond** — old intact ground, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 2 and BKT 11020:2026: land that remained whole because a farmer, family, or community chose restraint where disturbance was possible. Governed under BKT 17010:2026 Section 9 and the SGR registry codes (BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 1A.1).

**2.9 RP1** — the first survival-safe resting-and-stewardship step for tired or pressure-sensitive ground, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 10.

**2.10 Field Steward** — the Buktika-accredited practitioner authorised to perform BESCO-Sprint and BESCO-Scout field work and, where accredited, to issue a BESCO Stewardship Certificate (BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 4.6).

**2.11 Eco Guild** — the farmer-facing support circle, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 3, and the institutional home of the Reporter role.

**2.12 Reporter** — a person from the Eco Guild who turns accepted proof into a true, consent-bound, claims-boundary-respecting story, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 12.

**2.13 Viridian** — a Funding Source under disclosure, procurement, nature-risk, reputation, or governance pressure, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 13.

**2.14 Funding Source** — any party — Viridian, SA bank, foundation, donor, or other accepted funder — that activates against a Tika-governed object.

**2.15 Evidence period** — the stated date range for which a specific piece of evidence, or a specific claim drawn from it, is valid. A claim made outside its evidence period is, by definition, a forbidden claim under Part 7.

**2.16 Non-regression** — a time-bound commitment that an identified ecological polygon's condition will not be deliberately degraded during the evidence period, evidenced by refresh data per Part 9.

**2.17 Consent** — a recorded, dated agreement by the farmer, landowner, occupier, centre, or participant, in the form required by Part 4 eligibility rules and Part 8, authorising the specific evidence-gathering or story-telling activity described.

**2.18 Permitted claim** — a claim statement that this document’s Part 7 rules allow for the relevant lane, evidence position, and evidence period.

**2.19 Forbidden claim** — a claim statement that Part 7 prohibits by default, or that has not affirmatively cleared the eligibility and evidence requirements of Parts 4 and 5 for the lane in question.

**2.20 Activation** — the act by which a Funding Source commits funding, support, or recorded contribution against a specific Tika-governed object, following Part 10’s motive-classification requirement.

**2.21 Acceptance** — the formal act by which a Buktika-authorized person (per BKT 17010:2026 Section 18 Part references and Part 6 below) moves a candidate object into the “admitted” classification state.

**2.22 Refresh evidence** — new evidence gathered after initial acceptance that updates, confirms, or revises the claim, per Part 9.

**2.23 Proof trail** — the Tekmerion-generated, hash-sealed record showing which evidence supported which claim, checked against which version of this document, with what exceptions noted.

**2.24 Lane** — one of the four primary domains in Part 1.2(1-4). A single hectare, activity, or centre may carry evidence in more than one lane only where Part 3.3 (bundled evidence) is satisfied.

---

## **Part 3: Lane assignment**

**3.1** Every claim must declare exactly one primary lane before any evidence is gathered for it. Lane declaration happens at the candidate stage (Part 6.1) and is recorded in the proof trail.

**3.2** A claim may not move lanes after evidence has been accepted under one lane’s eligibility rules (Part 4), except by formal correction under Part 12. Moving lanes without correction is, by itself, a forbidden claim under Part 7.5(12).

**3.3 Bundled evidence.** Where a single farm, polygon, or centre genuinely carries activity in more than one lane (for example, a Sielsgrond polygon with an adjoining RP1 resting area, or a restoration site with an attached MamaDEX centre), each lane’s evidence, eligibility, and claim boundary must be assessed and recorded separately. A combined offer pack may reference more than one lane only if each lane’s own Part 11 offer-pack content is present in full for that lane.

**3.4** This rule binds the same way BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 1A.2 binds at the hectare level (“one hectare may carry only one active ecological claim class for the same evidence period”). Lane assignment under this Part is the claims-level expression of that same firewall; the two rules must never be read as independent of each other.

---

## **Part 4: Eligibility**

A candidate object becomes eligible for its lane only when every applicable item below is satisfied and recorded. An object missing any required item remains at “candidate” or “held for evidence” (Part 6) and may not be claimed.

### **4.1 Eco Conservation (Sielsgrond) — minimum eligibility**

All of the following are required:

1. an identifiable polygon, recorded with GPS centroid and area in hectares;
2. a farmer-declared non-disturbance history, dated and signed;
3. visible ecological condition consistent with long-term restraint, evidenced by at minimum one BESCO-Sprint (BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 3.1);
4. confirmation of no incompatible active use on the claimed polygon;
5. a signed, time-bound non-regression commitment;
6. written consent to field evidence gathering (D2);
7. written acceptance of the Eco Conservation claims boundary (Part 7.1);
8. written acknowledgement separating Sielsgrond from RP1, restoration, hunting, carbon, and offset claims, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 11.

Absence of item 3 (BESCO-Sprint evidence) is an automatic bar — no Sielsgrond object may be accepted on declaration alone.

### **4.2 Eco Restoration (RP1 through RP7) — minimum eligibility**

All of the following are required:

1. an identifiable tired, degraded, or pressure-sensitive area;
2. a documented farmer discussion of resting or pressure reduction, or an executed D3 Landowner Restoration Agreement for higher RP tiers;
3. a practical farm-continuity plan covering stock movement, roads, and water where relevant;
4. hunting-day and corridor planning where relevant, per BKT 17010:2026 Section 11;
5. agreed proof requirements matching the evidence hierarchy (Part 5) for the relevant RP tier;
6. an agreed evidence period;
7. an agreed payment, support, or funding basis;
8. written acceptance (D5 Task Order or equivalent) before any change to the area occurs.

For RP7-tier engineered work specifically, a BESCO-Charter (BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 3.3) is required in addition to the above; a Sprint or Scout alone is insufficient eligibility for RP7 claims.

#### **4.3 MDX Human Restoration — minimum eligibility**

All of the following are required:

1. an admitted MamaDEX or MDX activity, named and dated;
2. consent from each identifiable participant whose story or data will be used, where the activity involves identifiable individuals;
3. delivery evidence (attendance, service log, or equivalent);
4. participant or centre records sufficient to support the specific claim made;
5. grievance and safeguarding controls in place where the activity involves minors or vulnerable participants;
6. a funding record showing the activation basis;
7. written acceptance of the MDX claims boundary (Part 7.3);
8. a story boundary agreed with the Reporter before any narrative is produced (Part 8).

#### **4.4 EDU Education — minimum eligibility**

All of the following are required:

1. an admitted EduTower, Veldskool, trail, curriculum, or learning activity, named and dated;
2. an attendance or participation record;

3. a content or curriculum record;
4. a facilitator or delivery record naming the responsible person;
5. consent from participants or guardians where required;
6. written acceptance of the EDU claims boundary (Part 7.4);
7. an explicit education-accreditation boundary statement — naming whether any formal qualification is claimed, and if so, citing the accrediting body;
8. an evidence retention commitment matching Part 9.

#### 4.5 Acceptance authority

Satisfaction of the eligibility items above (4.1–4.4) must be certified by a named, authorised person before an object may move to “Admitted” (Part 6). Self-certification by the farmer, landowner, centre, or participant alone is not sufficient in any lane — Part 4’s eligibility items are evidence inputs, not a self-assessment outcome.

1. **Eco Conservation:** certified by a Field Steward or the Founder, consistent with BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 4.6 (the same persons authorised to issue a BESCO Stewardship Certificate).
2. **Eco Restoration:** certified by the Buktika-appointed acceptance authority named in the relevant D5 Task Order, or, for RP7, the independent acceptance authority named in the Issued for Construction pack (BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 3.3).
3. **MDX Human Restoration:** certified by a Buktika-appointed MDX programme lead or Eco Guild-appointed authority with safeguarding competence where minors or vulnerable participants are involved.
4. **EDU Education:** certified by the facilitator’s supervising Buktika-appointed education lead.

The certifying person’s name, role, and date are recorded as part of the state change (Part 6.3) and carried into the proof trail (Part 2.23).

#### 4.6 Cross-lane rule

No object may be accepted into any lane while a Control-Change BESCO Review is outstanding under BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 11A, where applicable. A lane acceptance granted while such a review is outstanding is void from the date the review was triggered, not merely suspended.

---

## Part 5: Evidence hierarchy

**5.1** Evidence is classified into three strength tiers. A claim's permitted strength (Part 7) is bounded by the strongest tier of evidence actually on file for it — a claim may not assert more than its evidence supports, but may always assert less.

**Tier A — Verified field evidence.** Geotagged photographs with STE seal; BESCO-Sprint, BESCO-Scout, or BESCO-Charter evidence packs; vegetation survey; species indicators; disturbance indicators recorded by a Field Steward; historical aerial or satellite imagery cross-referenced to the polygon; remote sensing; work completion records countersigned by an independent acceptance authority; ecological expert reports.

**Tier B — Recorded but unverified evidence.** Farmer declaration; family or neighbour testimony; grazing or land-use records not independently cross-checked; attendance records; payroll or service records; community records; Reporter records prior to Tekmerion check.

**Tier C — Supporting context only.** General narrative, photographs without geotagging or STE seal, informal observation not tied to a dated field visit.

**5.2** Tier C evidence alone may never support a permitted claim under Part 7. It may only support context within an offer pack (Part 11) where the offer pack discloses that the supporting material is Tier C.

**5.3** A claim resting solely on Tier B evidence must say so in the permitted-claim wording (for example, “based on farmer declaration, not yet independently field-verified”). Silence about evidence tier is itself a forbidden claim under Part 7.5(12) — it mixes claim strength without disclosing the evidence basis.

**5.4** Monitoring records and refresh evidence (Part 9) are classified by the same tier rules as initial evidence; refresh evidence does not automatically inherit a higher tier than the method used to gather it.

**5.5** Where BESCO evidence is cited, the cited version must be named (per BKT 17010:2026 Section 1B's version-pinning rule). Evidence drawn from a superseded BESCO version without re-confirmation against the current version is treated as Tier B regardless of its original tier, until re-confirmed.

---

## Part 6: Classification states

**6.1** Every Tika-governed object moves through the following states. A state may only be entered from the states listed as valid predecessors; entering a state from any other state is a recording error to be corrected under Part 12, not a valid transition.

State	Meaning	Valid predecessor states
Not assessed	Identified but no review has begun	— (initial state)
Candidate	Lane declared (Part 3.1), review begun	Not assessed
Held for evidence	Lane declared, eligibility (Part 4) not yet complete	Candidate
Admitted	All Part 4 eligibility items satisfied and recorded	Held for evidence
Admitted with limits	Eligible but with a named, recorded restriction on claim scope	Held for evidence, Admitted
Rejected	Eligibility not met and no further evidence expected	Candidate, Held for evidence
Suspended	Previously admitted, now paused per Part 12	Admitted, Admitted with limits
Corrected	A prior error has been fixed and the record updated	Suspended, any state subject to Part 12
Superseded	A newer version of the evidence or claim has replaced this record	Admitted, Admitted with limits, Corrected
Retired	No longer active; record kept per retention rules	Any state

**6.2** Only “Admitted” or “Admitted with limits” objects may be the subject of a permitted claim (Part 7). All other states default to no claim being available.

**6.3** State changes must be recorded with date, the name of the person or system effecting the change, and the reason. This record is part of the proof trail (Section 17, BKT 17010:2026).

---

## Part 7: Claims boundary

### 7.1 Eco Conservation — permitted and forbidden claims

**Permitted default claim:** “Verified continuing protection of [identified polygon] for [evidence period], under a non-regression commitment evidenced per [BESCO reference], classification: [state].”

The claim must not assert additionality, must not use the words “offset,” “credit,” or “tradeable,” and must state the evidence tier (Part 5) supporting it.

### 7.2 Eco Restoration — permitted and forbidden claims

**Permitted default claim:** “[Accepted restoration work] was performed on [identified area] during [evidence period], evidenced per [BESCO/D5 reference], classification: [state].”

A carbon-credit-class claim is permitted only where a named carbon methodology and verification route is separately cited and itself satisfied; absent that citation, the restoration claim must not reference carbon credits at all.

### 7.3 MDX Human Restoration — permitted and forbidden claims

**Permitted default claim:** “[Accepted human restoration activity] occurred at [centre/community] during [evidence period], with consent recorded and delivery evidenced per [record reference], classification: [state].”

The claim must not use language implying poverty as a marketing device, must not assert a wellbeing outcome unless that outcome was itself evidenced (not merely the activity that might produce it), and must not claim job creation in numbers exceeding the payroll or service record on file.

### 7.4 EDU Education — permitted and forbidden claims

**Permitted default claim:** “[Education activity] was delivered to [participant group] during [evidence period], with attendance and content evidenced per [record reference], classification: [state].”

The claim must not assert a formal qualification unless the accreditation boundary statement (Part 4.4(7)) names a real accrediting body, and must not assert a learning outcome beyond participation unless that outcome was itself tested and evidenced.

## 7.5 Cross-lane forbidden claims

The following are forbidden in every lane, without exception, regardless of evidence tier:

1. land sale where no land sale occurred;
2. carbon credit without a carbon methodology and verification route, separately satisfied and cited;
3. biodiversity credit without an admitted biodiversity-credit pathway, separately satisfied and cited;
4. statutory offset without legal-pathway admission, separately reviewed and recorded;
5. statutory-compliance discharge without a reviewed legal basis;
6. guaranteed future ecological outcome;
7. guaranteed social outcome;
8. formal qualification without accreditation;
9. poverty-theatre claims;
10. exaggerated family or community claims;
11. buyer claims made outside the stated evidence period;
12. any statement mixing lanes without independently satisfied evidence for each lane named.

## 7.6 Additionality

No claim under this document may assert or imply additionality (that an outcome would not otherwise have occurred) for any Eco Conservation object. Additionality language is reserved exclusively for Eco Restoration claims where a named, separately satisfied carbon or biodiversity methodology requires it, and even then only within that methodology's own scope — never imported into the surrounding STS claim language.

---

## Part 8: Consent and story discipline

**8.1** No Reporter may produce a story about any object until that object has reached “Admitted” or “Admitted with limits” (Part 6.2). A story written about a “Candidate” or “Held for evidence” object is, by definition, ahead of its proof and is a forbidden claim under Part 7.5(6) or 7.5(7) (it implies a guaranteed outcome not yet evidenced).

**8.2** Before any story is produced, the Reporter must confirm and record:

1. whose consent has been obtained, and for what specific use (internal record, Viridian pack, public-facing material — each requires separate consent unless the original consent explicitly covers all three);
2. which evidence tier (Part 5) the story is permitted to draw on;
3. which claims-boundary wording (Part 7) applies to the lane in question.

**8.3 The Story Test** (BKT 17010:2026 Section 12) is applied before publication: can the story be told with warmth, dignity, and commercial clarity without exceeding accepted proof or consent? A story that fails this test must be corrected before use, and the correction is recorded under Part 12.

**8.4** A person may withdraw consent at any time. Withdrawal does not retroactively un-publish material already lawfully shared under prior consent, but it does bar any further use, refresh, or republication from the date of withdrawal, and the withdrawal is itself recorded as a state-relevant event (Part 6.3).

---

## Part 9: Non-regression, continuity, and refresh

**9.1** Every “Admitted” object carries a refresh schedule appropriate to its lane:

1. **Eco Conservation:** at minimum one refresh BESCO-Sprint per evidence period claimed, or upon any significant land-condition event (fire, flood, invasive clearance) per BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 4.2.
2. **Eco Restoration:** post-work monitoring per the relevant RP tier’s accepted monitoring cadence; RP7 work additionally requires the monitoring named in its Issued for Construction pack.
3. **MDX Human Restoration:** follow-up records at the cadence the specific claim requires; a one-time activity does not require ongoing refresh, but any claim asserting a continuing outcome does.
4. **EDU Education:** evidence retention for the period stated in the claim, plus follow-up records wherever a learning outcome (not just participation) is claimed.

**9.2** A non-regression commitment (Eco Conservation) is breached the moment refresh evidence shows material degradation inconsistent with the committed condition. A breach triggers Part 12 (Suspension and correction) — it does not automatically void the entire prior evidence period’s claim, which remains valid for the period it actually covered.

**9.3** Refresh evidence enriches but does not replace prior evidence. The full evidence chain, not just the most recent refresh, is what a BESCO Stewardship Certificate or equivalent Tika-governed certificate reflects, per BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0 Section 4.3.

**9.4 Lapse.** Where the refresh schedule in 9.1 is missed and no other Part 12 trigger event has been recorded, the object’s classification state moves automatically to “Admitted with limits” on the day after the missed refresh deadline, with the limit recorded as “evidence lapsed, refresh overdue.” This is itself a Part 12.1 trigger; it carries no presumption of degradation, and the review outcome it normally produces is a return to “Admitted” once the overdue refresh evidence is supplied (Part 12.3(1), read here as: the missing evidence is the thing corrected). A claim made about a lapsed object must disclose the lapse; silence about a recorded lapse is itself a forbidden claim under Part 7.5(12).

---

## **Part 10: Buyer motive classification**

**10.1** No activation (Part 2.20) may proceed until the Funding Source’s motive is recorded in one of the following classes:

1. disclosure support;
2. procurement or finance policy;
3. voluntary aligned contribution;
4. donation;
5. corporate social investment;
6. human restoration support;
7. education support;
8. regulated voluntary market — only where scheme-specific review has separately admitted the instrument;
9. statutory purchase requirement — only where legal-pathway review has separately confirmed applicability.

**10.2** Motive classes 8 and 9 may not be recorded by self-declaration alone. Each requires a named reviewing authority and a dated review record before the motive class is accepted.

**10.3** The recorded motive class constrains which claim wording (Part 7) the Funding Source may use in its own disclosure. A Funding Source recorded under motive class 1 (disclosure support) may not subsequently describe the

activation using offset or credit language reserved for class 8, regardless of how the underlying object is otherwise eligible.

---

## **Part 11: Offer pack**

**11.1** No object may be offered to a Funding Source without an offer pack containing all of the following:

1. lane summary (Part 3.1's declared lane);
2. object or activity summary;
3. farmer, centre, or community consent status (Part 8.2(1));
4. evidence summary, naming evidence tier (Part 5);
5. evidence period (Part 2.15);
6. commitment or delivery basis;
7. refresh evidence schedule (Part 9.1);
8. permitted claim, in the exact wording the Funding Source may use (Part 7);
9. forbidden claims, listed explicitly for this object, not just by general reference to Part 7;
10. activation or funding value schedule;
11. distribution schedule, where relevant;
12. Reporter story boundary (Part 8.2);
13. version record, citing this document's version and the version of every other Buktika specification the offer pack relies on, per the version-pinning rule in BKT 17010:2026 Section 1B;
14. Tekmerion proof trail reference;
15. an auditor note, stating plainly what remains unverified or limited about the object as offered.

**11.2** An offer pack missing any item in 11.1 is incomplete and may not be activated against. Incompleteness is not cured by the Funding Source's willingness to proceed anyway — Axiom 4 (boundary before price) means the boundary must exist before the offer is made, not be supplied retroactively because a buyer didn't ask.

---

## Part 12: Suspension and correction

**12.1** Any of the following triggers a review under this Part: a claim is found to overstate its evidence; an evidence file is found incomplete or falsified; a polygon's condition changes materially; an activity record is found inaccurate; a consent record is found defective or withdrawn; a commitment (non-regression, continuity) is breached; a refresh schedule under Part 9.1 lapses per Part 9.4.

**12.2** On a trigger event, the object's classification state (Part 6) moves to "Suspended" immediately, pending review. Suspension is not a punishment — it is the correct intermediate state while the facts are established.

**12.3** Following review, the outcome is one of:

1. **Correction** — the record is fixed, the object returns to its prior state (or "Admitted with limits" if the correction narrows the prior claim), and both the error and the fix are retained in the record (12.6).
2. **Limitation** — the object moves to "Admitted with limits," with the new limit named and dated.
3. **Withdrawal** — the object moves to "Retired"; no further claims may be made.
4. **Versioned replacement** — a new object record is created (state: not assessed → candidate, per Part 6.1) and the old record moves to "Superseded," cross-referenced to the new record.

**12.4** Buyer notice and farmer or centre notice are mandatory, not discretionary, for any trigger event under 12.1 that affects a claim a Funding Source has already activated against or a farmer or centre has already consented to. Notice must be given before the new classification state is treated as final, except where immediate suspension is required to prevent ongoing harm (for example, an active safeguarding concern).

**12.5** A correction does not retroactively make a prior claim, made in good faith on the evidence available at the time, a violation of this document — provided the prior claim was within that evidence's tier and lane at the time it was made. This document does not punish honest claims that later evidence narrows; it punishes claims made beyond what the evidence supported at the time.

**12.6** The original error and the correction are both retained in the record, neither one overwriting the other. This is not optional — Axiom 1 (correctness before marketability) requires that the corrected history remain visible, not just the corrected present.

---

## 13. Conformance

**13.1** A Buktika claim conforms to STS if and only if:

1. it declares a single lane per Part 3, absent a satisfied Part 3.3 bundling;
2. its object has satisfied every applicable Part 4 eligibility item for that lane;
3. its evidence is classified by tier per Part 5, and the claim's strength does not exceed that tier;
4. its object's classification state is "Admitted" or "Admitted with limits" per Part 6;
5. its wording matches a permitted claim and avoids every forbidden claim under Part 7;
6. any story drawn from it has passed the Story Test and respects consent per Part 8;
7. its refresh schedule per Part 9 is current, or the claim discloses that it is not;
8. the Funding Source's motive is classified per Part 10;
9. its offer pack, if one exists, is complete per Part 11;
10. any prior trigger event has been resolved per Part 12, with the resolution reflected in the current claim.

**13.2** A claim failing any item in 13.1 does not conform to STS. A non-conforming claim may still be true. STS conformance is not a claim of truth — BKT 17010:2026 Section 1 makes clear that correctness, not attractiveness, is the standard's first question — but a non-conforming claim has not yet earned the right to say so under this document, and must not cite STS or BKT 17010:2026/17020:2026 in its support until it does.

---

## 14. Change control

**14.1** Amendments to this document follow the same numbering and amendment rules as BKT 12010:2025 +A1 Section 9 — additive amendment markers (+A#) for material additions, corrigenda for non-substantive corrections, new editions where accumulated change justifies a full republish.

**14.2** Any amendment to one of the twelve Parts above must be cross-checked against the other eleven for consistency before publication — a change to Part 7 (Claims boundary) that is not reflected in Part 11 (Offer pack) or Part 13 (Conformance) is itself a Tika defect and must be corrected before the amendment is considered complete.

**14.3** This document inherits BKT 17010:2026's own version-pinning discipline: any specification cited by reference number and version in this document is only current for that version. A future BESCO, D-set, or BKT 11020 revision does not automatically flow through to this document's rules until this document is itself revised to cite the new version.

---

**End of BKT 17020:2026 v1.0.1**

*This document is the criteria document anticipated by BKT 17010:2026 Section 18. From the date of this edition, an STS-governed claim must satisfy this document's normative rules, not merely the founding whitepaper's design description, to be called conformant.*