

AFRICAN TRUST & REPUTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Comparator Brief - Public Brief

Reading peer systems without importing their institutional assumptions

ATRI should neither claim to be without precedent nor present itself as a derivative of another jurisdiction's model. The strongest comparator argument is disciplined and modest: global systems show recurring success factors, and ATRI applies those lessons to verified claims in Africa's institutional context.

Status	Prepared for public designation review
Audience	Public readers, early stakeholders, and non-specialist institutional reviewers
Boundary	This brief is informational. It does not create legal authority, accreditation status, or data-access rights.

Comparator discipline

Comparator systems are useful because they reveal common design requirements: governance, security, interoperability, inclusion, issuer accountability, and public trust.

They are not useful if they tempt ATRI to import legal structures, data assumptions, or deployment models that do not fit the African context.

Design disciplines for ATRI

- Governance clarity around institutional responsibility.
- Technical interoperability around recognized claim schemas.
- Assurance levels that distinguish weak, moderate, and strong evidence.
- Public communication that explains the system in ordinary language.
- Controls for security, privacy, correction, and revocation.

What ATRI should avoid

- Overclaiming equivalence to another region's system.
- Presenting trust infrastructure as a technology product before governance is settled.
- Treating adoption as automatic. Public confidence must be earned through clear safeguards and useful services.

Public position

ATRI is a trust foundation for verified claims. Its value depends on governance and adoption as much as technical architecture.

Peer systems should be used as a reference library, not as a blueprint.



Public message: comparators help ATRI become more rigorous, not less African in its design.