BKT 17010:2026 — Buktika Tika Standard

BKT 17010:2026

Buktika Tika Standard

Foundational Design Whitepaper for Correct Evidence, Correct Claims, Correct Consent, and Correct Reporting Across Buktika Work

Reference Identifier: BKT 17010:2026 **Document Code:** BKT STS-WP-001:2026 **Version:** 1.3.0 **Supersedes:** BKT 17010:2026 v1.2.0 (2026-06-03) **Status:** Foundational design whitepaper — normative criteria now published separately as BKT 17020:2026 **Date:** 2026-06-23 **Working abbreviation:** STS **Full name:** Buktika Tika Standard **Primary domains:** Eco Conservation, Eco Restoration, MDX Human Restoration, EDU Education, Viridian assurance, claims governance, evidence governance **Primary first use cases:** Sielsgrond, RP1 first resting-and-stewardship step, Reporter discipline, Viridian evidence packs **Standards:** ISO 14064-3, ISO 14065, ISO/IEC 17029, ISO/IEC 17025, ISO 9001, ISO 37301 (assurance-route mapping per Section 19; STS itself is not certified under any of these — see Section 19.5) **Related Buktika specifications:** see Section 1B, Related Buktika specifications and document family **Related paper:** BKT 56110:2026, Sielsgrond Conservation Purchasing and Claims Boundary **Related engine:** Tekmerion, Buktika proof and audit engine **Numbering authority:** BKT 12010:2025 +A1, Buktika Specification Numbering Standard (series 17000-17999, Cross-domain correctness and claims standards)

Change Record — v1.3.0

This revision re-integrates three editorial changes that were applied to v1.1.0 (2026-06-23) but were not carried into the v1.2.0 lineage, and corrects one metadata error.

Material changes from v1.2.0:

- **Founding precedence axioms made an unnumbered preamble.** The axioms previously sat at “Section 0.” They now stand as a titled preamble before Section 1 (Executive summary), so the standard’s numbered sections begin at 1, in the manner of a Foreword preceding “1 Scope.” No other section number changes; all internal and external (BKT 17020:2026) cross-references to Sections 1–24 are therefore unaffected. The axioms themselves are unchanged and remain cited throughout as “Axiom 1” through “Axiom 6,” which the renumbering does not touch.
- **Section 19 renamed** from “ISO and assurance posture” to “Specifications and assurance posture.” The section number is unchanged, so every reference to Section 19 (here and in BKT 17020:2026) remains valid.
- **Standards reference register added as Section 19.6.** A role-classified register of the external published standards STS is designed to be read against, governed by three limits that prevent it from being read as certification, as a credit or offset claim, or as an additionality claim. It is the external-standards companion to the Buktika specification register at Section 1B.
- **Date corrected.** v1.2.0 was dated 2026-06-03 while declaring it superseded a v1.1.0 dated 2026-06-23 — chronologically impossible. This edition is dated 2026-06-23, consistent with its sibling BKT 17020:2026 v1.0.1.

This revision does not change any founding axiom, lane definition, design rationale, or the substance of the ISO assurance posture (Sections 19.1–19.5).

Change Record — v1.2.0

This revision marks Section 18 as superseded by the publication of BKT 17020:2026, STS Umbrella Criteria, the normative criteria document this whitepaper’s Section 18 anticipated but did not itself contain.

Material changes from v1.1.0:

- **BKT 17020:2026 published.** The twelve design-level parts in Section 18 (“the first STS criteria document should contain at least the following parts”) now have a binding counterpart: BKT 17020:2026 states each part as a pass/fail rule, with eligibility tests, evidence-tier classification, exact permitted-claim wording per lane, and a formal conformance test (BKT 17020:2026 Section 13).
- **Section 18 marked superseded, not deleted.** The original design rationale remains visible for context, but a notice at the top of Section 18 directs the reader to BKT 17020:2026 for the binding rule, and states that BKT 17020:2026 governs wherever the two differ.
- **Section 1B’s cross-reference register extended** with a row for BKT 17020:2026, and its closing paragraph updated to reflect that Section 18 is now superseded rather than pending.
- **Status line updated** to reflect that this whitepaper is no longer the sole normative text for Section 18’s subject matter, while remaining normative for Sections 2 through 17 and 19 through 24 (axioms, lane definitions, design rationale, ISO posture, Jungian trust architecture, and the foundational sentences).

This revision does not change any of the six founding axioms (the Founding precedence axioms preamble), the four lane definitions (Section 8), or the ISO assurance posture (Section 19). Those remain as published in v1.1.0.

Founding precedence axioms

Before any method, metric, lane, or claim defined in this standard, six precedence axioms govern the order in which work may proceed. Each axiom is a rule of sequence: the discipline named on the left must be satisfied before the step named on the right may be taken. The order is the standard. A claim that jumps its place in this sequence is, by definition, not correct under Tika — however attractive, fundable, emotional, or even ultimately true it may later prove to be.

1. **Correctness before marketability.**
2. **Proof before claim.**
3. **Consent before story.**
4. **Boundary before price.**
5. **Acceptance before reporting.**
6. **Funding only after the object is properly defined, evidenced, offered, and contracted.**

These six axioms also state, in the most compact form available, why a correctness standard is not a credit standard. A credit standard leads with the marketable claim and reaches for its proof afterward. Tika runs the sequence in the opposite direction: proof, consent, boundary, and acceptance come first, and the claim and the price are earned only at the end. Everything that follows in this document is the elaboration of these six lines.

---

1. Executive summary

The Buktika Tika Standard is proposed as the umbrella correctness standard for all Buktika work.

Its purpose is not to create a carbon credit standard, biodiversity credit standard, statutory offset scheme, land-sale framework, charity label, education-accreditation system, or guaranteed buyer market.

Its purpose is stricter and more foundational:

STS governs whether a Buktika claim is correct enough to be offered, funded, reported, audited, refreshed, and told without pretending to be something it is not.

STS exists because Buktika works across several kinds of value that are easily confused if they are not held in separate lanes:

1. Eco Conservation: protection and non-regression of ecological value that already exists.
2. Eco Restoration: repair, recovery, planting, erosion control, habitat work, and accepted restoration outcomes.
3. MDX Human Restoration: MamaDEX, family upliftment, dignity work, local income, community services, and human restoration outcomes.
4. EDU Education: EduTower, Veldskool, field learning, nature trails, curricula, farmer education, youth learning, and education evidence packs.

The standard is called **Tika** because the first question is not whether a claim is attractive, fundable, emotional, saleable, or marketable.

The first question is:

Is it correct?

The Tika question is:

Is the evidence correct, is the lane correct, is the claim correct, is the consent correct, is the boundary correct, is the farmer or centre protected, is the buyer protected, and can an auditor inspect the file without finding hidden exaggeration?

STS therefore sits between the kitchen table, the field, the MamaDEX centre, the classroom, the Viridian, and the auditor.

It is the standard of correctness.

Tekmerion is the proof engine that tests evidence against that standard.

Together:

Tika defines what may be truthfully claimed. Tekmerion proves whether the claim can stand.

1B. Related Buktika specifications and document family

STS is one node in a family of Buktika specifications. STS does not absorb or restate the content of these documents. It binds them by version-pinned normative reference: each linked document remains the authority for its own subject matter, and STS governs only whether claims drawn from that document's evidence are correct, lane-assigned, consented, and reportable.

A cross-reference in this section is only valid for the version named. If a linked document is reissued, the reference here is stale until this register is updated to cite the new version. This rule is itself an application of Axiom 1 (correctness before marketability): an unpinned cross-reference is a claim of currency the document cannot actually support.

Specification	Reference	What it is	How it connects to STS
BESCO	BKT-WP-BESCO-V7-004 v3.1.0	The field-evidence instrument: time-stamped, georeferenced biomass, soil, hydrology, and ecological-condition survey, in three forms (Sprint, Scout, Charter), producing the BESCO Stewardship Certificate.	Feeds the Eco Conservation and Eco Restoration lanes (Section 8.1, 8.2) as the accepted evidence class for polygon condition, non-regression, and restoration acceptance. BESCO Section 1A.2's rule that one hectare may carry only one active ecological claim class for the same evidence period is the field-level enforcement of STS's own lane-separation discipline (Section 4, Section 8) and is treated as binding under STS, not merely consistent with it.
BKT 11020:2026	Ecological State Governance and Sielsgrond Programmes	Defines ecological state classification (Track A Stewardship, Track B Restoration), the Sielsgrond Programme structure, and the SGR registry codes.	Supplies the state-classification layer STS's lane assignment (Section 8.1) draws on. STS governs the correctness of claims made about BKT 11020 states; BKT 11020 governs what the states are.
D2	Land Submission and Survey Consent (part of the D-set)	Defines farmer consent and survey-access agreement for BESCO and related field work.	Supplies the consent record STS requires before any Eco Conservation or Eco Restoration evidence may be gathered or claimed (Section 8.1, Section 18 Part 8).
D3	Landowner Restoration Agreement	Defines the landowner-facing restoration contract, including conditions under which limited standstill or tenure may be framed.	Supplies the contractual basis STS's Eco Restoration lane (Section 8.2) requires before restoration claims may be made.
D5	Restoration Addendum / Task Order	Defines task-level restoration instructions and triggers for BESCO-Sprint and BESCO-Scout work.	Supplies the trigger and task record STS's evidence hierarchy (Section 18 Part 5) treats as an accepted evidence class.

Specification	Reference	What it is	How it connects to STS
Eco Guild Charter	(charter document, version per Eco Guild governance)	Defines the Eco Guild as the farmer-facing support circle and the Reporter's home institution.	Supplies the institutional basis for the Reporter role STS defines and bounds in Section 12.
Tekmerion	(proof and audit engine, version per engine release)	The Buktika proof engine that checks evidence files against a named standard and produces proof trails, exceptions, and assurance packs.	Tekmerion tests evidence against STS specifically. STS defines correctness; Tekmerion proves whether a given evidence file meets it (Section 17). Tekmerion's own independent-review status is tracked under Workstream 11 (Section 20) and is not yet resolved as of this version.
BKT 56110:2026	Sielsgrond Conservation Purchasing and Claims Boundary	Defines the buyer-facing purchasing process and claims boundary specific to Sielsgrond transactions.	Already cited as STS's Related paper (see header). Operates one level below STS: BKT 56110 governs the Sielsgrond purchasing process; STS governs whether the claims made within that process are correct.
BKT 12010:2025 +A1	Buktika Specification Numbering Standard	Defines the reference-identifier and filename-identifier scheme for all Buktika documents, including the 17000–17999 cross-domain correctness range STS occupies.	Supplies STS's own Reference Identifier (BKT 17010:2026) and governs how future parts of the Tika Standard family (definitions, lane criteria, evidence hierarchy, annexes — see BKT 12010 +A1 Section 5.3) are to be numbered as they are split out from this founding document.

Specification	Reference	What it is	How it connects to STS
BKT 17020:2026	STS Umbrella Criteria	The normative criteria document anticipated by Section 18: twelve binding parts (scope, definitions, lane assignment, eligibility, evidence hierarchy, classification states, claims boundary, consent and story discipline, non-regression and refresh, buyer motive classification, offer pack, suspension and correction) plus a conformance test.	Supersedes Section 18's design-level description with pass/fail rules. A claim is only STS-conformant if it satisfies BKT 17020:2026 Section 13 (Conformance), not merely the design intent described in this document's Section 18.

This register will be extended as further Workstreams (Section 20) produce standalone documents — at minimum each lane module (Workstreams 2-5) will receive its own BKT 170XX reference identifiers under BKT 12010 +A1 Section 5.3, superseding the relevant parts of this founding document. Sections 2 through 17, 19 through 24 remain the sole normative text for the material they cover; **Section 18's twelve-part criteria architecture is superseded by BKT 17020:2026, the STS Umbrella Criteria, which contains the binding normative rules Section 18 below describes only at design level.** Where Section 18 and BKT 17020:2026 differ, BKT 17020:2026 governs, since it is the later, more specific, and normative document.

---

2. Why STS is needed

The immediate pressure that exposed the need for STS came through Sielsgrond.

Buktika saw something that existing carbon and restoration language could not hold properly:

land that stayed whole may carry value because it stayed whole.

This was the first Sielsgrond insight.

Sielsgrond means Soul Ground: old intact land that remained whole because a farmer, family, or community chose restraint where short-term pressure could have caused disturbance. In ordinary markets, such land is often treated as unused, idle, or commercially invisible. In the Buktika view, that is wrong.

Restraint can be stewardship.

Non-disturbance can carry value.

Old intact ground may deserve recognition before damaged ground is repaired.

However, the original insight was difficult to explain safely.

Farmers heard possible income.

Carbon-market practitioners asked where the new carbon uplift was.

Restoration practitioners looked for visible repair work.

Buyers wanted something they could report without greenwashing.

Auditors wanted criteria, evidence, boundaries, and control language.

The Sielsgrond insight was therefore true but exposed.

It could not safely be carried by hope alone. It could not be forced into old carbon vocabulary. It could not be sold as a guaranteed cheque. It could not be presented as a regulated credit or offset unless an admitted legal pathway expressly allowed that. It needed a standard of correctness before it could become a market-facing offer.

That is the origin of STS.

STS exists because Buktika had to answer a harder question than whether Sielsgrond might be valuable.

The harder question was:

How can Buktika make a farmer's old intact ground visible to a Funding Source without exaggerating the claim, misleading the farmer, confusing the buyer, or trapping the auditor?

The answer is Tika.

Correctness before marketability.

Proof before claim.

Consent before story.

Boundary before price.

Acceptance before reporting.

Funding only after the object is properly defined, evidenced, offered, and contracted.

---

3. The loop that strengthened the design

The Sielsgrond track was not abandoned because it was false.

It was delayed because the first language around it was incomplete.

The original concept was vulnerable to three misunderstandings:

1. that old intact land was being sold as carbon;
2. that untouched land automatically meant guaranteed money; and
3. that a buyer would appear simply because the ecological value was real.

During the wider Buktika design loop, the missing architecture emerged.

That loop brought in structures that now make the Sielsgrond pathway more credible:

1. **Eco Guilds** as the farmer-facing support circle;
2. **Reporters** as proof-bound storytellers from the Eco Guild, not decorative artists;
3. **Viridians** as real Funding Sources with disclosure, procurement, nature-risk, and reputation pressure;
4. **MamaDEX / MDX** as human restoration, so ecological work is not separated from family and community dignity;
5. **EduTower / EDU** as education proof and field learning;
6. **RP1** as the survival-safe first resting-and-stewardship step for tired or pressure-sensitive ground;
7. **claims boundaries** so conservation, restoration, human restoration, education, carbon, offsetting, donation, and disclosure support are not mixed;
8. **STS** as the umbrella correctness standard; and
9. **Tekmerion** as the proof engine that tests evidence against the standard.

The loop therefore did not weaken the original Sielsgrond insight.

It strengthened it.

The earlier sentence was:

Sielsgrond has value.

The corrected STS sentence is:

Sielsgrond may become commercially offerable when it is carried through a correctness standard, proven through a proof engine, supported by an Eco Guild, made recognisable through consent-bound reporting, and presented to a Funding Source under a precise claims boundary.

This is the difference between inspiration and infrastructure.

---

4. The problem with the old vocabulary

The Sielsgrond and RP1 concepts were repeatedly challenged because they were judged through existing carbon-market assumptions.

Those assumptions were too narrow.

Carbon logic asks:

What new carbon has been added or protected under an accepted carbon methodology?

Restoration logic asks:

What damaged system has been repaired and what uplift can be shown?

Sielsgrond asks a different question:

What old intact ecological value has survived because disturbance was avoided, and can its continuing protection be funded truthfully?

RP1 asks another different question:

Can tired ground be given a first survival-safe resting step without breaking the farm, moving animals casually, or creating unsupported claims?

These are related but separate concepts.

Sielsgrond is not RP1.

RP1 is not Sielsgrond.

Eco Conservation is not Eco Restoration.

Human Restoration is not decorative social impact.

Education is not a side brochure.

A Reporter is not an artist.

A Viridian is not buying a vague good feeling.

An auditor is not being asked to trust a story without evidence.

STS exists because each concept must keep its own lane.

---

5. Design principle: correctness before marketability

The Tika principle is:

Correctness comes before marketability.

This does not mean Buktika avoids commercial design.

It means commercial design must arise from a defensible object.

The object must be:

1. correctly named;
2. correctly placed in the correct lane;
3. correctly evidenced;
4. correctly consented;
5. correctly bounded;
6. correctly valued as a negotiated activation, service, contribution, or funded action, not as a promised price;
7. correctly matched to the buyer's motive;
8. correctly worded in the permitted claim;
9. correctly limited by the forbidden claims;
10. correctly refreshed during the evidence period; and
11. correctly withdrawn, corrected, or suspended if the evidence fails.

This prevents STS from becoming another attractive label on an uncertain asset.

STS must be a discipline before it is a brand.

6. What STS is

STS is the proposed Buktika umbrella standard for determining whether Buktika work is fit to be offered, funded, claimed, reported, audited, refreshed, and told.

It governs the movement from:

field reality

to:

accepted evidence

to:

lane-specific classification

to:

permitted claim

to:

buyer or funder review

to:

contracted or recorded activation

to:

refresh evidence and continued reporting

STS is not primarily a marketing standard. It is a correctness standard.

Its first practical output should be a buyer-reviewable and auditor-readable pack that says:

1. what the work or protected object is;
2. which STS lane it belongs to;
3. what evidence supports it;
4. what remains uncertain;
5. who consented to what;
6. what period the claim covers;
7. what refresh evidence will be gathered;

8. what claim the Funding Source may make;
9. what claims are forbidden;
10. what happens if evidence fails;
11. what payment, support, cost, fee, or distribution schedule applies once contracted; and
12. what record Tekmerion produced against the STS criteria.

---

7. What STS is not

STS must never be described as:

1. a carbon standard;
2. a biodiversity credit standard;
3. a statutory biodiversity offset scheme;
4. a land-sale framework;
5. a guaranteed buyer mechanism;
6. a price list;
7. a market exchange;
8. a promise of farmer income;
9. a guaranteed social outcome;
10. a guaranteed education outcome;
11. a guarantee of future ecological outcome;
12. a formal education accreditation unless an accredited education route exists;
13. a substitute for legal compliance;
14. a substitute for ecological science;
15. a substitute for ISO standards; or
16. a way to satisfy a named law without a reviewed legal-pathway record.

This is essential.

STS governs correctness of Buktika claims.

It does not magically turn every Buktika activity into an external regulated unit, certificate, offset, qualification, or statutory benefit.

---

8. The four STS lanes

STS is an umbrella correctness standard for all Buktika work.

Sielsgrond is the first urgent use case, but not the full definition of the standard.

STS governs the correctness of claims, evidence, consent, reporting, and assurance across four primary Buktika lanes.

8.1 Eco Conservation

Eco Conservation covers protection and non-regression of ecological value that already exists.

Sielsgrond belongs here.

The core claim is not restoration uplift.

The core claim is verified continuing protection of an identified ecological polygon for a stated evidence period, under a defined non-regression commitment and claim boundary.

Eco Conservation may include:

1. Sielsgrond;
2. protected intact veld;
3. non-regression commitments;
4. conservation stewardship activations;
5. evidence-backed protection of existing ecological condition;
6. refresh evidence of continued protection;
7. protection-support claims;
8. conservation-support claims; and
9. other admitted conservation objects.

Eco Conservation must not be confused with:

1. restoration uplift;
2. carbon credits;
3. biodiversity credits;
4. statutory offsets;
5. hunting products;
6. land sale;
7. guaranteed future ecological outcome; or

8. compliance discharge without a reviewed legal pathway.

8.2 Eco Restoration

Eco Restoration covers repair, recovery, planting, erosion control, water retention, habitat improvement, soil recovery, and other accepted restoration work.

The core claim is not that the land was always intact.

The core claim is that accepted restoration work was performed, evidenced, monitored, and reported under the correct method and claim class.

Eco Restoration may include:

1. restoration planning;
2. active repair work;
3. planting;
4. erosion control;
5. water-retention interventions;
6. habitat recovery;
7. soil improvement;
8. post-work monitoring;
9. accepted restoration evidence; and
10. restoration outcome reporting where the evidence supports it.

Eco Restoration must not be confused with:

1. Sielsgrond;
2. conservation-only non-regression;
3. carbon credits unless a carbon methodology and verification route apply;
4. guaranteed future uplift;
5. unverified “nature positive” claims;
6. speculative biodiversity gain; or
7. impact-offsetting without an admitted offset pathway.

8.3 MDX Human Restoration

MDX Human Restoration covers MamaDEX, family upliftment, dignity work, local income, community services, field support, and related human restoration outcomes.

The core claim is not poverty theatre.

The core claim is that human restoration activities or outcomes occurred, were consented to where required, were evidenced properly, and were not exaggerated.

MDX Human Restoration may include:

1. MamaDEX centre activities;
2. community-led service delivery;
3. family support;
4. local income linked to accepted Buktika work;
5. field team support;
6. dignity-linked outcomes;
7. Council of Elders participation where applicable;
8. grievance and consent records;
9. social evidence packs; and
10. human restoration reporting.

MDX Human Restoration must not be confused with:

1. ecological restoration;
2. charity theatre;
3. poverty marketing;
4. unsupported job-creation claims;
5. unsupported wellbeing claims;
6. education certification unless separately supported; or
7. buyer-facing impact claims without consent and accepted evidence.

8.4 EDU Education

EDU covers EduTower, Veldskool, field learning, nature trails, curricula, farmer education, youth learning, and education evidence packs.

The core claim is not a formal qualification unless an accredited education pathway exists.

The core claim is that education activities, participation, curriculum delivery, learning environments, or field-based knowledge transfer were evidenced under the correct boundary.

EDU may include:

1. Veldskool learning events;

2. EduTower content;
3. nature-trail education;
4. farmer training;
5. youth learning;
6. curriculum delivery;
7. attendance records;
8. learning materials;
9. facilitator records;
10. education evidence packs; and
11. learner or community feedback where consent allows.

EDU must not be confused with:

1. accredited qualification claims unless formally accredited;
2. guaranteed learning outcomes unless tested and evidenced;
3. social upliftment claims without MDX evidence;
4. ecological outcome claims without eco evidence; or
5. promotional education claims without participation proof.

---

9. Sielsgrond as the first urgent Eco Conservation use case

Sielsgrond is old intact ground.

Its value lies in what was kept whole.

It is not sold as land, carbon, restoration uplift, hunting, or a guaranteed credit.

Its commercial doorway is a private, evidence-backed conservation stewardship activation, where a Funding Source may fund verified continuing protection and non-regression of an identified polygon for a stated period.

The Sielsgrond design problem is expectation control.

The farmer must not hear:

My untouched land is now worth a lot of guaranteed money.

The farmer may hear:

The land you kept whole may now have a proper commercial doorway, but it must still be walked, evidenced, classified, priced, matched to a Funding Source, and contracted before money exists.

The farmer-facing control sentence is:

Sielsgrond is not a cheque. It is a door with a lock on it, and the key is proof.

The second control sentence is:

Sellable does not mean sold.

The third control sentence is:

No farmer plans with unsigned money.

These are not slogans.

They are risk controls.

They protect the farmer from premature expectation, the Viridian from greenwashing, the auditor from unsupported claims, and Buktika from overreach.

---

10. RP1 as the first urgent survival-safe stewardship use case

RP1 is the first survival-safe resting-and-stewardship step for tired or pressure-sensitive ground.

RP1 is not Sielsgrond.

Sielsgrond starts with old intact value.

RP1 starts with the farmer’s survival question:

If I rest this, how do I live?

RP1 belongs in the practical bridge between farm continuity and future restoration or conservation readiness.

It may involve pressure reduction, resting, observation, proof-building, mapping, water and road planning, and preparation for later work.

Before any RP1 resting area is agreed, the farmer must see:

1. the area;
2. the period;
3. the payment or support basis;
4. the proof required;
5. where sheep or cattle will go;
6. which camps remain farming;
7. which roads stay open;
8. which water points remain available;
9. how lawful hunting days and corridors are planned around;
10. what remains normal farm activity;
11. what is written before anything changes; and
12. what acceptance step must occur before payment or continuation.

RP1 is not a carbon shortcut.

RP1 is not a hidden takeover.

RP1 is not a promise of future restoration funding.

RP1 is the first disciplined answer to the farmer’s most practical question.

If Sielsgrond says:

What you kept whole may matter.

RP1 says:

What may rest must not break your family.

STS is the standard that keeps both sentences correct.

---

11. Hunting as an operational constraint, not a sellable product

STS must keep lawful hunting separate from the sellable conservation or restoration object.

On some farms, hunting days, hunting corridors, access routes, and safety windows are part of the ordinary lawful farm rhythm.

These must be planned around where relevant.

They must not be sold as part of Sielsgrond.

They must not be pitched to Viridians.

They must not become a buyer-facing conservation product.

They must not be used as a trigger.

The STS position is:

Hunting is an operational farm constraint to be mapped, timed, and managed around. It is not the Buktika-funded object.

In farmer-facing language:

If the farm has lawful hunting days, they are marked. If there are hunting corridors, they are marked. If there are quiet camps or resting areas, they are marked. The field plan works around the real farm, but Buktika does not sell hunting.

This separation is required because STS must not mix concepts.

---

12. Reporters and the Story Test

Reporters are central to STS because evidence alone does not make a farmer recognisable to a Viridian.

There may be ten farms that look similar on a screen.

The Reporter helps make the farmer’s polygon recognisable.

However, the Reporter must never become a source of overclaiming.

The Reporter:

1. comes from the Eco Guild;
2. is part of Eco Guild service delivery;
3. is not an outside decorative artist;
4. is not a poverty-theatre storyteller;
5. works from accepted proof;
6. obtains and respects consent;
7. distinguishes narrative from evidence;
8. tells the true story of the farmer, family, centre, classroom, land, or polygon;

9. helps the Viridian understand why this funded object matters; and
10. stays inside the STS claims boundary.

The Story Test asks:

Can the story be told with warmth, dignity, and commercial clarity without exceeding accepted proof or consent?

If not, the story must be corrected before it is used.

A beautiful story may invite attention.

Only accepted proof may carry the claim.

---

13. STS and the Viridian

The Viridian is not buying a vague good feeling.

The Viridian is a Funding Source under pressure from disclosure, procurement, reputation, governance, finance, or internal sustainability commitments.

The Viridian asks:

Can I support this and explain it to my CFO without creating greenwashing risk?

STS must allow the Viridian to say:

1. what was funded;
2. which STS lane it belongs to;
3. what claim is permitted;
4. what claim is forbidden;
5. what evidence supports the statement;
6. what period the statement covers;
7. what consent exists;
8. what refresh evidence will be gathered;
9. what the Reporting story may say; and
10. where the auditor can inspect the record.

For Sielsgrond, a STS-aligned claim may be:

We funded verified continuing protection of an identified Sielsgrond polygon for the stated evidence period. The conservation-support statement is backed by an accepted Sielsgrond evidence file, non-regression commitment, and refresh evidence under the Buktika Tika Standard.

For RP1, a STS-aligned claim may be:

We funded a first resting-and-stewardship step on an identified farm area for the stated period, with agreed farm-continuity controls, accepted evidence, and claim boundaries under the Buktika Tika Standard.

For MDX, a STS-aligned claim may be:

We funded evidenced human restoration activities through an admitted MamaDEX or MDX pathway, with consent, delivery records, and claim boundaries under the Buktika Tika Standard.

For EDU, a STS-aligned claim may be:

We funded evidenced education delivery through an admitted EduTower or Veldskool pathway, with participation records, content records, consent where required, and claim boundaries under the Buktika Tika Standard.

These sentences are useful because they are modest enough to be safe and structured enough to be reportable.

---

14. STS and the auditor

An auditor will not accept feeling, narrative, or dignity as evidence on their own.

The auditor will ask for the criteria document.

STS must therefore be designed as an audit-readable standard from the start.

The auditor must be able to inspect:

1. scope;
2. definitions;
3. eligibility criteria;
4. lane assignment;
5. polygon or activity admission rules;

6. evidence hierarchy;
7. ecological age corroboration rules where applicable;
8. disturbance and non-disturbance indicators where applicable;
9. baseline condition record where applicable;
10. delivery record where applicable;
11. consent record where applicable;
12. non-regression or continuity commitments where applicable;
13. monitoring and refresh evidence;
14. conflict-of-interest controls;
15. acceptance authority;
16. permitted claim classes;
17. forbidden claim classes;
18. version control;
19. suspension and withdrawal rules;
20. record retention;
21. buyer disclosure controls; and
22. Tekmerion proof trail.

If these exist, the auditor does not need to believe the story first.

The auditor can review the file.

That is the point.

---

15. The Greta, Sophia, and Farmer tests

STS must pass three human tests before it can become useful.

15.1 The Greta Test

Greta is the Viridian.

She manages sustainability disclosure, internal governance, procurement justification, investor-facing language, or similar obligations.

She may want to support nature-positive action or human restoration, but she is tired of claims that sound good and become liabilities later.

The Greta Test asks:

Can a careful Viridian take this to her CFO without sounding like she bought another fragile green claim?

To pass the Greta Test, the STS pack must let her say:

1. we know what we funded;
2. we know which lane it belongs to;
3. we know what claim we may make;
4. we know what claim we may not make;
5. we know what evidence supports the statement;
6. we know what period the statement covers;
7. we know what consent exists;
8. we know what refresh evidence is required;
9. we know who accepted the evidence; and
10. we know where the auditor can look.

If Greta can say that, the pack is commercially reviewable.

15.2 The Sophia Test

Sophia is the auditor.

She is not hostile, but she cannot accept what cannot be defended on paper.

The Sophia Test asks:

Can an auditor inspect this without first believing the story?

To pass the Sophia Test, the STS pack must show:

1. criteria;
2. evidence;
3. acceptance;
4. exclusions;
5. version control;
6. lane boundary;
7. claim boundary;
8. consent;
9. refresh evidence;
10. correction or withdrawal rules; and
11. Tekmerion proof trail.

Sophia does not need to be emotionally moved.

She needs to be unable to dismiss the object as vague.

That is success.

15.3 The Farmer Test

The farmer asks:

Can I hope without being misled?

STS must protect the farmer from premature money expectation.

The farmer-facing control sentence is:

Sellable does not mean sold.

The second control sentence is:

No farmer plans with unsigned money.

The third control sentence is:

Sielsgrond is not a cheque. It is a door with a lock on it, and the key is proof.

These control sentences must guide farmer-facing material, including the Farmer’s Kitchen Table Storybook.

They are not cold legal caveats.

They are trust protections.

---

16. STS and Jungian trust architecture

STS must also be psychologically correct.

Nature markets are wounded spaces.

Buyers have seen carbon claims collapse.

Farmers have seen clever people arrive with promises and leave with control.

Auditors have seen beautiful words hide poor evidence.

Founders have seen good ideas die because nobody trusted the bridge.

In Jungian language, many market instruments operate through the Persona: the public face, the claim, the appearance of legitimacy.

STS must operate closer to the Self: the organising centre that holds the parts together and forces coherence between inner truth and outer statement.

This is why the word **Tika** is calming.

It does not inflate.

It does not glitter.

It does not say premium, credit, offset, market, or yield.

It says:

correct.

That is psychologically important because the buyer does not need to be dazzled. The auditor does not need to be seduced. The farmer does not need to be excited into a false expectation.

They all need to feel:

This thing is being held correctly.

If STS can do that, it becomes not only a standard but a trust vessel.

---

17. Tika and Tekmerion

STS defines correctness.

Tekmerion tests proof.

The relationship is:

Tika asks whether the claim is correct. Tekmerion shows whether the proof can stand.

STS is the body of criteria, claim boundaries, evidence rules, consent rules, and lane separation.

Tekmerion is the Buktika auditor engine that checks a Buktika evidence file against the Tika Standard and produces proof trails, exceptions, assurance packs, and review records.

This pairing is essential because STS must not depend on narrative strength.

A beautiful story may invite attention.

Only proof can carry a claim.

In practical terms:

1. STS defines the lane.
2. STS defines the criteria.
3. STS defines accepted evidence.
4. STS defines permitted claims.
5. STS defines forbidden claims.
6. STS defines consent requirements.
7. STS defines refresh evidence.
8. Tekmerion checks the file against those rules.
9. Tekmerion produces the proof trail.
10. The Viridian receives a reviewable pack.
11. The auditor receives an inspectable record.
12. The farmer or centre receives protection against overclaiming.

This is the core system relationship.

---

18. STS first design architecture

This section is design-level description and has been superseded as the normative source by BKT 17020:2026, STS Umbrella Criteria. It is retained here as the original rationale for why each of the twelve parts exists. For the binding rule itself, see BKT 17020:2026 Parts 1 through 13. Where the two differ, BKT 17020:2026 governs.

The first STS criteria document should contain at least the following parts.

Part 1: Scope

Defines which Buktika work STS governs.

The scope should include Eco Conservation, Eco Restoration, MDX Human Restoration, EDU Education, Reporter discipline, Viridian claims, and Tekmerion proof trails.

Part 2: Definitions

Defines all core terms, including:

1. STS;
2. Tika;
3. Tekmerion;
4. Eco Conservation;
5. Eco Restoration;
6. MDX Human Restoration;
7. EDU Education;
8. Sielsgrond;
9. RP1;
10. Field Steward;
11. Eco Guild;
12. Reporter;
13. Viridian;
14. Funding Source;
15. evidence period;
16. non-regression;
17. consent;
18. permitted claim;
19. forbidden claim;
20. activation;
21. acceptance;
22. refresh evidence; and
23. proof trail.

Part 3: Lane assignment

Defines how a work item, polygon, activity, centre, or education event is assigned to the correct STS lane.

A claim must not move lanes casually.

If a bundle includes multiple lanes, each lane must have its own evidence and claim boundary.

Part 4: Eligibility

Defines what may enter each STS pathway.

For Sielsgrond, minimum eligibility may include:

1. identifiable polygon;
2. farmer-declared non-disturbance history;
3. visible ecological condition consistent with long-term restraint;
4. no incompatible active use;
5. ability to enter a time-bound non-regression commitment;
6. willingness to allow field evidence;
7. willingness to accept claims boundary;
8. willingness to separate Sielsgrond from RP1, restoration, hunting, carbon, and offset claims.

For RP1, minimum eligibility may include:

1. identifiable tired or pressure-sensitive area;
2. farmer willingness to discuss resting or pressure reduction;
3. practical farm-continuity plan;
4. stock movement plan where relevant;
5. road and water plan where relevant;
6. hunting-day and corridor planning where relevant;
7. agreed proof requirements;
8. agreed period;
9. agreed payment or support basis; and
10. written acceptance before changes occur.

For MDX, minimum eligibility may include:

1. admitted MamaDEX or MDX activity;
2. consent where required;
3. delivery evidence;
4. participant or centre records;
5. grievance or safeguarding controls where relevant;
6. funding record;
7. claim boundary; and
8. story boundary.

For EDU, minimum eligibility may include:

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

3. content or curriculum record;
4. facilitator or delivery record;
5. consent where required;
6. claim boundary;
7. education accreditation boundary; and
8. evidence retention.

Part 5: Evidence hierarchy

Defines what evidence is accepted and how evidence strength is classified.

Possible evidence classes:

1. field walk notes;
2. geotagged photographs;
3. farmer declaration;
4. family or neighbour testimony;
5. historical aerial or satellite imagery;
6. vegetation survey;
7. species indicators;
8. disturbance indicators;
9. grazing or land-use records;
10. ecological expert report;
11. remote sensing;
12. work completion records;
13. attendance records;
14. payroll or service records;
15. consent records;
16. Reporter records;
17. education delivery records;
18. community records;
19. monitoring records; and
20. refresh evidence.

Part 6: Classification states

Suggested states:

1. not assessed;
2. candidate;

3. held for evidence;
4. admitted;
5. admitted with limits;
6. rejected;
7. suspended;
8. corrected;
9. superseded; and
10. retired.

Part 7: Claims boundary

Defines permitted and forbidden claims by lane.

For Eco Conservation, the permitted default Sielsgrond claim is verified continuing protection for a stated evidence period.

For Eco Restoration, the permitted claim depends on accepted restoration work and evidence.

For MDX, the permitted claim depends on accepted human restoration activity and consent.

For EDU, the permitted claim depends on accepted education delivery evidence and accreditation boundary.

Forbidden default claims include:

1. land sale where no land sale occurred;
2. carbon credit without a carbon methodology and verification route;
3. biodiversity credit without an admitted biodiversity-credit pathway;
4. statutory offset without legal-pathway admission;
5. statutory-compliance discharge without 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 outside the evidence period; and
12. any statement that mixes lanes without evidence for each lane.

Part 8: Consent and story discipline

Defines who may tell what story, on what evidence, with whose consent, and for which purpose.

This part governs Reporters.

Part 9: Non-regression, continuity, and refresh

Defines what commitments continue after funding or acceptance.

For Sielsgrond, this includes non-regression.

For RP1, this includes the agreed resting or stewardship conditions.

For Eco Restoration, this includes post-work monitoring.

For MDX, this includes follow-up records where claims require them.

For EDU, this includes education evidence retention and follow-up where claimed.

Part 10: Buyer motive classification

STS must require the Funding Source’s motive to be recorded.

Possible motive 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 admits the instrument; and
9. statutory purchase requirement only where legal-pathway review confirms applicability.

Part 11: Offer pack

Defines the minimum buyer-facing pack for each lane.

A general STS offer pack should include:

1. lane summary;
2. object or activity summary;
3. farmer, centre, or community consent status where applicable;
4. evidence summary;
5. evidence period;
6. commitment or delivery basis;
7. refresh evidence schedule;
8. permitted claim;
9. forbidden claims;
10. activation or funding value schedule;
11. distribution schedule where relevant;
12. Reporter story boundary;
13. version record;
14. Tekmerion proof trail; and
15. auditor note.

Part 12: Suspension and correction

Defines what happens when a claim, evidence file, polygon condition, activity record, consent record, or commitment fails.

STS must allow:

1. correction;
2. limitation;
3. suspension;
4. withdrawal;
5. buyer notice;
6. farmer or centre notice;
7. versioned replacement; and
8. record retention of the original error and the correction.

---

19. Specifications and assurance posture

STS should be designed for international auditor readability.

However, STS must not claim that one ISO route certifies every part of Buktika work.

STS spans different claim types.

Different claim types may require different assurance routes.

19.1 Eco Conservation

Eco Conservation may require ecological expert review, environmental information validation or verification, biodiversity or conservation-method review, legal-pathway review, and independent assurance where applicable.

19.2 Eco Restoration

Eco Restoration may use ISO 14064-2 and ISO 14064-3 where greenhouse-gas project assertions are made. It may also require ecological restoration standards, ISO 14001-style environmental management controls, field verification, and independent technical acceptance.

19.3 MDX Human Restoration

MDX Human Restoration may require social-impact assurance, consent controls, safeguarding, privacy controls, grievance records, payroll or service records, ISO 9001-style management controls, ISO 37301-style compliance controls, and related governance support.

19.4 EDU Education

EDU may require curriculum evidence, attendance records, assessment records where relevant, trainer credentials, child-safety controls where relevant, education accreditation only where formal qualification claims are made, and evidence-pack assurance.

19.5 Umbrella assurance position

The correct STS assurance posture is:

STS is designed as an auditor-readable umbrella standard, with each claim type routed to the correct evidence and assurance basis. Where GHG assertions are made, ISO 14064-3 may apply. Where broader environmental information is validated or verified, ISO 14065 or ISO/IEC 17029 routes may apply where appropriate. Where social or education claims are made, STS defines the evidence and assurance route appropriate to those claims.

STS should not say:

STS is ISO 14064-3 certified.

STS may say, after proper review:

STS is designed to be independently reviewable and capable of accredited validation or verification where the claim type and accreditation scope allow.

19.6 Standards reference register

This register lists the published external standards against which STS is designed to be read, and to which its evidence and assurance routes are aligned where the claim type calls for them. It is the external-standards companion to the Buktika specification register at Section 1B: where Section 1B pins Buktika documents by version, this section names the external standards-bodies' instruments STS aligns to.

Three limits govern the whole register and must be read with it:

1. Listing a standard does **not** mean STS is certified, registered, or accredited under it. STS holds no certification under any standard listed here unless and until an accreditation body issues one in writing (see Section 19.5).
2. Listing a standard does **not** convert any Buktika claim into a carbon credit, biodiversity credit, statutory offset, or additional-gain assertion. These references support correctness, measurement traceability, and assurance readability only.
3. No single standard governs all STS work. Different lanes invoke different subsets. The greenhouse-gas and quantification standards in particular apply only where a lane makes a greenhouse-gas or other quantified assertion — primarily Eco Restoration — and the Eco Conservation condition claim does not depend on them.

A. Field measurement and laboratory evidence — invoked where a lane relies on measured soil, vegetation, or related field readings.

1. ISO 10694:1995 — Soil quality — Determination of organic and total carbon after dry combustion.
2. ISO 10390 — Soil quality — Determination of pH.
3. ISO 11261 — Soil quality — Determination of total nitrogen (modified Kjeldahl method).
4. ISO 11263 — Soil quality — Determination of phosphorus.
5. ISO 11277 — Soil quality — Determination of particle size distribution.
6. ISO 11464 — Soil quality — Pretreatment of samples for physico-chemical analysis.

7. ISO 14870 — Soil quality — Extraction of trace elements.
8. ISO 15178 — Soil quality — Determination of total sulfur by dry combustion.
9. ISO 16772 — Soil quality — Determination of mercury and trace metals.
10. ISO 18400 series — Soil quality — Sampling.
11. ISO/IEC 17025:2017 — General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories.

B. Spatial evidence, metadata, and data quality — invoked for polygon identification, remote evidence, and geospatial record quality.

1. ISO 19115 — Geographic information — Metadata.
2. ISO 19157:2013 — Geographic information — Data quality.
3. ISO/TS 19159-1:2014 — Calibration and validation of remote sensing imagery sensors (optical sensors).

C. Validation, verification, and accreditation of bodies — invoked primarily where a lane makes greenhouse-gas or other quantified assertions (most relevant to Eco Restoration). The Eco Conservation condition claim does not rest on these.

1. ISO 14064-2:2019 — Greenhouse gases — Project-level quantification, monitoring, and reporting.
2. ISO 14064-3:2019 — Greenhouse gases — Verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements.
3. ISO 14065:2020 — General principles and requirements for bodies validating and verifying environmental information.
4. ISO 14066:2023 — Competence requirements for greenhouse gas validation and verification teams.
5. ISO/IEC 17029:2019 — Conformity assessment — General principles and requirements for validation and verification bodies.
6. ISO 14055-1 — Environmental management — Guidelines for combating land degradation and desertification.
7. ISO 14080:2018 — Framework and principles for methodologies on climate actions.
8. ISO 14034:2016 — Environmental management — Environmental technology verification.

D. Management-system and governance controls — invoked as organisational controls for Buktika as the methodology-owning organisation.

1. ISO 9001:2015 — Quality management systems.

2. ISO 14001:2015 — Environmental management systems.
3. ISO 45001 — Occupational health and safety management systems.
4. ISO 37301:2021 — Compliance management systems.
5. ISO 37001:2016 — Anti-bribery management systems.
6. ISO 31000:2018 — Risk management — Guidelines.
7. ISO 19011:2018 — Guidelines for auditing management systems.
8. ISO/IEC 38500:2015 — Governance of information technology for the organisation.

E. Traceability and evidence integrity — invoked for chain-of-custody, record security, and the privacy of personal and farm data.

1. ISO 22095:2020 — Chain of custody — General terminology and models.
2. ISO/IEC 27001 — Information security management systems.
3. ISO/IEC 27701 — Privacy information management.

F. Funding-source disclosure context — listed for completeness only. These standards govern a Funding Source's own reporting and finance, not STS. STS neither operates nor certifies under them, and references them only to help a Funding Source locate STS evidence within its own disclosure obligations.

1. ISO 14097:2021 — Framework for assessing and reporting investments and financing activities related to climate change.
2. ISO 14030 series — Environmental performance evaluation — Green debt instruments.

Where any standard in this register is updated, superseded, or withdrawn by its issuing body, the affected STS clause is reviewed under the change-control process and the register is reissued. The presence of a standard in this register is a statement of alignment and readability, not a statement of certification.

---

20. First implementation path

The first practical STS design path should be:

Workstream 1: STS Umbrella Criteria Draft

Create the first criteria document for lane assignment, evidence, consent, claims, acceptance, refresh, correction, and Tekmerion proof trails.

Workstream 2: STS Sielsgrond Module

Create the Eco Conservation module for Sielsgrond eligibility, evidence, ecological age, non-regression, claims, farmer controls, and offer packs.

Workstream 3: STS RP1 Module

Create the RP1 module for first resting-and-stewardship steps, farm continuity, stock movement, water, roads, hunting-day planning, support basis, proof, and written acceptance.

Workstream 4: STS MDX Module

Create the MDX module for MamaDEX and human restoration claims.

Workstream 5: STS EDU Module

Create the EDU module for EduTower, Veldskool, trail learning, and education evidence packs.

Workstream 6: STS Reporter Guide

Create the Reporter discipline guide for turning accepted proof into a truthful farmer, centre, or education story.

Workstream 7: STS Claim Wording Register

Create approved and prohibited claim wording by lane.

Workstream 8: STS Tekmerion Interface

Define how Tekmerion checks STS evidence files, records exceptions, produces proof trails, and generates buyer and auditor packs.

Workstream 9: STS Viridian Pack

Create the first Greta-readable pack.

Workstream 10: STS Auditor Pack

Create the first Sophia-readable pack.

Workstream 11: Independent Review Pathway

Ask an appropriate ISO auditor, validation or verification body, ecological reviewer, social-impact reviewer, and education reviewer to advise on external review and assurance routes.

21. Design conclusion

STS is not the market.

STS is the door discipline.

It cannot guarantee a Funding Source.

It cannot force a buyer to fund a Sielsgrond polygon, RP1 resting area, MamaDEX activity, or education event.

But it can make the object credible enough to review.

It can turn a farmer’s old intact ground from a private memory into a governed conservation-support object.

It can turn a tired camp from an argument into a survival-safe first resting plan.

It can turn MamaDEX dignity work into evidenced human restoration without poverty theatre.

It can turn education work into proof-bound learning support without pretending to be an accredited qualification.

It can let the Viridian proceed without pretending.

It can let the auditor ask for the criteria document instead of closing the file.

It can let Buktika speak boldly without lying.

And it can let the farmer hear hope in the correct order:

First the land is seen.

Then the land is walked.

Then the land is evidenced.

Then the land is named.

Then the land is offered.

Then, only if a Funding Source chooses and the papers are correct, the land is funded.

That is Tika.

That is the beginning of the Buktika Tika Standard.

---

22. Foundational control sentence

The foundational STS control sentence is:

The Buktika Tika Standard governs whether a Buktika claim is correct enough to be offered, funded, reported, audited, refreshed, and told without pretending to be something it is not.

---

23. Foundational field sentence

The foundational farmer-facing STS sentence is:

Sellable does not mean sold.

---

24. Foundational proof sentence

The foundational Tekmerion sentence is:

Tika defines what may be truthfully claimed. Tekmerion proves whether the claim can stand.

End of draft