Foundational Publication Checklist

Phase	Action	Description	Done
Plan a Knowledge Initiative	Identify the Global Challenge	Identify the challenge to be addressed; define in terms of scale and urgency; global and local impact; key drivers and root causes.	
	Establish Leadership & Expertise	Identify the Working Group Leadership, Publication Lead (if different), and initial Working Group Membership.	
	Check for Conflicts of Interest (COI)	All individuals identified above complete Conflict of Interest forms for review by WG and submission to Secretariat (see Conflict of Interest Disclosure & Disposition Form).	
	Establish Scope of Initiative	Define purpose, boundaries, and focus areas to ensure CAETS is positioned to contribute (*see Statement of Task Template*).	
	Identify Primary Audience & Objectives	Identify audience expected to understand, use, apply or act upon content of the publication; describe desired outcomes from its creation (see Audience Planning Form).	
	Design the Publication Architecture	Option 1: Foundational Publication from which multiple Companion Deliverables may be derived; Option 2: Family of Foundational Publications (each of which will have its own Statement of Task) from which a Companion Deliverable may provide a synthesized perspective.	
	Prepare the Statement of Task (SoT)	Defines the scope and objectives of the Foundational Publication (*see Statement of Task Template*).	
Board Approval	Submit SoT and COI forms to Secretariat; identify gaps in expertise	Secretariat will circulate the proposed SoT to the Board for approval.	
Call for Additional Participation	Expand Working Group Membership	Secretariat to circulate approved Statement of Task to all member academies to invite additional expertise and broader participation (repeat Conflict of Interest Check for new participants).	
Build the Foundational Publication	Choose the Publication Type	Identify the publication type (see Section 3.1); most common types for Foundational Publications are Technical Report, White Paper, Position Paper, or Policy Paper. Companion deliverables may also be considered at this stage.	
	Write for the Primary Audience	Language, tone, and technical complexity should be aimed at the Primary Audience.	
	Build a Coherent Narrative	Use figures, graphics, tables, and other visual elements to clarify complex information and reinforce the narrative; avoid/minimize the use of copyrighted graphics/visuals.	
	Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	Findings are evidence-based results identified; conclusions are judgements drawn from the findings that explain meaning in context. Recommendations are actionable outcomes based on conclusions and should be used selectively, supported by analysis, and directed to the Primary Audience.	

Foundational Publication Checklist

	Design for Future Application	Clear structure, concise statements of key findings, reusable graphics, consistent terminology, as well-organized source material will facilitate development of Companion Deliverables.	
	Technical Integrity & Knowledge Traceability	Structure findings, conclusions, recommendations and related evidence to support traceability and facilitate development of Companion Deliverables	
	Pre-Publication Check	Ensure evidence and sources are properly attributed; adherence to CAETS Publication Standards (see Publication Standards Checklist); and that the publication is ready to enter the final review and endorsement processes.	
Review & Endorsement	Technical Review	Identify reviewers who collectively provide the breadth of expertise, independence, and diversity needed to cover the scope of the publication. Each reviewer should receive the full publication together with the Technical Review Form. Comments received together with their disposition must be provided to the Secretariat upon completion (form for Technical Review Disposition).	
	Communications Review	The Secretariat will submit the publication to the Communications Committee for review or adherence to CAETS Publication Standards (see related checklist); the result will be sent to the Publication Lead for action (see form for Communications Review Disposition). When complete, the Communications Committee may make a recommendation to the Council regarding publication-readiness from a communications perspective.	
	Council Review & Endorsement	The Secretariat distributes the publication to all member academies (including associate members) for review and comment (see Member Review Form). All comments must be considered by the Publication Lead, who documents the disposition (see Member Review Disposition). If at least one-third of CAETS members have endorsed publication, the document will enter the publication process.	
	Document Authors, Reviewers & Contributors	The Publication Lead will document authors, contributors, and technical reviewers and insert that information into the completed Foundational Publication (either in Acknowledgements or in an Appendix).	
	Submit for Publication & Release	Upon completion, the Publication Lead submits the publication to the Secretariat, which initiates the Publication and Release phase.	

Related Templates, Forms & Checklists

Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Disposition Form
Statement of Task Template
Audience Planning Form
Technical Review Form; Technical Review Disposition Form
Communications Review Disposition Form
Member Review Form; Member Review Disposition Form
Publications Standards Checklist

CAETS Audience Planning Form

Knowledge Initiative: _____

Foundational Publication: _____

Working Group: _____

Working Group Chair: _____

Publication Lead: _____

Date: _____

Purpose

Audience planning begins early in the development of a CAETS Knowledge Initiative and is refined as the work progresses. The purpose of this form is to identify the **Primary Audience** for the Foundational Publication and potential **Priority Audiences** for knowledge amplification; clarify what CAETS wants each audience to understand, consider, or do; and inform decisions about publication content, Companion Deliverables, formats, and dissemination. Audience planning is expected to evolve as the knowledge develops. Completion of this form does not commit CAETS to producing every Companion Deliverable identified.

1. Primary Audience — Foundational Publication

The **Primary Audience** is the principal audience for whom the Foundational Publication is developed.

Who is the Primary Audience?

Be as specific as practical. Avoid overly broad descriptions such as “policymakers,” “industry,” or “the public” when a more useful definition is possible.

Primary Audience:

Why is this audience important?

What role does this audience play in addressing the challenge or applying the knowledge?

What does this audience need from CAETS?

What knowledge, analysis, evidence, conclusions, or recommendations will be most useful to this audience?

What does CAETS want this audience to understand, consider, or do?

Implications for the Foundational Publication

Consider the appropriate technical depth, terminology, length, structure, use of graphics, recommendations, and other characteristics needed to make the publication useful to its Primary Audience.

---

2. Priority Audiences — Knowledge Amplification

Identify other audiences for whom knowledge from the Foundational Publication could be particularly useful. A **Priority Audience** does not necessarily require a separate Companion Deliverable. A single deliverable may serve more than one audience when their needs are sufficiently similar.

Priority Audience:_____

Why this Audience Matters:_____

Desired Action/Understanding:_____

Priority Audience:_____

Why this Audience Matters:_____

Desired Action/Understanding:_____

Priority Audience:_____

Why this Audience Matters:_____

Desired Action/Understanding:_____

CAETS Audience Planning Form

3. Audience Needs

For **each** Priority Audience that warrants further attention, consider how its needs differ from those of the Primary Audience.

Priority Audience: _____

What does this audience already know about the subject?

What knowledge is most relevant to this audience?

What should this audience understand, consider, or do as a result?

What could prevent the audience from understanding, trusting, accessing, or using the knowledge? Consider technical complexity, terminology, length, accessibility, language, cultural context, competing information, or other barriers.

What would make the knowledge most useful and accessible to this audience?

---

4. Potential Companion Deliverables

Use the audience analysis to identify potential ways to amplify knowledge from the Foundational Publication. Companion Deliverables derive their substantive content from one or more endorsed Foundational Publications and must remain traceable to those sources.

Priority Audience	Communications Objective	Potential Deliverable/ Format	Key Content or Message

CAETS Audience Planning Form

5. Delivery and Engagement

For the audiences identified above, consider how and where they are most likely to encounter and use the knowledge.

Relevant channels, organizations, networks, events, or platforms:

Potential role of CAETS Member Academies in reaching these audiences:

Translation or multilingual considerations:

Accessibility or digital-format considerations:

6. Priorities

Not every potential audience or deliverable can or should be pursued. Identify the highest priorities based on expected value, relevance to the Knowledge Initiative, available resources, and opportunities for impact.

Highest-Priority Audiences

1.
2.
3.

Highest-Priority Knowledge Amplification Opportunities

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Rationale for these priorities:

_____

_____

7. Revisit During Development

Audience planning will be revisited as the Foundational Publication develops and the Working Group gains a clearer understanding of the knowledge, findings, conclusions, and potential recommendations.

At that point, consider:

- Have the needs of the Primary Audience changed or become clearer?
- Have additional Priority Audiences emerged?
- Are the proposed Companion Deliverables still appropriate?
- Can one Companion Deliverable effectively serve multiple audiences?
- Have new opportunities for knowledge amplification emerged?
- Are there audiences or deliverables that should no longer be priorities?

Updates / Decisions:

_____

_____

Date Reviewed: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Working Group Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Disposition Form

Knowledge Initiative / Publication: _____

Working Group: _____

Name: _____

Institution / Organization: _____

Role in the Working Group or Publication: _____

Purpose

CAETS Working Groups depend on members with substantial professional expertise and experience. Such expertise may involve professional, institutional, financial, or other interests related to the subject under consideration.

The purpose of this disclosure is to identify interests or relationships that could reasonably be perceived as affecting a member's objectivity in developing, reviewing, or approving the technical content, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of a CAETS publication.

Disclosure of an interest does not necessarily constitute a conflict of interest or preclude participation. Relevant disclosures will be considered in determining whether any steps are needed to protect the independence, credibility, and technical integrity of the work.

Disclosure

Please consider interests or relationships that are relevant to the subject matter of this Knowledge Initiative or publication, including those involving your employer or institution where appropriate. Disclose any of the following that could reasonably be perceived as affecting your objectivity:

- **Financial interests** — significant financial interests in an organization, technology, product, or sector that could be affected by the publication's findings or recommendations.
- **Professional or organizational relationships** — employment, consulting, advisory, board, leadership, or other significant relationships with organizations having a material interest in the subject matter.
- **Research or funding relationships** — significant current or recent research support, sponsorship, contracts, or other funding related to the subject matter.
- **Intellectual property interests** — patents, licenses, royalties, or other intellectual property interests relevant to the work.
- **Other interests or relationships** — any other circumstance that could reasonably be perceived as affecting your impartiality or the credibility of the CAETS work.

Working Group Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Disposition Form

Disclosure Statement

☐ I have no interests or relationships relevant to this work that I believe require disclosure.

☐ I have the following interests or relationships to disclose:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Member Certification

I have disclosed interests and relationships that I believe could reasonably be perceived as relevant to my participation in this work. I understand that disclosure does not necessarily indicate the existence of a conflict of interest or prevent my participation. I will inform the Working Group Chair or CAETS Secretariat if a material change occurs during the course of the work.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

_____

CAETS Review

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

Determination:

☐ No conflict requiring action identified.

☐ Participation is appropriate with the disclosed interest recorded.

☐ Participation is appropriate subject to the following management measures:

☐ Other action required:

Comments, if any:

Statement of Task

Knowledge Initiative: _____

Proposed Publication Title: _____

Working Group: _____

Working Group Chair: _____

Publication Lead: _____

Date Submitted: _____

Version: _____

1. Challenge and Rationale

Briefly describe the global challenge, issue, or opportunity the publication will address and why it warrants CAETS attention. Explain the relevance to engineering and technological sciences and the value of addressing the issue through international collaboration.

Challenge / Rationale:

2. Purpose and Objectives

State what the publication is intended to accomplish. Objectives should be specific enough to guide development of the publication and subsequent assessment of whether the work fulfilled its intended purpose.

Purpose:

Objectives:

1.

2.

3.

---

3. Scope and Key Questions

Define the boundaries of the work and the principal questions the publication will address. The Statement of Task should establish sufficient scope to guide the Working Group without prescribing its findings, conclusions, or recommendations.

Scope:

Key Questions:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Important exclusions or limitations, if any:

---

4. Primary Audience

Identify the principal audience for the Foundational Publication. Describe how the intended audience will use or benefit from the publication.

Primary Audience:

Intended use or benefit:

5. Proposed Publication

Publication Type:

☐ Technical Report
☐ White Paper
☐ Position Paper
☐ Policy Paper
☐ Other: _____

Brief description of the proposed publication:

Anticipated findings, conclusions, or recommendations:

Do not specify predetermined outcomes. If appropriate, indicate whether the publication is expected to develop findings, conclusions, recommendations, options, or other forms of authoritative guidance.

6. Priority Audiences and Potential Companion Deliverables

Identify Priority Audiences that may benefit from knowledge derived from the Foundational Publication. Where useful at this stage, identify potential Companion Deliverables. Identification of a potential Companion Deliverable at the planning stage does not commit CAETS to producing it. Additional opportunities may emerge as the work develops.

Priority Audience	Communications Objective	Potential Deliverable/ Format	Key Content or Message

Statement of Task

7. Expertise and Participation

Identify the principal areas of expertise needed to undertake the work. Membership may be refined as the project develops. All Working Group members participating in development of the publication will complete the applicable CAETS Conflict of Interest Disclosure.

Required expertise:

Participating Member Academies, if known:

Other expertise or participation anticipated/needed, if any:

---

8. Evidence and Approach

Briefly describe the anticipated evidence base and analytical approach. CAETS publications normally analyze and synthesize existing knowledge rather than report original research. Relevant evidence may include peer-reviewed literature, academy reports, authoritative institutional and governmental sources, technical standards, data, expert knowledge, and other credible sources appropriate to the subject.

Anticipated approach and evidence base:

---

9. Review and Publication Path

The publication will be developed and reviewed in accordance with CAETS Publication Standards and the Guide for Working Groups and Publication Leads. The anticipated process includes:

Publication Development → Independent Technical Review → Communications Review → Council Review and Endorsement → Publication

Statement of Task

Significant changes to the approved scope or objectives will be brought to the attention of the Working Group Chair and Secretariat and addressed in accordance with CAETS governance requirements.

10. Anticipated Schedule

Provide major milestones rather than a detailed project schedule.

Milestone	Target Date
Board Approval of Statement of Task	
Publication Development	
Draft ready for review	
Technical and Communications Reviews	
Council Review and Endorsement	
Publication/Release	

11. Resources and Other Considerations

Identify significant resource requirements, external dependencies, partnerships, translation needs, data requirements, or other considerations known at the outset.

If none: **No significant additional requirements identified at this stage.**

Board Approval

The Board approves this Statement of Task as the basis for development of the proposed CAETS publication. Approval authorizes the Working Group to proceed within the scope and objectives described above. It does not constitute approval or endorsement of the publication's eventual findings, conclusions, or recommendations.

Board Approval (name/date): _____

Conditions or comments, if applicable:

Publication Standards Checklist

Purpose: This checklist is to be used by the Working Group during their Pre-Publication **Check to ensure compliance with CAETS Publication Standards. More detailed guidance is provided in Reference D.**

	Publication Standards	Review Comments
	Audience and Tone: Is the content, level of detail, organization and presentation matched to the identified Primary Audience?	
	Voice: Is the voice neutral and nonpolitical? Is collaboration emphasized?	
	Inclusive and Respectful: Does the content avoid stereotyping and patronization of individuals, institutions, and countries?	
	International English: Is the English used consistent throughout the publication?	
	Clear and Accessible Writing: Does the writing favor direct sentence structures, define specialized terms, and avoid unnecessary jargon? Is terminology consistent throughout?	
	Evidence, Analysis & Expert Judgment: Does the work clearly distinguish evidence from outside sources, analysis developed through the work, and expert judgment used to interpret that evidence or reach conclusions?	
	Graphics, Tables, & Visual Evidence: Do these elements support the narrative? Are they accurate, legible, and understandable at a variety of sizes for different devices?	
	Claims, Attribution, and References: Are ideas, data, findings, and quotations clearly attributed? Do references consistently adhere to ISO 690 format?	
	Use of AI-Enabled Tools: Has all AI-assisted content been subjected to careful review by an expert member of the Working Group?	

Publication Standards Checklist

	Publication Identity: Are relationships to other publications (within or across Knowledge Portfolios) clearly identified?	
	Visual Identity Standards: Are CAETS Brand elements (logos and other visual assets, color palette, typography) used appropriately and consistently?	
	Multilingual and Translation Ready: *Implementation deferred.*	
	Digital Publication and Accessibility: Are navigation links provided within the document to facilitate access? (*Additional guidance TBD)*	
	Publication Rights, Copyright and Licensing: Has use of 3rd party visuals and quotations been minimized? Is the CC BY 4.0 license used?	

CAETS Individual Technical Review Form

Publication Title: _____

Knowledge Initiative: _____

Working Group: _____

Reviewer: _____

Institution / Organization: _____

Date:_____

Purpose of the Technical Review

CAETS technical review provides an independent assessment of the technical integrity, accuracy, balance, and evidentiary basis of a publication before it is submitted for endorsement and publication.

Reviewers are asked to evaluate whether the publication:

- addresses its approved purpose and scope;
- accurately represents the relevant evidence and state of knowledge;
- presents analysis, findings, conclusions, and recommendations that are supported by the evidence;
- appropriately represents significant uncertainties, limitations, and differing technical perspectives; and
- is technically sound and suitable for publication by CAETS.

The reviewer is not being asked to rewrite the publication or necessarily to agree with every judgment made by the authors.

1. Overall Assessment

Please provide your overall assessment of the publication.

☐ **Acceptable as written** — No substantive technical changes are required.

☐ **Acceptable with minor revisions** — Limited changes are needed but do not require substantial reconsideration of the analysis, findings, conclusions, or recommendations.

☐ **Substantive revisions required** — Significant technical issues should be addressed before the publication proceeds.

☐ **Not suitable for publication in its present form** — Fundamental technical concerns require substantial reconsideration.

Overall comments:

2. Scope and Purpose

Does the publication adequately address the purpose, objectives, scope, and key questions established for the work? *Consider whether significant issues within the approved scope have been omitted or whether the publication extends materially beyond its intended scope.*

Comments:

3. Technical Accuracy and Integrity

Are the technical statements, analyses, data, and interpretations accurate and technically sound? *Identify significant errors, unsupported assertions, internal inconsistencies, or areas where additional qualification is needed.*

Comments:

4. Evidence and Sources

Is the evidence appropriate, credible, sufficiently current, and adequate to support the publication's analysis? Are important sources, bodies of evidence, or relevant technical perspectives missing or inadequately represented?

Comments:

5. Balance, Uncertainty, and Limitations

Does the publication fairly represent significant technical perspectives and areas of uncertainty? Are assumptions, limitations, evidence gaps, and unresolved questions appropriately identified?

Comments:

6. Findings and Conclusions

Do the findings and conclusions follow logically from the analysis and evidence presented? Are they stated with an appropriate degree of confidence and precision?

Comments:

7. Recommendations

Complete if the publication contains recommendations.

Are the recommendations supported by the analysis, findings, and conclusions?

Are they sufficiently clear and appropriately directed to the intended Primary Audience?

Identify any recommendation that appears unsupported, overstated, ambiguous, or inconsistent with the evidence presented.

Comments:

8. Figures, Tables, and Technical Information

Are figures, tables, quantitative information, and other technical materials accurate, appropriately sourced, and consistent with the narrative? Do they support understanding of the technical content?

Comments:

---

9. Major Issues Requiring Resolution

Please identify the most important issues that, in your judgment, must be addressed before the publication proceeds. For each issue, please provide sufficient explanation to enable the Working Group to understand and respond to the concern.

Major Issue 1:

Major Issue 2:

Major Issue 3:

---

10. Other Comments and Suggested Improvements

Please identify other corrections, clarifications, or improvements that would strengthen the publication. *Minor editorial corrections may be provided directly in a marked copy of the manuscript rather than repeated here.*

Reviewer Confirmation

I have reviewed the publication from the perspective of technical quality and integrity and have identified the substantive issues that I believe should be considered before publication.

☐ I have no interests or relationships relevant to this review that I believe require disclosure.

☐ I have disclosed potentially relevant interests or relationships to CAETS.

Reviewer Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

CAETS Technical Review Disposition Record

Publication Title: _____

Knowledge Initiative: _____

Working Group: _____

Working Group Chair: _____

Publication Lead: _____

Review Period: _____

Number of Technical Reviewers: _____

Purpose

This record documents the substantive issues identified during independent technical review and how they were addressed by the Working Group. The purpose is not to reproduce every editorial comment received. Minor corrections may be incorporated directly into the manuscript. This record should capture significant technical comments, particularly those concerning accuracy, evidence, interpretation, balance, findings, conclusions, recommendations, or other matters affecting the technical integrity of the publication.

1. Overall Review Assessment

Briefly summarize the technical review, including the principal themes or issues raised by reviewers.

2. Disposition of Substantive Review Comments

For each substantive issue, summarize the review comment, the Working Group's response, and the resulting change to the publication, if any.

No.	Issue/Comment	Working Group Response	Disposition/Change Made
1			

2			
3			
4			
5			

Additional pages may be attached as necessary.

3. Significant Comments Not Incorporated

Identify any substantive reviewer recommendation that was not incorporated into the publication and briefly explain the rationale. A reviewer comment need not be accepted, but substantive technical concerns should be explicitly considered and their disposition documented.

Review Comment	Disposition and Rationale

4. Changes Resulting from Technical Review

Briefly summarize significant changes to the publication resulting from the review.

5. Unresolved Issues

☐ No significant technical issues remain unresolved.

☐ The following significant issues remain unresolved:

Proposed resolution or action:

---

6. Working Group Confirmation

The Working Group has considered the substantive comments received through independent technical review and has documented their disposition. To the best of our judgment, the revised publication is technically sound and ready to proceed to the next stage of the CAETS publication process.

Publication Lead: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Working Group Chair: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Secretariat Record

Technical Review documentation received: ☐ **Yes**

Review disposition record complete: ☐ **Yes**

Date received: _____

Comments, if applicable:

Member Review Form

Completed by Secretariat

Title of Publication
Type of Publication
Review Initiation Date
Review Due Date

To be completed by Member Academy

Member Academy	
Respondent (name)	
☐ **Fully endorse**	
☐ **Endorse with non-binding suggestions**	(provide comments/suggested modifications)
☐ **Do not endorse**	(provide reason)

Additional Comments:

Member Review Disposition Form

Completed by Secretariat

Title of Publication
Type of Publication
Review Initiation Date
Review Due Date

Completed by Secretariat	**Completed by Publication Lead**
Member Review Comments Date Sent:	**Response/Disposition Date Completed:**

CAETS Guide for Working Groups and Publication Leads

User Feedback – Short Form

Thank you for helping CAETS improve the **Guide for Working Groups and Publication Leads**. This short form should take about **2–3 minutes**. Your feedback will help us make the Guide clearer, easier to use, and more useful to future Working Groups and Publication Leads.

1. Your Role

☐ Working Group Chair
☐ Publication Lead
☐ Working Group Member
☐ Reviewer
☐ Communications Committee / Secretariat
☐ Other: _____

2. How Did You Use the Guide?

Check all that apply.

☐ Planning a Knowledge Initiative or publication
☐ Developing a publication
☐ Planning audiences or Companion Deliverables
☐ Conducting or responding to review
☐ Preparing for endorsement or publication
☐ Using a template, form, or checklist
☐ Other: _____

3. Your Experience

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Needs Improvement
Overall usefulness	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clarity	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ease of finding what I needed	☐	☐	☐	☐
Usefulness of templates and tools	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Did the Guide Help You Do the Work?

☐ Yes — I generally knew what was expected and how to proceed.
☐ Mostly — I needed clarification in a few areas.

User Feedback – Short Form

☐ Partly — I frequently needed additional guidance.
☐ No — the Guide did not provide enough practical guidance.

5. What Would Most Improve the Guide?

What was difficult to understand or find, what was missing, or what one change would make the Guide more useful?

---

6. Anything That Worked Particularly Well?

Optional, but we'd like to know what we should **keep** as well as what we should improve.

Would You Be Willing to Tell Us More?

☐ Yes — I am willing to complete the Detailed User Feedback Form.

☐ Yes — CAETS may contact me for brief follow-up.

Name (optional): _____

Email (optional): _____

☐ No additional follow-up, thank you.

Thank You

Your feedback will help CAETS improve the Guide and its supporting resources as the Knowledge Ecosystem evolves.