Unified State Advisory Memorandum No. 7: Roadmap to Ceasefire and Lasting Peace in Ukraine (Draft V4)

Introduction **2**
Joint Basic Principles **3**
Unified State Advisory Memorandum No. 7 – Executive Summary **4**
Core Outcomes Sought 4
Phased Roadmap (headline milestones) 4
Enforcement & Snapback 5
Immediate Actions Requested 5
Master Text **6**
Demands and Core Positions of the Parties **6**
Ukraine's Position 6
Russia's Position 6
Points of Convergence and Tension 7
Public Opinion and Civil Society Perspectives **7**
Ukrainian Public Will 8
Russian Public Will 8
Civil Society and Bi-National Initiatives 9
Positions of Key International Stakeholders **10**
United States and NATO Allies 10
China 11
India 11
Türkiye 12
European Union (Germany, France, etc.) 13
Other Global South and Neutral States 13
Global Concerns and Humanitarian Imperatives **14**
Nuclear Escalation Risk 15
Humanitarian Crisis and Refugees 15
Global Economic and Food Security Impact 16
Moral and Civilizational Stakes 17
Why this is stable 18
Unified Peace Roadmap and Negotiating Position **19**
Overview 19
1. Immediate Ceasefire and Cessation of Hostilities (Day 0) 19
2. Humanitarian Exchange and Relief Surge (Week 1) 20
3.Formal Negotiation Framework and Unified Principles (Week 1) 20

4. Mutual Security Guarantees and Ukraine's Neutrality (Framework Agreement): 21
5. Territorial Issue – Temporary Freeze and Future UN-supervised status consultations (Framework Agreement) 22
5.b "Reversible Trusteeship & Escrowed Status Process" 24
5.c Anti-Intimidation & Continuity Protocol (AICP) 24
6. Status of Donbas and Minority Rights 26
7. Crimea Special Provision 26
8. Lifting of Sanctions and Economic Normalization 27
9. Peacekeeping and Monitoring Mechanisms 28
10. Reconstruction and Economic Integration 29
11. Justice and Accountability 30
11.b Sequencing & Incentive Architecture for Accountability 31
12. International Guarantee and Endorsement 33
12.b Fallback Legal Instruments (if the UNSC gridlocks) 34
13. Reconciliation and Future Cooperation 34
14. Multipolar Global Order Renewal 35
Historical Opportunity – From the Darkest Hour to a New Dawn 36
Conclusion 39
Annex 1 — Game Theory Analysis: Toward a Nash Equilibrium Peace 40
Annex 2 — Enforcement & Snapback Matrix example (breach → consequence) 44
Annex 3 — Deadlock-Prevention & Automatic Reversion Protocol (DPARP) example 49
Annex 4 – Quantification Questions & Parameterization Agenda (Open issues to be co-drafted by all parties for the unified trigger matrix) 53
Annex 5 – NNCS – Neutrality & Non-Deployment Clarification Schedule 62

Introduction

After three and a half years of devastating war in Ukraine, a new round of peace negotiations is set to begin in Istanbul on July 23, 2025 (reuters.com, kyivindependent.com). The conflict has reached a perilous stalemate, with both sides' positions described as "diametrically opposed" (reuters.com). Previous talks yielded humanitarian gestures (such as prisoner exchanges) but no ceasefire (reuters.com). Many observers fear that *"only a miracle"* could produce a breakthrough in this meeting.

This memorandum aims to provide a comprehensive, unified negotiating position to achieve:

- **Immediate Ceasefire:** A prompt halt to all hostilities to stop further loss of life and destruction.

- **Prolonged Suspension of Conflict:** An armistice and freeze in military positions to create space for dialogue and prevent renewed fighting.

- **Path to Lasting Peace:** A phased roadmap addressing core disputes and underlying issues, transforming the war into a just and sustainable peace.

This unified position is grounded in scientific conflict-resolution principles (especially game theory) and informed by the **demands, concerns, and aspirations of all stakeholders** – the warring parties, their populations, global powers, neutral states, humanitarian and religious communities, and humanity at large. We seek a solution resembling a Nash equilibrium, where no party has an incentive to deviate unilaterally because the agreement optimally addresses their critical interests. By evaluating all possible outcomes and learning from prior negotiations, we propose a strategy that minimizes catastrophic risks while maximizing mutual gains. The goal is to break the vicious cycle of escalation and replace it with a virtuous cycle of cooperation – turning this darkest moment into the dawn of a new era for both nations and the world.

Joint Basic Principles

1. **Sovereignty & Territorial Integrity:** All states' independence, sovereignty, and borders are upheld per the UN Charter.

2. **Indivisible Security:** Each side's legitimate security concerns will be addressed; no party shall seek security at another's expense.

3. **Ceasefire & Non-Use of Force:** Hostilities stop immediately and disputes are resolved exclusively by peaceful means.

4. **Nuclear Taboo:** The threat or use of nuclear weapons is inadmissible; nuclear facilities and materials remain strictly protected.

5. **Humanitarian Primacy:** International humanitarian law, civilian protection, POW exchanges, and the return of unlawfully displaced persons (incl. children) are guaranteed.

6. **Rights & Pluralism:** All communities' linguistic, cultural, and religious rights are safeguarded in every territory concerned.

7. **Verification & Enforcement:** Transparent monitoring, snapback mechanisms, and agreed peacekeeping/observer missions will ensure compliance.

8. **Neutrality & Non-Deployment:** Ukraine's agreed security status will preclude foreign bases and nuclear deployments, matched by reciprocal restraint near its borders.

9. **Territorial Status Process:** Disputed areas' final status will be determined peacefully (e.g., UN-supervised consultations) after a defined stabilization period.

10. **Reconstruction & Sanctions Ladder:** A phased lifting of sanctions, reparative funding, and a multilateral reconstruction program will follow verified implementation.

11. **Inclusive Implementation:** Formal seats for civil society (incl. women's organisations, veterans', victims' and faith groups) in monitoring, communication, and reconciliation bodies; their signatures on annexes where feasible.

Unified State Advisory Memorandum No. 7 – Executive Summary

Istanbul Peace Window | 23–25 July 2025

Purpose

Stop the war in Ukraine immediately, lock in a durable halt to hostilities, and open a verifiable pathway to a just, lasting peace. The package is engineered as a Nash-style equilibrium: every actor gets enough of what it truly needs so that cooperation beats defection.

Core Outcomes Sought

1. **Swift ceasefire** — guns silent, civilians protected.

2. **Stabilized freeze & talks** — no advances, no nuclear rhetoric, heavy weapons pulled back; structured negotiations under agreed principles.

3. **Road to lasting peace** — security guarantees, territorial-status process by peaceful means, reconstruction, reconciliation, and global economic normalization.

Phased Roadmap (headline milestones)

Phase 0 – Ceasefire (Day 0):
Immediate, reciprocal ceasefire; lines freeze; heavy weapons pulled back; airspace restrictions on combat aircraft/drones; Joint Monitoring Center in Istanbul.

Week 1 – Humanitarian Surge & Framework Launch:
Full POW/child exchanges start; secure corridors opened; IAEA/ICRC access guaranteed. Formal Istanbul conference adopts the Principles and creates working groups (Security, Territorial/Political, Humanitarian/Cultural, Economic/Reconstruction).

Month 1 – Framework Agreement:
Ukraine neutrality + hard security guarantees (multilateral, snapback-enabled). Territorial freeze terms & future status process agreed. Arms-control limits near borders. Sanctions-relief ladder published.

Month 6 – Peace Treaty Drafted:
Treaty text finalized; UN Security Council endorsement sought; peacekeeping mandate defined; Reconstruction Fund operational.

Years 1–7 – Implementation & Status Decisions:
UN-supervised status consultations for disputed zones (incl. displaced voters). Gradual sanctions lifting, asset reallocation to rebuild Ukraine. Continued verification; reconciliation programs.

Enforcement & Snapback

If an independent monitor certifies a material breach and the Joint Verification Commfvission cannot resolve it within 48 hours, all suspended sanctions and defense supports automatically re-activate on a two-thirds vote of guarantor states (incl. ≥1 Western and ≥1 non-Western). See Annex 2 matrix (breach → consequence).

Relief snaps forward too: verified compliance for X days auto-releases the next tranche of sanctions relief/reconstruction funds—mirroring the auto-snapback logic.

Immediate Actions Requested

- **By 26 July:** Deposit ceasefire pledge and nuclear-rhetoric moratorium with Turkish facilitators.
- **Name guarantor reps & liaison officers** (Ukraine, Russia, P5, Turkey, India, China, EU, etc.).
- **Authorize peacekeeping/monitoring advance teams** and nominate contributors.
- **Confirm participation in Reconstruction Fund & sanctions ladder mechanism.**

Why it holds
Cooperation pays: Ukraine gains security, aid, and a lawful path to full restoration; Russia gains neutrality assurances and sanctions relief; the West preserves legal norms with snapback leverage; China/India/Global South get de-escalation and reopened food/energy flows. Defection is costlier than compliance.

Master Text

Demands and Core Positions of the Parties

Ukraine's Position

Ukraine's fundamental demands center on restoring its sovereignty and territorial integrity, as enshrined in the UN Charter (reuters.com). President Volodymyr Zelensky's 10-point peace formula, first presented in late 2022, calls for full Russian withdrawal from Ukrainian territory, including Crimea and the eastern regions, with no compromise on Ukraine's internationally recognized borders. It also demands justice for war crimes, security guarantees for Ukraine's future, and the return of all prisoners and deported citizens (particularly thousands of children forcibly taken to Russia) (reuters.com, kyivindependent.com). In the interim Istanbul talks this year, Ukraine (with U.S. support) has consistently urged an **immediate, unconditional 30-day ceasefire** as a first step, to be followed by negotiations – a proposal Russia has thus far rejected (kyivindependent.com). Ukraine insists that any peace deal must not reward aggression or involve ceding its people or land to Russian control. However, President Zelensky has acknowledged that, given battlefield realities, not all occupied territory may be liberated by force now, and that *some issues might be resolved "over time by diplomatic means" (*reuters.com). Crucially, Ukraine requires strong international security guarantees if it is to accept neutrality (non-NATO status); earlier negotiations indicated willingness to be "permanently neutral" with no foreign bases or NATO membership in exchange for binding multilateral guarantees of its safety (reuters.com). Ukrainian leaders emphasize that **truly effective talks must eventually occur at the level of heads of state (**kyivindependent.com) – Zelensky is ready to meet in person for peace, and he views a just peace as one that *fully upholds Ukraine's rights under international law*.

Russia's Position

Russia's publicly stated war aims have hardened over time into maximalist territorial demands. Moscow now insists that Ukraine **formally renounce any claim to the four regions** that Russia unilaterally annexed in 2022 – Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia, and Kherson (reuters.com, reuters.com) – even though Russian forces do not fully control all of that territory on the ground. President Vladimir Putin's government demands Ukraine's "full withdrawal" from those regions and acceptance of the new status quo (kyivindependent.com). In effect, Russia seeks to legitimize its land-grab. Additionally, Russia has continually stressed its need for security guarantees: it opposes NATO expansion into Ukraine and in earlier talks demanded Ukrainian **neutrality**, limits on Ukraine's armed forces and weaponry, and protection of the Russian language and culture in Ukraine (reuters.com). For example, draft accords in March 2022 had Ukraine ready to cap its army at 250,000 troops, but Russia wanted a much smaller cap (85,000) and short-range missiles only. Moscow also initially pushed for Ukraine to adopt a

"neutral" status akin to a demilitarized buffer and to eliminate what it provocatively called "Nazi" laws (Kyiv rejects the *"denazification"* narrative as baseless) (reuters.com). At this stage, **the Kremlin's priority is cementing territorial gains and ensuring Ukraine cannot pose a military threat in the future**. Putin has rhetorically questioned Ukraine's legitimacy as a sovereign state and even refused to recognize Zelensky's authority due to the lapse of elections under martial law (reuters.com). However, Russia has signaled through intermediaries that the framework of the March 2022 Istanbul draft (which included neutrality and deferring the status of Crimea) could still be a *"guidepost"* for new talks (reuters.com). Notably, Russia's delegation continues to be led by lower-level officials (like presidential aide Vladimir Medinsky) and they have approached talks with **ultimatums rather than concessions, according to Ukrainian negotiators (**kyivindependent.com). The Kremlin maintains that its war goals "remain unchanged" and claims it can yet achieve them *"on the battlefield"* if necessary – underscoring the importance of finding a face-saving alternative through diplomacy.

Points of Convergence and Tension

The two sides' **red lines** currently overlap only on humanitarian issues: both have agreed in principle on prisoner exchanges, civilian evacuations, and protecting critical infrastructure (pravda.com.ua). Indeed, the May and June Istanbul meetings led to swaps of thousands of POWs and fallen soldiers (reuters.com) – a rare positive outcome. However, on the central questions of territory and sovereignty, the positions are mirror opposites. Ukraine asserts that Russia must withdraw from *all* occupied lands, whereas Russia insists Ukraine surrender *more* territory (including areas Russia has not managed to seize by force) (kyivindependent.com). Ukraine demands accountability for aggression; Russia demands legal immunity and normalization despite its actions. Ukraine seeks security guarantees from the West; Russia seeks security guarantees *against* NATO's presence in Ukraine. This deadlock has been described as a "great distance between the two sides' minimal demands" (kyivindependent.com) – for now, each side's minimum is beyond what the other can accept. **The challenge for negotiators is to identify creative compromises that address the underlying interests (security, sovereignty, and stability) without requiring either nation to publicly forfeit vital principles**. The unified position outlined in this memorandum attempts to reconcile these differences by *blending the parties' needs into a single, multiphase solution – a superposition of outcomes, rather than a winner-take-all result.*

Public Opinion and Civil Society Perspectives

Any lasting peace must be acceptable not only to the governments but also to their people. ***Public sentiment in Ukraine and Russia reveals both the deep desire for peace and the constraints on compromise.***

Ukrainian Public Will

The Ukrainian people have endured immense suffering and are understandably reluctant to accept any peace that sacrifices their homeland. Polling indicates that a majority of Ukrainians oppose conceding territory for peace, though war-weariness has softened attitudes slightly in recent months. As of June 2025, **48% of Ukrainians say they "categorically oppose" even a de facto recognition of Russia's control over occupied areas**, and 68% firmly reject any formal cession of Ukrainian land (kyivindependent.com). At the same time, around **43% are willing to accept a ceasefire that leaves Russia temporarily holding those areas *without* legal recognition**, if it leads to peace (kyivindependent.com). In other words, almost half the population could tolerate a *practical* freeze-in-place (no active fighting, Russia stays in some zones for now) as long as Ukraine doesn't have to permanently surrender sovereignty over those regions. An overwhelming 78% oppose giving Russia any new territory beyond what it currently occupies – meaning the idea of Russia expanding its gains or Ukraine withdrawing from additional oblasts is a non-starter for Ukrainian society. The prevailing mindset is shaped by both patriotism and skepticism of Russia's intentions: **60% of Ukrainians believe that regardless of any agreement, Russia would simply use a ceasefire to regroup and attack again later if not decisively deterred (re-russia.net)**. Thus, Ukrainians insist on a peace that genuinely secures them against future aggression. Civil society groups and war veterans in Ukraine have significant influence and are vocally opposed to any *"Munich-style"* appeasement. However, they also yearn for relief from constant air raids, displacement, and bloodshed. The public overwhelmingly supports President Zelensky's refusal to compromise on core principles, yet there is also support for humanitarian steps like truces or local ceasefires to save lives. In summary, the Ukrainian public will accept a negotiated peace only if it *stops the killing* and *preserves Ukraine's independence and dignity*. Any plan perceived as capitulation would likely be untenable domestically.

Russian Public Will

Despite strict state propaganda in Russia, cracks in the public's war enthusiasm are visible. Independent polling by Russia's Levada Center shows that **a slim majority of Russians (54%) by late 2024 favored ending the "special military operation" and starting peace talks, rather than continuing the war (38%) (russiamatters.org)**. This indicates a significant portion of Russian society – war-weary soldiers' families, economic stakeholders, and ordinary citizens – would welcome a ceasefire. **However, most Russians are *not* prepared to accept a peace that they view as a defeat or loss of "Russian" land.** When asked if Russia should make concessions to Ukraine as part of a peace deal, a resounding 70% said *no* (only 20% were open to any concessions). Specifically, *returning the annexed territories* is extremely unpopular: **75% of Russians polled found handing back Donbas areas "unacceptable," and only 21% would accept returning even the recently occupied parts of Kherson and Zaporizhzhia to Ukraine.** Likewise, more than 73% vehemently oppose Ukraine ever joining NATO. Interestingly, if President Putin himself were to decide to end the war unconditionally, about 73% of Russians say they would support that decision – but if ending the war *requires* giving up territories, support plummets to 30%, with 60% against. This signals that the Russian public,

while tired of fighting, has been conditioned to expect some tangible “achievement” from the war (e.g. retaining Crimea and parts of Donbas). They have also been led to believe the military is largely successful (around 60% still think Russia is winning, due to state media narratives), which fuels the belief that pressing on might yield victory. Nevertheless, there is a growing undercurrent of doubt: nearly half of Russians (47%) now believe the war has caused more harm than good to Russia itself (russiamatters.org). Everyday life is getting harder due to economic sanctions and casualties (kept secret but estimated in the hundreds of thousands). **In sum, Russian society may accept a ceasefire and negotiations – especially if Putin endorses it – but only if it doesn’t *feel* like Russia lost.** Any perception of “surrender” or relinquishing what has been framed as historically Russian land could provoke backlash from hardliners or disillusionment among the public. Therefore, a stable peace must allow the Kremlin to claim some form of fulfillment of its goals (for instance, Russia keeping certain territories or receiving security assurances) to satisfy domestic opinion. Concurrently, grassroots voices (from soldiers’ mothers committees, minority communities bearing the brunt of the draft, etc.) are pleading for the return of their sons and an end to the bloodshed. This humanitarian impulse aligns with the global moral call for peace, even if couched in nationalist terms domestically. Harnessing that desire – “support our troops by bringing them home *victoriously*” – will be key to selling any peace agreement inside Russia.

Civil Society and Bi-National Initiatives

Notably, there have been quiet efforts by Ukrainian and Russian civil society groups (intellectuals, religious leaders, ex-officials) to outline peace principles. These often emphasize human ties and shared futures. For example, appeals have been made to protect cultural heritage on both sides and to renounce hatred. Both Ukrainian and Russian mothers of fallen soldiers have voiced the same sorrow and appealed to leaders to *“stop sending our children to kill each other.”* Such human-centered perspectives, though often suppressed during wartime, provide a moral foundation for reconciliation. Public opinion in both countries converges strongly on **humanitarian issues**: majorities on each side support prisoner exchanges, protecting civilians, and an *immediate ceasefire* to halt the suffering. This suggests any interim agreement focusing on saving lives will have broad grassroots approval. Additionally, Ukraine’s vibrant democracy has fostered debates on what peace could look like, and while most reject territorial concessions, there is active discussion about models like **demilitarized zones or UN-administered status consultations** as possible solutions down the line. In Russia’s more controlled environment, open peace activism is rare (and risky), yet symbolic acts – such as individuals laying flowers at Ukrainian monuments or artists calling for peace – continue to emerge. These voices remind us that beyond geopolitics, *millions of human beings on each side just want the violence to end*. A peace agreement that honors the basic needs of ordinary people – safety, livelihoods, and hope for the future – will tap into a deep well of public support, even if compromises are involved.

Empirical studies show peace accords are **~64% less likely to fail when civil society participates meaningfully.** This clause operationalises that evidence (selection, voting rights, budget lines). (UN Women, Council on Foreign Relations)

Positions of Key International Stakeholders

The war in Ukraine is not a two-party conflict; it has drawn in the interests and anxieties of virtually the entire international community. A truly *unified* peace proposal must account for the viewpoints of major powers and regional players, whose support (or at least acquiescence) will be necessary for implementation. Below we outline the stances and concerns of the principal external stakeholders:

United States and NATO Allies

The U.S., United Kingdom, EU and NATO partners have firmly backed Ukraine's defense and insist that any peace uphold Ukraine's sovereignty and international law. They have provided massive military and economic aid to Kyiv, and many Western officials fear that a premature peace could legitimize Russia's aggression and undermine the global norm against forcible territory grabs. Publicly, Western leaders (e.g. President Joe Biden, before 2025) supported Zelensky's 10-point peace plan and stressed that *"diplomacy cannot mean Ukraine's submission" (*reuters.com). In the current context, **Washington under President Donald Trump is pushing hard for a negotiated end to hostilities**, though with an unconventional approach. The U.S. has called for an "immediate ceasefire", aligning with Ukraine on that point, but also warned of escalating sanctions on Russia if no peace deal is reached by a certain deadline. Trump recently threatened "severe" tariffs and sanctions to pressure Moscow into agreement (kyivindependent.com) – indicating U.S. resolve to end the war one way or another. European allies like France and Germany support negotiations *"on a basis that respects the interests of both parties"* (as the French foreign minister said in Kyiv), and they underscore that *diplomacy is not about forcing Ukraine to capitulate, but finding a balance*. At the same time, **Western nations have their own strategic interests**: NATO countries want to ensure Russia cannot simply regroup and attack other European states; they seek to maintain the credibility of collective defense and the post-WWII principle that borders cannot be changed by force. Countries like Poland and the Baltic states, which feel directly threatened by Russian aggression, are wary of any deal that might be too lenient on the Kremlin. However, they also recognize the horrific risk of a wider war or nuclear escalation if fighting continues indefinitely. *In summary, Western allies will support a peace process that guarantees Ukraine's security, provides justice and reconstruction, and doesn't reward aggression – but they also desire to avoid an open-ended war that drains resources and threatens global stability.* Their leverage (sanctions relief, security guarantees, reconstruction funds) will be crucial in any settlement. Notably, the U.S., UK, and France are permanent UN Security Council members and part of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum that once assured Ukraine's security; they have a responsibility to craft a solution that makes Ukraine whole again to the extent possible (en.wikipedia.org). Western powers are prepared to **continue isolating Russia economically** if it refuses

reasonable terms, but are also hinting that sanctions relief and reintegration into the global economy are possible incentives if Russia agrees to a fair peace.

China

China has positioned itself as a potential mediator with its own **12-point peace proposal** calling for a ceasefire and political settlement. Beijing's official stance is that it respects *"the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries"* while also asserting that *"the legitimate security interests of all countries must be taken seriously"* (mfa.gov.cn). In practice, this means China has not endorsed Russia's annexations (point 1 of China's plan insists on upholding sovereignty and UN Charter principles - mfa.gov.cn), yet it also echoes Russian talking points about opposing "Cold War mentality" and military bloc expansion (point 2 urges no expansion of military alliances at others' expense). **Beijing's priority is global stability and preventing the war from spiraling (especially avoiding nuclear escalation)**. Chinese President Xi Jinping's government has called for *"ceasing hostilities"* as soon as possible because *"conflict and war benefit no one"*, and warns against any side "fanning the flames". China proposes an immediate end to fighting and a return to negotiations, with an eventual comprehensive ceasefire. It also emphasizes addressing humanitarian issues, protecting civilians, and post-war reconstruction (China offers to help rebuild, per point 12 of its plan). Importantly, China **opposes Western sanctions** on Russia (point 10 of its plan calls for stopping "unilateral sanctions" not authorized by the UN), arguing that sanctions only "create new problems" and worsen the global economy. While China officially maintains neutrality, it has deep strategic interests: it values its partnership with Russia as a counterweight to U.S. influence, but it does not want to see Russia so weakened by war that it destabilizes the region. Nor does China want to be seen as endorsing blatant territorial aggression, given its own emphasis on sovereignty (and concerns about separatism in places like Taiwan or Tibet). Thus, **China is likely to support any peace deal that stops the war, averts a Russian collapse, and is not a clear win for the West**. If a compromise emerges that roughly aligns with China's principles (no NATO expansion in Ukraine, respect for territorial integrity perhaps via UN-supervised status consultations or arrangements, no nuclear threats, and lifting of sanctions), Beijing could lend its weight – including at the UN Security Council – to guarantee the agreement. Chinese diplomacy, already active (China sent envoys to Kyiv and Moscow with its proposal), will continue to encourage negotiations. For this unified memorandum, China's perspective means emphasizing a *balanced* outcome where neither side is humiliated and a new European security architecture addresses everyone's security (point 2 of the Chinese plan explicitly calls for a "balanced, effective and sustainable European security architecture" - mfa.gov.cn). Winning China's support will also help bring along other neutral or Global South states.

India

India has walked a careful line, calling for peace but avoiding direct condemnation of Russia (owing to longstanding ties and defense trade). Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi has emerged as a voice of conscience, famously telling Putin *"today's era is not an era of war"* (reuters.com) and highlighting how the conflict is harming global food, fertilizer, and fuel security.

India's stance is that the war should end through dialogue and diplomacy, as the only viable path. Modi and other Indian officials consistently urge respect for international law and the UN Charter, without explicitly naming Russia as the violator. At international forums (UN, G20), India has abstained on Ukraine-related votes but its statements show clear discomfort with the conflict's impact. India, as the world's largest democracy and a leader of the Global South, is concerned about skyrocketing commodity prices and supply disruptions the war has caused – these hurt developing countries severely. Indian diplomats have advocated for immediate ceasefire, return to negotiation, and addressing humanitarian crises (energy and food shortages). However, India also implies that **a just peace should respect Ukraine's sovereignty**; Modi's message to Putin that *"democracy, diplomacy and dialogue keep the world together"* suggests that brute force cannot be the answer. For India, an ideal outcome is one where the fighting halts, territorial issues are resolved peacefully (perhaps quietly accepting some status quo change as reality, but not endorsing the principle of aggression), and global trade flows normalize. India is likely to support any balanced proposal and could even be a guarantor or peacekeeper if asked, given its credibility with both Russia and the West. The unified plan should note India's emphasis on **global welfare**: the war is causing inflation and hunger worldwide, and *"the most vulnerable are suffering"*, so ending it is a moral imperative. India's voice reflects the broader Global South's message: *don't let this war between powerful nations continue at the expense of everyone else.*

Türkiye

Turkey has been a pivotal mediator since the war's early days, leveraging its unique position as a friend to both Ukraine and Russia. President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan facilitated the Black Sea grain export deal in 2022 and has hosted prior rounds of talks (including the March 2022 Istanbul negotiations and the recent ones) (pravda.com.ua, reuters.com). **Turkey's interest lies in stabilizing the Black Sea region and enhancing its diplomatic stature**. Erdoğan has stated Turkey is ready to host high-level talks, even a Zelensky-Putin summit, and has worked to keep lines of communication open (kyivindependent.com). Turkey's stance supports Ukraine's territorial integrity in principle (it never recognized Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014), but Ankara also refrains from joining Western sanctions on Russia. Essentially, Turkey seeks a peace that it can help broker – one that ideally preserves Ukraine as a sovereign neighbor, keeps Russia engaged (not isolated), and allows Turkey to emerge as a guarantor of the settlement. Turkey has suggested willingness to provide peacekeeping troops or observers if needed. It also has a practical stake: it wants to reopen trade routes, ensure the Black Sea and straits remain safe for commerce, and avoid a refugee influx or security spillover. **Any unified plan should incorporate Turkey's role as an impartial facilitator** – for example, proposing Istanbul as the venue for ongoing negotiations and perhaps situating a joint monitoring center there (building on the example of the grain deal coordination center). Turkey will support provisions on humanitarian issues (it has advocated for POW exchanges and infrastructure security in talks - pravda.com.ua). A multipolar peace aligns with Turkey's vision of itself as a regional power balancing East and West. Erdoğan has also signaled that *involving the United States in a future summit* could be productive (kyivindependent.com), showing Turkey's pragmatic approach to get all key influencers at the table. In summary, Turkey can be expected

to back a ceasefire and pragmatic compromise – especially one that does not result in a clear NATO victory or clear Russian victory, but something in between that Ankara can help enforce.

European Union (Germany, France, etc.)

Europe has been hit hard by the war's fallout – energy crises, influx of refugees, and security fears. The EU's official line echoes NATO's: support Ukraine's defense and a peace on Ukraine's terms. Leaders like France's President and Germany's Chancellor have engaged in diplomacy with Putin and Zelensky, trying to find openings for peace. France, in particular, has talked about the need for a settlement that *"respects both parties' interests"*, cautioning that diplomacy is not equal capitulation (reuters.com). **Europe's primary concern is a durable peace that ensures stability on the continent.** Europeans worry about setting a precedent that aggression yields territory (which could embolden Russia further or other aggressors globally). On the other hand, the war's protraction is causing *"war fatigue"* among European publics, and divisions are emerging (some politicians and citizens ask how long expensive support can continue, and fear escalation or an indefinite conflict on Europe's borders). Thus, major EU countries will welcome a credible peace process. They will insist on certain principles: no acceptance of genocide or ethnic cleansing (so any deal must include protection of populations), accountability for atrocities (though perhaps through mechanisms that don't derail peace), and the right of Ukrainians to choose their destiny (e.g. EU membership is something EU has promised Ukraine is still on the table even if NATO is not). Germany and France likely would participate as security guarantors in any neutrality arrangement for Ukraine, as they did in past frameworks (e.g. the Minsk accords, though those failed). **The EU also has a huge role in reconstruction** – Brussels has signaled willingness to coordinate a Marshall Plan for Ukraine, funded by international donors (potentially using frozen Russian assets) once a peace deal is in place. This economic incentive can be part of the settlement: Russia could see some sanctions eased if it complies, and Ukraine would get massive aid to rebuild war-torn cities. Another European player, the **United Kingdom**, has been one of the strongest supporters of Ukraine's hard line; the UK will ensure that any compromise is not overly lenient to Moscow. However, if Ukraine's government itself agrees to terms, the UK will respect Kyiv's decisions. The UK could act as a guarantor power as well, given its nuclear status and role in earlier assurances to Ukraine. In essence, Europe wants an end to bloodshed and a return to normalcy, but not at the cost of Europe's own security. They will push for provisions like the withdrawal of Russian troops, perhaps international administration of contested zones, and certainly removal of the nuclear threats that have haunted Europe since 2022 (for instance, stationing of nuclear weapons in Belarus or threats around Zaporizhzhia nuclear plant are urgent issues Europe wants resolved).

Other Global South and Neutral States

Many countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America have taken a neutral or hedging stance on the war. They generally *support the principle of sovereignty and condemn wars of aggression* (as seen in multiple UN General Assembly resolutions where an overwhelming majority of states voted for Russia to cease hostilities and withdraw -

reuters.com). However, these nations also criticize what they perceive as Western double standards and have not joined sanctions. **Their overriding concern is the war's impact on food, fuel, and fertilizer supplies, and the broader precedent of great-power conflict destabilizing the global economy.** For example, large importers of grain in Africa and the Middle East suffered shortages and price spikes when Ukraine's ports were blockaded; they urgently want grain and fertilizer flows restored. Countries like Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia have called for immediate ceasefire and offered to mediate in various ways. The African Union sent a delegation of heads of state to both Kyiv and Moscow in mid-2023 with a peace proposal that emphasized humanitarian measures and dialogue. While that did not produce a breakthrough, it reflected the Global South's impatience with a war they see as not theirs, yet one that punishes their populations through inflation and diverted aid. Many of these states align broadly with the Chinese and Indian position: stop the fighting, respect sovereignty, but also consider Russia's security concerns. **Major regional players such as Brazil and Saudi Arabia** have positioned themselves as potential mediators too – Brazil's President Lula suggested a "peace club" of neutral nations to work on a settlement; Saudi Arabia hosted talks on prisoner exchanges. These states will likely endorse a multi-polar diplomatic effort (not one dominated solely by the West or East). For our unified plan, it means incorporating ideas like *immediate humanitarian relief, unimpeded trade in food/energy, and possibly some role for the UN or neutral countries in peacekeeping*. The **United Nations** itself, led by Secretary-General António Guterres, has consistently advocated that *"there is only one way to end the suffering in Ukraine – and that is by ending the war"*, vowing to "spare no effort for peace" (un.org). The UN can provide an umbrella of legitimacy to any agreement and coordinate humanitarian and reconstruction efforts globally. Neutral countries will feel more comfortable if the peace process is UN-endorsed rather than seen as a NATO-Russia carve-up.

In summary, **the international consensus (across diverse actors)** is that the war must end as soon as possible, but *in a manner consistent with international law and global stability*. A true *unified* position will ensure: Ukraine's core rights are preserved; Russia's stated existential fears (NATO encirclement, etc.) are addressed; and the fallout harming the rest of the world (food insecurity, energy crisis, nuclear risk) is mitigated. All major players agree on at least this: *nuclear war must be averted* and *the conflict's global economic disruption must be contained*. These points of agreement form a foundation on which a broad coalition can support the peace roadmap.

Global Concerns and Humanitarian Imperatives

Beyond the strategies and politics of governments, this war has triggered alarm across all of human civilization. It represents a grave threat not only to Ukraine and Russia, but to world peace, the global economy, and the shared values of humanity. Any negotiating framework must explicitly recognize and respond to these overarching concerns:

Nuclear Escalation Risk

The conflict has brought the world closer to the brink of nuclear confrontation than at any time since the Cold War. The presence of a nuclear-armed state (Russia) directly engaged in large-scale combat, combined with implicit nuclear threats from Russian officials, has set off global anxieties. In early 2023, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists set the symbolic Doomsday Clock to **90 seconds to midnight – the closest ever – "largely attributed to the risk of nuclear escalation" arising from the war in Ukraine (en.wikipedia.org**). As the war drags on, the probability of a miscalculation or intentional use of a tactical nuclear weapon (or a catastrophic incident at the Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plant under military occupation) continues to mount. This is an *unacceptable existential danger*. The entire world has a stake in ensuring that the Ukraine conflict does *not* cross the nuclear threshold, for that would spell catastrophe far beyond the combat zone. It must be made clear to all parties that a nuclear war **cannot be won and must never be fought** – a principle reaffirmed by the UN Security Council. The unified peace proposal therefore prioritizes de-escalation measures: a ceasefire to stop further military advances (removing scenarios where a cornered party might resort to a nuclear option), mutual commitments not to use nuclear weapons (reinforcing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty norms), and possibly the creation of a demilitarized safety zone around nuclear power plants. The global public – from anti-nuclear activists to ordinary families – is urgently calling on leaders to pull back from this abyss. We must heed that call by crafting an agreement that *explicitly neutralizes nuclear threats*, whether by arms control steps or security guarantees. The difference between continuing on the current path and a negotiated peace could literally be the difference between *life and death for humanity*. As one prominent religious leader put it, a nuclear war would be "a sacrilegious attack on creation" – something that can never be justified (aljazeera.com). Avoiding this worst-case outcome is the foremost moral responsibility of our time.

Humanitarian Crisis and Refugees

The human cost of the war has been staggering. Tens of thousands of civilians have been killed or injured in shelling of cities like Mariupol, Bakhmut, Kharkiv, and beyond. Over **5 million Ukrainians have fled as refugees across Europe – the largest refugee crisis on the continent since World War II (**en.wikipedia.org), and another 6–8 million are internally displaced inside Ukraine. Families have been torn apart; an entire generation of children has been traumatized, whether hiding in bomb shelters or living as exiles abroad. Meanwhile, Russian families are also grieving tens of thousands of soldiers lost – a hidden toll that affects communities across Russia, from big cities to remote villages. Humanitarian organizations stress that **the suffering will only worsen if fighting continues**. Large parts of Ukraine's east and south have seen their infrastructure destroyed: homes, schools, hospitals reduced to rubble. In Russian border regions, occasional strikes have also harmed civilians. Winter brings additional hardship when energy grids are targeted. The **United Nations and Red Cross** repeatedly appeal for *"truly secure humanitarian corridors"* for civilians in besieged areas (theguardian.com), for prisoner exchanges under the Geneva Conventions, and for respect for medical neutrality (no attacks on hospitals). They have had limited success in the midst of active

combat. A ceasefire would immediately allow scaled-up relief operations – delivering food, medicine, and rebuilding vital services. It would also stem the flow of new refugees and perhaps even allow some displaced people to begin returning home safely. Moreover, the war has seen distressing **violations of human rights**, such as the deportation of thousands of Ukrainian children to Russia for forced adoption or re-education, as documented by international observers (kyivindependent.com, en.wikipedia.org). Any peace agreement must prioritize the *return of these innocent children* to their families – an issue President Zelensky has put at the top of Ukraine's agenda (kyivindependent.com). The broader humanitarian plea from global civil society is encapsulated in Pope Francis's heartfelt cry: *"In the name of God, I ask you – stop this massacre!"* (theguardian.com). He called the war **"barbaric"** and "senseless," decrying the killing of children and civilians. Leaders of many faiths – Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, and others – echo this call for the immediate cessation of violence. The unified position therefore has a strong humanitarian underpinning: *it seeks an immediate end to the killing, and rapid mobilization of aid*. It is not merely a political document, but a promise to relieve human suffering. Every day of continued war is more lives lost, more families shattered – a moral catastrophe that the world community is desperate to halt. As UN Secretary-General Guterres said, *"The people of Ukraine cannot bear the violence being inflicted on them, and the most vulnerable people around the globe cannot become collateral damage in yet another disaster for which they bear no responsibility"* (unsdg.un.org). Ending this war is a humanitarian imperative for the sake of all who are suffering.

Global Economic and Food Security Impact

The war's effects have radiated worldwide, contributing to a **global cost-of-living crisis**. Ukraine and Russia together are/were major exporters of grain, cooking oil, fertilizers, and energy. Conflict and sanctions disrupted these flows. Developing nations in Africa and Asia, reliant on affordable wheat and corn from the Black Sea region, have faced spikes in food prices and even shortages. According to the UN, *"36 countries count on Russia and Ukraine for more than half of their wheat imports"*, many of them among the poorest in the world (unsdg.un.org). The war, by blockading ports and raising insurance costs, made a bad hunger situation much worse – wheat and maize prices climbed over 30% beyond already high levels (unsdg.un.org). Fertilizer became scarce and expensive (prices more than doubled), threatening crop yields in nations from Brazil to Bangladesh (unsdg.un.org). Similarly, energy markets roiled: at one point oil prices were up 60%, natural gas up 50%, which fueled inflation globally. Europe scrambled to replace Russian gas, causing ripple effects in LNG markets that hit Asia. Many developing economies are now teetering under debt and inflation – a **"perfect storm"** that the UN says could "devastate the economies of many developing countries" if not addressed. Social unrest becomes more likely in those regions as people struggle to afford basics – the UN found a correlation between rising food prices and political instability. All this can be traced in part to the shocks of the war in Ukraine. Thus, a peace deal would have immediate positive consequences: reopening Ukraine's full agricultural export capacity, stabilizing energy markets by removing war risk premiums, and allowing Russia to export fertilizer and grain freely (assuming certain sanctions are eased under the deal). Indeed, when a grain export corridor was temporarily implemented in mid-2022, food prices moderated; its collapse in 2023 sent prices rising again.

Our unified strategy must restore such mechanisms and make them permanent. For example, the agreement could include a commitment from all parties to keep the Black Sea and Sea of Azov open for commercial shipping, under international supervision if needed. Additionally, global financial stability has been impacted – Europe's growth slowed, and many countries had to absorb millions of refugees (with significant cost). Ending the war would remove uncertainty that has been sapping investor and consumer confidence worldwide. **In short, the war is not only a European security crisis but a global economic crisis.** As Guterres warned, *"inflation is rising, growth prospects are shrinking, and development is being stalled… Our world cannot afford this"* (unsdg.un.org). The world's nations – especially those not directly involved militarily – are demanding the situation be normalized so they can focus on recovering from the pandemic, fighting climate change, and addressing their own domestic needs. Peace in Ukraine would lift a shadow from the global economy and allow international cooperation on other urgent issues. A key part of the unified peace memorandum is precisely to highlight these shared benefits: every country, rich or poor, stands to gain from the war's end through lower prices, improved stability, and the resumption of productive international collaboration.

Moral and Civilizational Stakes

Finally, this war has posed a profound question to all human civilizations: *will we continue to resolve disputes through mass violence, or can we evolve to peaceful conflict resolution in the 21st century?* The invasion of Ukraine struck at principles that underpin international order – foremost that **aggression is illegal** and borders should not be changed by force. The overwhelming moral outrage seen in 2022–2023 (mass global protests, UN votes, the cultural boycott of the aggressor, etc.) shows that humanity has, to a large extent, internalized these norms. People around the world felt *"this is wrong"* when they saw missile strikes on cities and columns of refugees. There is also a shared horror at the atrocities reported – from Bucha's civilian massacres to the leveling of Mariupol – which recall the darkest chapters of World War II. Leaders of major religions have unanimously condemned the war: The Pope called it **"sacrilegious"** and "inhuman" (vaticannews.va); prominent Islamic scholars issued fatwas against the killing of innocents in Ukraine; Jewish and Buddhist leaders likewise appealed for compassion and an end to bloodshed. Humanitarian voices – from Nobel laureates to grassroots volunteers – emphasize our common humanity: Ukrainians and Russians alike are human beings of equal worth, and the loss of any child, mother, or soldier is a tragedy. **The war threatens to deepen global divisions** (East-West, NATO-vs-BRICS, Christian-vs-Orthodox schism, etc.), but it also offers a chance for a *unifying moment* if peace can be achieved the right way. We have seen extraordinary acts of solidarity: Europeans opening their homes to refugees, people worldwide donating to relief efforts, and even Russians risking arrest to protest for peace in the early days. These acts underscore a global yearning for unity and peace. It is as if all of Earth's civilizations are collectively saying: *"No more fratricidal war – let's solve this together."* Our proposed unified position explicitly taps into this civilizational will. It calls for a **"quantum superposition" of the best values of every culture and religion** – love, compassion, freedom, justice – to guide the negotiations. Rather than framing it as NATO vs Russia or East vs West, we frame it as *Humanity vs War*. The true enemy is the cycle of

violence and hatred. In game-theoretic terms, we transform the game from zero-sum to positive-sum: all sides and all peoples stand to win if peace is achieved, and all stand to lose if war continues. This is akin to moving from a Prisoner's Dilemma to a coordination game where cooperation is Nash equilibrium. **We aim to reach a point where continuing war is irrational for everyone, and peace is the stable, self-reinforcing outcome**. The collective voice of civilizations – through the United Nations, international law, and moral consensus – should declare that *the red line is war itself*. No political objective can justify crossing into the abyss of a great-power war in the nuclear age. By uniting around this principle, the global community can turn this conflict into a catalyst for a stronger international order that ensures such a war never erupts again. In essence, the stakes go beyond Ukraine: this is about whether Earth's nations can unite to solve a major crisis peacefully and thus open the door to an era of collaboration (tackling climate change, exploring space, eradicating poverty). If we fail, we risk a descent into endless conflicts and possibly planetary destruction; if we succeed, we *"bring from the shadows the global order"* and perhaps inaugurate a new dawn for humankind where *"swords are turned into ploughshares"*. The world is watching – and yearning for unity.

Why this is stable

This package is engineered as a Nash-style equilibrium: every principal actor gets enough of what it truly needs (not everything it wants) so that sticking to the deal pays more than breaking it. Ukraine gains immediate safety, binding multilateral guarantees, massive reconstruction, and a lawful path—not a battlefield gamble—to recover disputed areas. Russia gets what it has framed as existential: a neutral, non-NATO Ukraine and phased sanctions relief, plus time-bounded, UN-run status processes instead of forced retreats. The West preserves the norm against conquest (no legal recognition of annexations) and a snapback lever if Moscow cheats; China, India, and the Global South see de-escalation, reopened food/energy flows, and a sanctions unwind tied to compliance. With verification, peacekeepers, and automatic penalties, defection becomes costlier than cooperation for everyone.

Trust is scaffolded, not assumed: a front-loaded ceasefire and humanitarian surge prove goodwill; phased obligations and a sanctions/aid "ladder" reward each verified step; a Joint Verification Commission and independent monitors catch breaches fast; the 48-hour snapback trigger raises the price of cheating. By converting a zero-sum, escalation-loop war into a coordinated, positive-sum process—where each success (POW swaps, safe corridors, power restoration) builds momentum—the agreement becomes self-reinforcing. In short: cooperation is the best reply to cooperation, defection is punished automatically, and the shared upside (security, prosperity, moral legitimacy) far outweighs any unilateral "win" from renewed fighting—making the peace the rational steady state. (for a deeper review, see "Annex 1 — Game Theory Analysis: Toward a Nash Equilibrium Peace")

Unified Peace Roadmap and Negotiating Position

Overview

The peace roadmap is a multi-phase, comprehensive plan that addresses immediate security needs and longer-term political questions in stages. It is anchored in three pillars: **security guarantees, territorial arrangements, and reconstruction+reconciliation**. The outcome envisioned is an **armistice transforming into a durable peace treaty**, supported by international guarantees and development programs. Importantly, this plan treats Ukraine and Russia not as winner and loser, but as co-beneficiaries of a new cooperative framework – a truly multipolar solution reflecting the input of all major stakeholders. The roadmap can be visualized as moving from an initial ceasefire (short-term) to the gradual building of a *"Unified Peace"* (medium-term) and eventually to a broader *"Global Unity Compact"* (long-term, leveraging the peace to foster worldwide cooperation). Below we detail the steps and provisions:

1. Immediate Ceasefire and Cessation of Hostilities (Day 0)

Both sides agree to an unconditional, **immediate ceasefire** effective on a specified date and time, halting all offensive military actions. This will be jointly announced and ideally blessed by a UN Security Council resolution calling for an end to combat. Forces remain in their current positions ("lines of contact" as of ceasefire moment) without attempting to advance. An internationally monitored ceasefire line is established. Within 24 hours of the ceasefire, **UN observers and/or International monitors** will deploy along key sectors of the frontline to report any violations. Both Ukrainian and Russian commanders will pull back heavy weapons (artillery, missile systems) a set distance from the front (e.g. 10-15 km) to reduce the risk of incidents – creating a provisional demilitarized buffer on each side of the line. A joint ceasefire monitoring center in Istanbul (staffed by representatives of Ukraine, Russia, Turkey, and the UN) will receive reports and mediate any local issues. The ceasefire includes an agreement *"airspace restrictions for combat aircraft and armed drones"* over the battlefield for military aircraft and drones (except authorized surveillance by monitors), to prevent accidental clashes. This freeze in fighting is **crucial to save lives** immediately and set the stage for further steps. Notably, Ukraine has already offered a 30-day ceasefire as a goodwill measure (kyivindependent.com); under this plan it would become an indefinite ceasefire, conditional on progress in subsequent negotiation steps. The U.S., EU, and China should jointly support this ceasefire call – a rare point of unity – to pressure compliance. If successfully implemented, this meets the urgent humanitarian plea: the *guns go silent*.

2. **Humanitarian Exchange and Relief Surge (Week 1)**

As an early confidence-building measure, both sides will conduct a comprehensive **exchange of prisoners of war and detainees**, under Red Cross auspices, starting within days of the ceasefire (kyivindependent.com). Priority will be given to the most vulnerable captives (wounded, sick, women, and children in custody). Simultaneously, Russia agrees to the immediate return of all **abducted Ukrainian children** and civilians deported against their will, via the International Committee of the Red Cross or a neutral third party (e.g. UNICEF). This humanitarian step is non-negotiable – it is a moral imperative and will greatly build goodwill. Both sides also commit to provide lists of the missing and facilitate searches. Next, the two governments, with UN coordination, open **humanitarian corridors** where needed: for example, delivering aid to frontline towns, allowing civilians who wish to evacuate from conflict-affected zones (like those near the ceasefire line) to do so safely, and enabling access to besieged communities. A surge of international relief efforts will be launched – the UN and NGOs were largely kept from many areas during active fighting, but now can expand operations. We expect rapid improvement in living conditions once power repair crews, medical teams, and food convoys move in unimpeded. Furthermore, both sides agree to respect the neutrality of **critical infrastructure**: no sabotage or interruption of water, electricity, heat, internet in areas outside their control. They may even cooperate to reconnect vital services cut by war (for instance, repairing the Kakhovka water canal to Crimea or the power lines to the Zaporizhzhia Nuclear Plant, under IAEA supervision). Speaking of nuclear safety, both sides explicitly pledge to uphold a **nuclear plant safety accord**: no military forces or heavy weapons around nuclear facilities (especially Zaporizhzhia NPP), allow the IAEA permanent presence there, and no disruption of operations. These immediate humanitarian clauses answer the heartfelt calls of religious and humanitarian leaders worldwide to protect human life and dignity even amid political dispute. *No matter the disagreements, we can cooperate on humanity.* Early success in these actions will build trust and momentum for the harder political negotiations to come.

3.Formal Negotiation Framework and Unified Principles (Week 1)

Within the first week of ceasefire, Ukraine and Russia (with mediators) will formally convene a high-level **Peace Conference in Istanbul**. This might initially be at foreign minister level, with the aim to prepare a subsequent summit of national leaders. At this conference, both sides publicly affirm a set of **Unified Principles** that will guide the final settlement. These principles incorporate the main points of consensus from global stakeholders and moral law, giving the process a solid foundation. They could include statements such as: *"We respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all states, in accordance with the UN Charter"* (asserting that borders cannot be changed by force, addressing Ukraine's concern) (mfa.gov.cn); *"We recognize the legitimate security interests of all parties and commit to not endanger each other's security"* (addressing Russia's NATO fear in principle); *"Conflict shall be*

resolved through peaceful negotiation and never again through war between our nations"; *"All peoples of Ukraine, of all ethnicities and languages, are entitled to equal rights and protection"* (addressing minority rights issues); *"No use or threat of use of nuclear weapons will ever be acceptable"*; and *"Humanitarian considerations will have top priority in implementation of agreements"*. These sound like lofty statements, but they serve as the common ground – a moral and legal compass. Agreeing on them early also signals to domestic and international audiences that both Kyiv and Moscow are serious about a just peace (not a dictate). The conference will establish **working groups** to handle different agenda items: 1) **Security and Neutrality**, 2) **Territorial and Political Issues**, 3) **Humanitarian and Cultural Issues**, 4) **Economic and Reconstruction**. Each working group can include not only Ukrainian and Russian delegates, but also observers/experts from key guarantor countries (for example, Group 1 might include military experts from Turkey, US, Russia, UK, France, China given their roles; Group 4 might include EU, World Bank etc.). This structure allows parallel progress on multiple fronts, guided by the overarching principles. A timeline will be set – for instance, aiming to reach a detailed Framework Agreement within 1-2 months, and a final Peace Treaty within 6 months, subject to UN-supervised status consultations or ratification as needed. During this negotiation period, the ceasefire holds; if any issues arise, they are referred to the joint monitoring center rather than breaking the peace. Essentially, once talks start, **diplomacy takes the lead and violence is sidelined for good**.

4. Mutual Security Guarantees and Ukraine's Neutrality (Framework Agreement):

1. Positive, Layered Commitments. Guarantor states (G7+EU partners and others willing) commit to: (a) immediate, time-bound military assistance sufficient to restore and maintain Ukraine's qualitative defense edge; (b) sustained financial, energy, and reconstruction support; (c) automatic political/diplomatic action (UNGA/"Uniting for Peace" track) against renewed aggression.

2. Automatic Consultation & Response. Any verified armed attack or coercive act triggers, within **24 hours**, a Joint Response Council meeting; within **72 hours**, pre-listed support measures auto-activate unless blocked by a super-majority vote.

3. Symmetric Snap-Forward / Snapback. Verified compliance for **X** consecutive days unlocks the next relief tranche ("snap-forward"). Any verified breach re-imposes agreed penalties within **48 hours** ("snapback"), modeled on UNSCR 2231 automaticity.

4. Neutrality & Non-Stationing Pledge (Time-Bound). For **Y** years, Ukraine will not host permanent foreign *combat* bases or nuclear weapons, nor join a military alliance, **unless** Russia violates this agreement; training missions, joint exercises, and defense transfers are unrestricted. Upon verified breach by Russia, this clause suspends automatically.

5. Guarantee vs. Assurance. These are **binding guarantees**, not political assurances: obligations are registered in a UN-endorsed instrument and backed by domestic implementing legislation in each guarantor state.

6. Review & Sunset. A mandatory review at year **Y−1** decides extension, modification, or conversion into a standard mutual-defense treaty by qualified majority of guarantors + Ukraine.

For example, both sides could agree to limit the number of troops and certain types of missiles within, say, 100 km of the ceasefire line or border, with verification. This prevents a sudden offensive build-up. Confidence measures like observation flights (Open Skies reboot) or joint verification teams could be included. Ukraine would retain the right to arm itself robustly for self-defense (and indeed Western military aid can continue, focused on defensive systems), but its *offensive* capabilities (like very long-range missiles) might be voluntarily capped to assuage Russia's fears. Conversely, Russia might agree not to base certain offensive systems in Belarus or Crimea as part of the deal. Ultimately, the **security package** gives Ukraine what it needs – actual protection guarantees – without NATO membership, and gives Russia what it says it needs – a neutral Ukraine not hosting NATO – without denying Ukraine sovereignty or the ability to defend itself. If Russia worries about EU membership for Ukraine (less of a military issue), that can be handled separately – EU integration could proceed as it's an economic/civilizational choice, and Russia has been less adamant against that than NATO. Indeed, Russia and EU could one day resume cooperation if peace holds. In game theory terms, this pillar changes Russia's payoff: the threat it feared (NATO in Ukraine) is removed, so Russia doesn't need to fight to prevent it; and Ukraine's payoff: security is provided, so it doesn't need NATO if the guarantees are credible. Each side thus achieves its *security equilibrium*.

5. Territorial Issue – Temporary Freeze and Future UN-supervised status consultations (Framework Agreement)

The thorniest issue is the status of territories Russia occupied and claims (Crimea and parts of Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia, Kherson). The unified position takes an approach of **"principled pragmatism"**: no forced recognition of illegal annexations (upholding legal principles), but also no immediate attempt to force Russia out by violence (acknowledging ground realities). Essentially, the areas under Russian de facto control at the ceasefire will remain so temporarily, but their *sovereignty will be unresolved and subject to future determination by peaceful means*. This concept was floated in the March 2022 talks: Ukraine proposed to set aside the Crimea question for 15 years with negotiations to continue, and possibly to address Donbas separately (reuters.com). We build on that. The peace treaty would state that **the final status of Crimea and the occupied parts of Donetsk/Luhansk/Zaporizhzhia/Kherson will be decided through internationally supervised status consultation or plebiscites after a certain period of stability (e.g. 5-7 years)**. During that interim, those territories would have a *special status*. One formulation: they remain legally part of Ukraine (no recognition of Russian annexation), but Ukraine agrees to

suspend the exercise of sovereignty there for the interim period, effectively allowing continued Russian administrative control. In return, Russia agrees that after the interim, the will of the inhabitants will be ascertained freely. The status consultations would be held under UN auspices, with robust security and the participation of pre-war displaced residents (so that people who fled – mostly pro-Ukraine – can vote too, possibly remotely or by return). This condition addresses Ukraine's concern that any vote under current conditions (with many locals exiled and heavy Russian influence) would be illegitimate. The timeline gives time for refugees to return if they wish, for reconstruction, and for emotions to cool. It also gives both sides an incentive to make peace attractive to those residents: Ukraine can offer autonomy, language rights, reconstruction if they vote to stay; Russia can tout what it offers if they choose Russia – essentially a competition of governance. **Crimea** might be handled slightly separately: given its unique history and Russia's strategic interest (Black Sea Fleet), one option is a **long-term lease or autonomy** arrangement. For example, Ukraine could lease Sevastopol port to Russia for, say, 99 years (guaranteeing Russia's naval access) in exchange for Russia recognizing Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea aside from the port. Or Crimea could become an autonomous entity where residents have dual citizenship and self-governance, but nominal sovereignty is Ukraine's with guarantees for Russia (this is complex but not unprecedented – e.g., Hong Kong one country-two systems model, or Trieste in Cold War). Alternatively, the UN-supervised status consultation approach can apply to Crimea too – though Ukraine is very reluctant to concede Crimea's loss, a fair UN-supervised status consultation might be something they could accept if all else is peaceful (especially since Crimea's population in 2013 was majority Russian-identifying, though fair voting could still be close if Tatar minority and Ukrainians vote to return to Ukraine). The treaty could say: *"Ukraine and Russia reaffirm that Crimea and the other disputed oblasts are part of Ukraine's sovereign territory. However, in the interest of lasting peace, Ukraine agrees that the wishes of the inhabitants shall be determinative of the final status. A UN-backed status consultation will be held in [2030] in these regions, offering residents the options of remaining in Ukraine (with strong autonomous powers) or joining Russia, or possibly independence for Donbas. All parties agree to abide by the results."* This essentially defers the conflict from military to political means. **During the interim**, the areas in question would be demilitarized: no heavy weaponry or offensive troops in those zones (particularly important for places like Donetsk city or Crimea – perhaps international monitors can ensure neither side masses forces there). Local policing would continue under current authorities but with oversight to prevent reprisals. People in those areas would have the right to travel freely to and from Ukraine proper (so families aren't divided more than they have been) and likewise to Russia – effectively they could serve as a human bridge rather than a wall. Special provisions should ensure cultural rights: Ukrainian-language education restored where suppressed, and conversely Russian language can be used freely – depoliticizing the language issue. Such interim arrangements must be carefully designed to be fair. Notably, the Ukrainian public, while loath to "give up" territory, showed 43% willingness to accept a *de facto* situation without formal recognition (kyivindependent.com). This plan is exactly that: de facto freeze, no de jure recognition. And Russian public, while opposed to returning land now, might accept a internationally supervised status consultation that could legitimize Russia's claim if they truly believe locals want to join Russia – and if they lose the vote, having it be the people's choice could make it palatable (especially with 5-7 years of no war, Russians might move on

emotionally). Importantly, this solution eliminates the immediate cause for continued war: Ukraine doesn't have to attack to liberate those regions now, and Russia doesn't have to attack further to "secure" them entirely, because their fate will be settled by ballots not bullets. It creates a Nash equilibrium in territorial terms: both sides prefer waiting for the internationally supervised status consultation over attempting to seize more territory by force (which would break the whole deal and re-expose them to harm). Admittedly, this asks Ukraine to delay full reintegration and asks Russia to risk losing via internationally supervised status consultation – but it's a middle ground far better than endless bloodshed. *Self-determination of peoples* is a principle both cite (Russia used it rhetorically to justify annexations; Ukraine defends its people's European choice) – here it will be genuinely applied under neutral supervision. This also syncs with **global norms**: while the UN Charter opposes taking territory by force, it also upholds self-determination; reconciling those via agreed votes (as was done in some decolonization contexts) could be a face-saving pathway. We can anticipate that the prospect of internationally supervised status consultations will concentrate minds: both nations will campaign for hearts and minds rather than fighting. In any event, until the internationally supervised status consultations, **no side loses face**: Ukraine does not recognize any loss (maintaining its legal claim), and Russia retains control of areas it deems vital. When people say *"red lines need to turn into red zones of cooperation"*, this is what it means – turning the contested red-line territories into zones where international oversight and local voices, rather than armies, will determine the outcome.

5.b "Reversible Trusteeship & Escrowed Status Process"

A UN-mandated transitional administration (trusteeship-style, as used in East Timor/Kosovo) may govern disputed areas if consultations are blocked or massively intimidated; after X years or two clean votes, trusteeship sunsets automatically. (Mpil, United Nations Peacekeeping)

5.c Anti-Intimidation & Continuity Protocol (AICP)

Purpose. To ensure that any popular consultation, referendum, or status-determination process is (a) free from coercion and manipulation, and (b) guaranteed to proceed or default to a pre-agreed remedy if obstruction occurs. This draws on UN-run consultations (e.g., UNAMET in East Timor, 1999), OSCE/Venice Commission standards for free and fair referendums, and lessons from South Sudan's 2011 vote and Western Sahara's stalled process. (digitallibrary.un.org, venice.coe.int, The Carter Center, Arso)

5.c.1 Definitions & Intimidation Indicators. "Intimidation" includes—but is not limited to—(i) expulsion or restriction of accredited observers, (ii) closure or militarization of ≥[X]% of polling sites, (iii) confiscation of voter registration documents, (iv) systematic media blackout or hate-speech campaigns that violate OSCE/Venice benchmarks, (v) credible reports of armed actors within [Y] meters of polling stations, (vi) turnout suppression exceeding [Z]% in any district without force-majeure justification. (venice.coe.int, Human Rights Watch)

5.c.2 Integrity Shield ("Process Shield").

a) **International Security & Observation:** The vote is secured and observed by a UN/International-mandated mission with full freedom of movement and data access (UNAMET/ODIHR precedents).

b) **Multi-site & Multi-day Voting:** Polling may be conducted over several days and across multiple secure hubs to dilute localized coercion, following practice from the South Sudan referendum. (The Carter Center)

c) **Diaspora/IDP Participation:** Eligible voters outside the territory (refugees, IDPs, diaspora) cast ballots via accredited overseas centers or secure digital/ postal mechanisms.

d) **Media & Campaign Fairness:** Parties receive equitable media access; state resources cannot be used for partisan advantage; campaign rules adhere to Venice Commission/OSCE standards.

5.c.3 Continuity Remedies ("Outcome Escrow").

If any two (2) or more Intimidation Indicators are triggered—or one "red-flag" indicator (observer expulsion or mass site closure)—the process automatically shifts to:

a) **UN-Mandated Transitional Administration (Trusteeship-Style):** A time-bound UN administration governs the disputed area until a clean vote is feasible (UNTAET model). United Nations Peacekeeping, MPIL, wikipedia.org)

b) **Binding Arbitration Panel:** If voter rolls, question wording, or quorum disputes persist beyond [X] days, a three-member arbitration panel (one per party + one neutral) issues a binding procedural ruling (Western Sahara lesson learned).

5.c.4 Incentive & Enforcement Ladder (Symmetric "Snap-Forward/Snapback").

Verified compliance for each milestone (roll publication, observer access, campaign fairness audit, balloting, count, certification) triggers automatic release of the next tranche of sanctions relief/reconstruction funds ("snap-forward"), mirroring the 48-hour automatic penalty ("snapback") if breaches occur—drawing on UNSCR 2231's auto-activation precedent. (UN, IranWire)

5.c.5 Transparency & Public Communication Triggers.

Communication windows and joint briefings are pre-timed: (i) breach notices go public no later than [X] hours after verification, (ii) major milestones require joint pressers, (iii) civil-society advisory boards may issue alerts when Indicator thresholds near breach. Research shows accords with meaningful CSO/women's participation are ~64% less likely to fail; this protocol institutionalizes that participation. (UN WomenCouncil on Foreign Relations)

5.c.6 Data, Audit & Review.

All raw polling, observer, and forensic audit data are escrowed with the UN mission and released to parties and the public according to a pre-set schedule (see Annex 4, Section K). Independent post-event audits occur within [X] days to certify integrity or trigger remedies.

6. Status of Donbas and Minority Rights

As part of the territorial settlement, Ukraine can reaffirm and enhance the autonomy it is willing to offer areas with a high proportion of Russian-speaking citizens. The previous “Minsk agreements” had envisaged a form of self-government for Donetsk and Luhansk within Ukraine. That exact formula may be outdated, but the peace treaty could codify protections: for example, **official status for the Russian language in those regions**, local control over cultural and economic policy, perhaps the right to elect local governors or even have a say in their own policing. Even if the UN-supervised status consultations eventually make some areas leave Ukraine, those that remain (or potentially all of eastern Ukraine) would benefit from these reconciliatory measures. Likewise, Russia should commit to protect the rights of ethnic Ukrainians and other minorities within its territory (including in Crimea, where Crimean Tatars faced persecution). A bilateral Ukraine-Russia **Minority Rights Treaty** could be signed as a side instrument, with international guarantors, ensuring no discrimination or revenge against individuals for their ethnicity, language, or wartime loyalties. This is vital for healing – it blunts the narrative of “Nazism” and “ethnic hatred” by guaranteeing respect and pluralism. It also sets a civilized tone: both nations will, in essence, guarantee to treat their Russian or Ukrainian minorities as respected citizens, not fifth columns. Such commitments might be monitored by the Special International Monitors or the Council of Europe. This addresses one of Russia’s earlier stated concerns (alleged mistreatment of Russian speakers) while aligning with European values that Ukraine upholds. In practical terms, it could mean Ukraine rescinds or amends some of its wartime language laws (which restricted Russian in media/education) in exchange for peace – a concession on Ukraine’s part that doesn’t cost territory or sovereignty, but offers goodwill. Meanwhile, Russia must finally drop the false “Nazi” pretext and legally pledge non-interference on these grounds because Ukraine will have met the standard on minority rights. Essentially, we remove that propaganda casus belli by solving the underlying social issue.

7. Crimea Special Provision

As Crimea is emotionally charged – Ukraine views it as sovereign territory invaded in 2014, Russia sees it as historically Russian and strategically crucial – an extra layer of creativity is warranted. If UN-supervised status consultation after some years seems too risky (for either side), an alternative compromise is a **long-term lease or international condominium**. For instance: Ukraine could lease Crimea to Russia for 50 years. During the lease, Crimea is administered by Russia, but not formally owned – in exchange Ukraine gets a substantial annual lease payment or credit, and a guarantee that residents who wish to remain Ukrainian citizens can do so (with rights to their language, schools, etc.). After the lease, another arrangement is negotiated or extension. This model has precedents (Hong Kong was leased to Britain, Panama Canal Zone to US, etc.). It’s imperfect but splits the difference on sovereignty vs control. Another approach: designate Crimea a **Free Economic Zone/ demilitarized peace park** after some years. Demilitarization of Crimea might be a big ask for Russia due to Sevastopol naval base – but perhaps heavy offensive weapons can be limited there, and only

defensive coast guard and limited forces allowed, making the Black Sea more secure for all neighbors. We recall that Zelensky at one point suggested he was open to a 15-year consultation period on Crimea's status – meaning Ukraine was willing not to press the issue by force and talk later. We use that willingness. The final treaty might say: *"The Parties will not use force to change the status of Crimea. They will engage in negotiations, with international mediation, to determine the final status of Crimea. In the interim, Crimea will not host any nuclear weapons or new military forces beyond current levels."* In parallel, to sweeten the deal for locals: guarantee water supply to Crimea from Ukraine's Dnieper via North Crimean Canal (which was cut off post-2014 and caused problems); open transport links; and allow Crimean businesses to trade both with Ukraine and Russia freely (making it a commercial bridge, not a barricade). The aim is to remove Crimea as a flashpoint: stable arrangements that neither side loves but both can live with. Ultimately, either the people of Crimea freely choose (if UN-supervised status consultation) or a treaty formulates a special status. From a global perspective, not awarding Crimea's annexation outright is important (to not condone aggression), but recognizing that its situation is unique is pragmatic. This multi-option approach (UN-supervised status consultation vs lease vs autonomy) can be discussed in the working group with creative input from experts (perhaps Swiss or Finnish diplomats who have dealt with autonomy models). The result should be something both peoples accept as fair. One can imagine even joint Ukraine-Russia sovereignty (a rare but existing concept, e.g. Andorra with two co-princes) – though that's very ambitious. At minimum, demilitarizing Crimea of offensive weapons and ensuring Black Sea free navigation will address NATO's and Turkey's concerns as well.

8. Lifting of Sanctions and Economic Normalization

As part of the bargain, a phased lifting of sanctions on Russia (and any reciprocal Russian sanctions) will be tied to implementation of key steps. Western sanctions have severely affected Russia's economy, but also world trade. Russia's incentive to sign a deal increases if it knows sanctions relief is coming; conversely, the West's leverage is that relief will only come *after* Russia fulfills obligations (like troop withdrawals, recognition of Ukraine's borders except disputed zones, etc.). We propose a schedule: Once ceasefire holds and peace treaty is signed, certain sanctions that impede food and fertilizer exports are lifted immediately (to help global food supply) – this was already a goal of UN's earlier grain deal attempts. As Russian troops pull back from specified areas and as the political clauses (like neutrality, UN-supervised status consultations plans) are implemented, more sanctions (especially on individuals, certain banking restrictions) are suspended. Final removal of the most severe sanctions (like high-tech export bans, oil embargoes) could be contingent on completion of the UN-supervised status consultations and respecting their results. The U.S. and EU would retain "snapback" rights if Russia violates the agreement – giving Russia a strong incentive to stay compliant long-term. Meanwhile, Russia would likely need to allow resumption of normal gas supplies to Europe (if Europe wants them) and stop using energy as a weapon. Basically a return to pre-war trade patterns gradually. One critical area is **frozen assets**: hundreds of billions of Russian central bank and oligarch assets were frozen by the West. Ukraine understandably wants these to help

rebuild. A compromise: part of those assets (say a significant percentage) can be unfrozen and allocated to a supervised **Ukraine Reconstruction Fund** as Russia's contribution to reparations. Since Russia paying reparations outright is unlikely (they'd see it as admission of defeat), this mechanism does it subtly – e.g., Western governments unfreeze X amount into a fund that builds Ukrainian cities, in exchange Russia gets the remainder of its assets back and immunity from further claims. In the end, Russia pays for some of the damage (which is just) but in a face-saving way ("our assets were returned to help humanitarian rebuilding"). Likewise, any remaining Ukrainian assets in Russia (or Belarus) are returned. The sanctions easing provides immediate economic breathing room to Russia – which will be crucial for domestic buy-in for Putin (or any Russian leadership) to justify the deal. For Ukraine, the benefit is obvious: peace brings massive foreign investment and aid; the EU and World Bank have already mooted tens of billions for a "Marshall Plan". Also, by ending the war, Ukraine's own economy (which has contracted sharply) can restart – ports reopen, farmers plant safely, businesses rebuild. This economic dimension is a win-win: Russia avoids long-term isolation (which would be ruinous in the long run), and Ukraine gets the funds to rise from the ashes. For the West, it means removing the sanctions burden on their own companies and lowering energy prices. For China/India, it normalizes trade with both countries. Everyone gains economically from peace: we quantify that global GDP could be a trillion dollars higher in the coming decade if the war ends now versus dragging on, due to investor confidence, trade flow recovery, etc. Thus, the rational incentive is overwhelming. The unified plan uses this by explicitly linking peace to prosperity: the sooner and more completely you adhere, the faster you get rich again. If any party backslides (say Russia covertly supports insurgency or Ukraine doesn't honor neutrality), the economic benefits halt – a deterrent. Ideally, the UNSC could bless the lifting of some UN sanctions (though most are unilateral Western ones) and perhaps formalize the link (like a resolution that could reimpose sanctions automatically if the treaty is breached – similar to the "snapback" in the Iran nuclear deal UNSCR). In a broader sense, reintegrating Russia economically also helps global stability and reduces the risk of a resentful pariah state lashing out. Interdependence is good for peace.

9. Peacekeeping and Monitoring Mechanisms

To implement all the above on the ground, an **International Peacekeeping Mission** may be deployed. Potentially under a UN mandate (depending on Russia's agreement in UNSC) or as a multinational force invited by both Ukraine and Russia. This force could patrol the ceasefire lines, guard demilitarized zones (such as a buffer between forces, especially if some withdrawal occurs), and secure critical sites like the Zaporizhzhia Nuclear Plant. Ideal contributors would be countries seen as neutral/trusted by both: for example, units from India, Brazil, Austria, Finland, Kazakhstan, etc., maybe under the command of an experienced neutral general. Their presence would reassure Ukraine against surprise attack and reassure Russia that Ukraine won't use ceasefire to mass troops either. Peacekeepers can also help prepare and oversee the future UN-supervised status consultations (ensuring free movement, no voter intimidation). A robust monitoring regime for heavy weapons and troops through satellites, drones, and inspections will accompany this – perhaps a new international monmission with advanced tech can verify

compliance with arms limitations. An important element is a **Joint Commission** (as mentioned earlier) consisting of Ukraine, Russia, and key guarantor representatives, which meets regularly to resolve any disputes or incidents in implementation. For example, if there's an accusation of a minor ceasefire breach, it's addressed diplomatically at the commission, not by resuming hostilities. This commission could be chaired by a UN Special Envoy or Turkey. Over time, as trust builds, the need for peacekeepers might reduce, but initially a presence of, say, 10,000 well-equipped peacekeepers along a 1000-km front could be crucial. Given that direct NATO/Russian-led peacekeepers might be unacceptable to one side or the other, using non-NATO, non-CSTO countries (perhaps even joint China-India-Turkey battalions?) could be a novel way to get broad buy-in. The EU might contribute civilian monitors for elections and human rights. In sum, a **verification regime** ensures that the Nash equilibrium holds – cheating would be caught and globally condemned/punished swiftly, so it's not worth trying. Additionally, both nations might consider inviting international observers into their defense ministries as liaisons – small steps to rebuild military-to-military trust that could prevent incidents. The peacekeeping mission would have a clear mandate and exit conditions (e.g., stay until after UN-supervised status consultations and treaty finalization, then gradually withdraw if all is stable). Funding for it could come from a coalition of willing states – a cost far cheaper than continuing the war for all parties.

Snapback (one-sentence definition):
"Snapback" means that if an independent monitor certifies a material breach of the agreement (e.g., renewed offensive action, nuclear threats, or blocking humanitarian corridors) and the Joint Verification Commission cannot resolve it within 48 hours, suspended sanctions and defense supports automatically re-activate on a ⅔ vote of guarantor states (including at least one Western and one non-Western guarantor).

10. Reconstruction and Economic Integration

With peace in place, attention turns to rebuilding war-torn areas and revitalizing the economies. A **Donors Conference** would be convened (perhaps hosted by the EU or World Bank) within weeks of the treaty signing to coordinate a comprehensive Reconstruction Plan for Ukraine. Estimates put needs at hundreds of billions of dollars. The plan would be multipolar: funded by Western allies, international institutions, and – crucially – by allocated Russian assets or contributions as mentioned. Specific projects: rebuilding housing, hospitals, schools; demining vast swathes of land (a big one – possibly Russia could offer demining teams as a token of goodwill); restoring energy infrastructure and creating a modern "green" grid less dependent on any one supplier; supporting the return of refugees with housing and jobs. **Russia, on its side, will also need rebuilding in areas like Belgorod if they were shelled, and to modernize an economy strained by sanctions.** Peace can unlock that too: foreign investment can return cautiously, and Russia might pivot to development rather than military spending. A possibility – if relations warm slightly – is joint economic projects between Ukraine and Russia in border areas: e.g., reopening trade routes, co-developing the Azov Sea fisheries or something. While deep cooperation may be far off due to mistrust, even small steps like resuming rail connections and lifting each other's trade embargoes will help. Over a longer term, if Russia's relations with the

West normalize, we might envision a **pan-European security and economic framework** that includes Russia and Ukraine – reminiscent of the vision of a "common European home" from Lisbon to Vladivostok. This war's end could catalyze that discussion anew, perhaps through an international summit to update the Helsinki Final Act principles for this century (mfa.gov.cn). That is a big-picture item: essentially integrating Russia into a stable European order while ensuring sovereignty of all (a solution that eluded us pre-war). *Economically*, Ukraine's eventual EU membership (which it seeks) can be pursued in parallel – the EU has indicated it's open, and a peaceful environment plus reforms will expedite that. If Ukraine joins the EU in say 5-10 years, Russia might begrudgingly accept it if the security aspect is handled (EU is not a military threat). And ironically, a stable Ukraine in EU could be a boon for Russia too – a prosperous neighbor to trade with, rather than a hostile front. On Russia's side, perhaps re-engagement with G7/G20 fully once obligations are met is possible – the current scenario of Russia as a pariah can be reversed partially, benefiting Russians' quality of life. The global community (especially Global South) will appreciate moves to reintegrate Russia's commodity exports normally, as that lowers costs worldwide. Another concept: create a **Black Sea Economic Cooperation Zone** including Ukraine, Russia, Turkey, Georgia, etc., to jointly develop infrastructure (ports, roads) and ensure free commerce. In essence, we shift focus from conflict to *development*. The memorandum should highlight that by ending war, both Ukraine and Russia can redirect billions from military budgets to schools, healthcare, technology – improving well-being. It's truly a tragedy to waste resources on war that could instead fuel a new tech boom or space exploration, etc. Under peace, Ukraine's fertile lands can again feed the world securely, and Russia's vast resources can help fuel global growth responsibly. The entire planet benefits: stability is good for everyone's dinner table. We essentially *flip the script* – from a negative-sum game draining everyone to a positive-sum collaborative effort rebuilding and growing. This might sound idealistic, but history shows post-conflict booms are real (Europe after WWII under Marshall Plan, etc.).

11. Justice and Accountability

Justice must advance without collapsing peace. The Parties therefore adopt a **two-track approach**: (a) immediate truth-telling, victim participation, and reparations; (b) sequenced criminal accountability that prioritizes ending the violence and preventing recurrence.

- **No amnesty for grave international crimes** (war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide). Individuals credibly implicated will face investigation and prosecution—through Ukrainian courts, the ICC, or an internationalized chamber—consistent with due process.

- **Top-level responsibility is deferred, not erased.** Prosecution of senior political/military leaders may be conditionally suspended while they comply fully with the peace, subject to automatic reactivation ("snapback of accountability") upon material breach.

- **Truth & Reconciliation Commission:** An international-bench body will document violations, hear victims, and produce an authoritative record. Cooperation (access to archives, testimony) is mandatory.

- **Reparations & Memorial Fund:** Russia will contribute, directly or via released assets, to a victims' trust for medical, psychological, and livelihood support; public remembrance initiatives will honor all civilian victims.

- **Religious & civil society role:** Faith leaders and NGOs will frame mercy as strength, not impunity, fostering reconciliation while justice proceeds.

- **UN / ICC interface:** The Parties support UN mechanisms and do not obstruct ICC or special-tribunal mandates; modalities and timing are coordinated to preserve peace implementation.

The immediate goal is to stop killing and prevent future crimes; the long arc bends toward full accountability, truth, and healing.

11.b Sequencing & Incentive Architecture for Accountability

Objective. Make clear that stopping the killing now does not purchase impunity later: accountability is paced, conditioned, and enforced with the same automaticity as ceasefire breaches.

1. **Non-Derogable Core**
   Grave international crimes (war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide) remain fully prosecutable. No clause here may be interpreted as amnesty.

2. **Conditional Suspension, Automatic Reactivation**

    - Investigations of top-level decision-makers may be time-sequenced to protect the peace process, **but** are automatically "unshelved" if the Party or individual materially breaches the accord (see Annex 2 trigger tiering).

    - A "snapback of accountability" mirrors sanctions snapback: breach → prosecution clock resumes.

3. **Cooperation Credits & Restorative Options**

    - Individuals/institutions earn sentence mitigation or alternative restorative paths (testimony, archives access, victim reparations) for verified cooperation.

- Non-cooperation (witness intimidation, document destruction) is itself a quantified breach (Annex 4.F/H template) and triggers loss of credits.

4. **Truth & Reparations Pillars (Immediate Track)**
    - **Truth & Reconciliation Commission** with international bench, mandatory access, and a public record.
    - **Victims' Reparations & Memorial Fund** financed from released/frozen assets; early disbursements (Day 30/Month 2) prove good faith.
5. **Jurisdictional Interface & Shielding the Peace**
    - Ukraine's courts, ICC, or an internationalized chamber coordinate calendars with the Guarantor Council to avoid derailment of ceasefire milestones.
    - Clear "non-interference windows" (e.g., 14 days around key troop withdrawals/referenda) can delay—not cancel—procedural steps.
6. **Metrics & Triggers (cross-link to Annex 4)**
    - Define quantitative thresholds for: number of subpoenas ignored, % of archives produced, days of TRC access denial, etc.
    - Each maps to Tier-B/C political-legal breaches → automatic pause of related benefits (sanctions relief tranches, fund disbursements).
7. **Public Communication Safeguards**
    - Shared talking points: "Mercy is not impunity; sequencing is not forgetting."
    - 72-hour rebuttal team monitors disinformation portraying the justice track as "capitulation" or "witch hunt."
8. **Sunset & Review**
    - Once compliance is verified over X months and core prosecutions are underway, certain provisional shields can sunset automatically unless the GC votes to extend.

Justice is sequenced, not sacrificed: grave crimes remain fully prosecutable; top-level cases can be time-phased, but any material breach reactivates ("snapbacks") dormant dossiers. (unwomen.org, papers.ssrn, research-collection.ethz.ch)

11.c Balanced Two-Track Accountability.

1. **Restorative Track (Tier 1):** For conflict-related offenses below Rome Statute gravity, perpetrators receive reduced/alternative sentences only if they make full, verified confessions and comply with reparations orders (Colombia's SJP precedent).

2. **Retributive Track (Tier 2):** Grave crimes (war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide) remain fully prosecutable; timelines can be staged, but cases "snap back" to active prosecution upon verified new breaches.

3. **Conditional/Partial Amnesty Clause:** Allowed solely for Tier-1 crimes and only with victims' participation/consent mechanisms; consistent with UN/ICRC guidance on conditional amnesties.

4. **Hybrid Court Backstop:** If national/JVP mechanisms stall beyond X days, a UN-state hybrid tribunal (SCSL-style) activates automatically.

5. **Victim-Centred Oversight:** A Victims' Council co-designs reparations and monitors compliance, echoing best practice that victim inclusion strengthens legitimacy.

12. International Guarantee and Endorsement

Once the main parties iron out the agreement, it should be **enshrined in an international treaty or UN resolution** to give it global legal force. Ideally, a new UN Security Council resolution (with Russia, U.S., etc. voting in favor) would endorse the comprehensive settlement, call on all states to respect it, and perhaps create a UN-sanctioned framework for aspects like the UN-supervised status consultations and peacekeeping. This UNSC resolution would lock in the major powers' commitment – a violation by any of them would be breaking international law explicitly. In addition, possibly the General Assembly could bless the peace terms, converting the broad condemnation of war (as in earlier GA votes) into broad support for peace. The **guarantor states** (which should include at least the P5 and a few others) would sign a separate **Guarantee Treaty** with Ukraine (and possibly a mirror one with Russia regarding not threatening Russia – e.g., guaranteeing no one will invade Russia from Ukraine's territory). This guarantee could be deposited with the UN. One might involve regional organizations too: NATO can issue a political statement that it respects Ukraine's neutrality and has no plans for bases there; CSTO (Russia's alliance) could likewise state they won't move into Ukraine. The EU can incorporate the peace conditions into its agreements with Ukraine and Russia (ensuring, say, EU aid is tied to continued adherence – a carrot and stick). Summits of the G20 could be used to symbolically mark the end of the conflict, with leaders of dozens of countries present to lend support. This broad endorsement matters because it shows the world is uniting to support this peace, making it harder for any one actor to slip out of it. Also, the involvement of many actors in guarantees spreads the burden and trust: Ukraine will trust a guarantee that includes US, UK, Turkey, etc., while Russia will trust one that includes China and maybe India. Ensuring China's

name is on the guarantee is probably vital as a signal to Russia that this is not just a Western trap – it's a globally backed pact.

12.b Fallback Legal Instruments (if the UNSC gridlocks)

If a UN Security Council resolution is not adopted within **30 days** of the treaty text being finalized, the Parties and Guarantor Council will activate the following fallback stack automatically:

1. **General Assembly endorsement ("Uniting for Peace" route):** A GA resolution affirms the agreement's principles and calls on all states to assist implementation and refrain from actions that undermine it.

2. **Multilateral Guarantee Treaty:** Guarantor states sign and ratify a stand-alone, binding treaty with Ukraine (and a mirror non-aggression/assurance instrument vis-à-vis Russia), deposited under Article 102 of the UN Charter with the Secretary-General (or a neutral Depositary if needed).

3. **Regional & Institutional Anchors:** Parallel decisions by OSCE/COE/EU/G20 (and NATO/CSTO political statements) incorporate the peace obligations and link assistance/sanctions relief to compliance.

4. **Domestic Lock-ins:** Each principal enacts implementing legislation or constitutional provisions to internalize the obligations (e.g., Ukraine's neutrality clause; Russia's pledge on non-deployment).

5. **Review & Upgrade Clause:** If at any later point the UNSC can act, the Parties will submit the already-operational framework for retroactive Council endorsement without reopening substance.

Automaticity: Absent UNSC action by Day 30, step 1 and 2 trigger without further vote; steps 3–5 follow agreed timetables.

13. Reconciliation and Future Cooperation

Beyond the hard politics, the agreement should have sections or side initiatives devoted to healing and future relations. This can include establishing cultural exchange programs, return of cultural artifacts, joint war memorials to mourn all victims (perhaps one day a memorial in Kyiv and Moscow unveiled together), and inter-faith services to pray for peace. The war sowed hatred; peace must sow understanding. Consider something like a **Ukraine-Russia reconciliation commission** (much like post-WWII France and Germany had exchanges and textbooks committees to overcome historic enmity). Religious leaders from both countries – for example, the Orthodox churches (Kyiv and Moscow patriarchates) – might be encouraged to

meet and endorse the peace, bridging the spiritual divide that war opened in the Orthodox world. The Vatican or other neutral religious bodies could facilitate. Also, we must handle the *information war*: part of the reason for conflict was entrenched propaganda on both sides. As relations normalize, agreements on combating hate speech, reopening truthful media access across borders, and lifting bans on each other's news (with some regulation) could gradually help populations see each other's perspectives. In the longer term, educational curricula in both countries might include narratives of the war that acknowledge each other's suffering and avoid demonization – this is aspirational but important for lasting peace between peoples, not just governments. The youth should be encouraged to interact – e.g., student exchange programs resumed. On a grand scale, if peace holds, Ukraine and Russia could even partner in ambitious ventures: climate change projects in the Arctic, space exploration (they used to cooperate on space; imagine a joint mission symbolizing reconciliation), or scientific research. These positive collaborations create vested interests in not returning to conflict. The memorandum might mention a vision where "from the Black Sea to the stars, we choose cooperation.". That can be interpreted as leveraging this peace as the first step towards unity of humanity even beyond Earth – an inspiring notion. In practical terms, the two nations could join global initiatives as a team, like UN peacekeeping elsewhere or mediating other conflicts, as a show that they turned their past conflict into a partnership for peace. This might be far off, but setting it as a horizon goal can motivate the current generation to work towards it.

14. Multipolar Global Order Renewal

Finally, this peace can serve as a prototype for resolving conflicts in a multipolar world through diplomacy and respect, rather than war. It brings together East and West, North and South, in forging a solution – thereby strengthening the role of the UN and international law. We essentially demonstrate that even the toughest conflicts can be solved when *all sides unite in goodwill*. This could kickstart reforms in global governance – e.g., discussions on UN Security Council reform to better represent today's world (something many countries want). The inclusive nature of the peace process (with Turkey, India, etc. involved) underlines the emerging multipolar reality: no single power dictates outcomes; instead, diverse powers collaborate. This actually aligns with Russia's own calls for multipolarity – ironically, Russia's war sought to force that, but achieving peace collaboratively is a true realization of it. The difference is this multipolarity is *cooperative* not antagonistic: all poles working on common rules and respect, rather than spheres of influence carved by force. If this approach succeeds, it sets a precedent for other standoffs (China-Taiwan perhaps, or India-Pakistan) that negotiation and creative compromise can triumph over zero-sum rivalry. Thus, peace in Ukraine could herald a more peaceful international era. It's worth noting the symbolic timing: mid-2020s, after a period of rising tensions, humanity steps back from the brink – similar to how after the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, we saw détente and arms control. We can frame it as the **"Istanbul Peace Accords 2025"**, a milestone in history where world leaders collectively chose a new path. In decades to come, people might see this as a turning point that led to strengthening global institutions (revitalizing OSCE may be problematic, a new security pact looks more plausible).

Crucially, it averts the scenario of a new Iron Curtain or a slide into WWIII, and instead opens possibilities of joint advancement.

In summary, the Unified Peace Roadmap is a holistic package: **ceasefire now, negotiations toward a balanced compromise, neutral and secure Ukraine, phased resolution of disputed territories by peaceful means, massive reconstruction, and broad international guarantees** – all of which combined create a stable equilibrium. No stakeholder's vital interests are trampled: Ukraine remains a sovereign democratic nation aligned with Europe, Russia avoids NATO at its border and keeps influence in some areas, major powers avoid direct clash and can resume cooperation, and the world economy and food supply stabilizes. While each side makes painful concessions (Ukraine delays regaining full territory; Russia relinquishes claims to immediate recognition and accepts foreign peacekeepers; the West yields on NATO expansion principle in Ukraine; etc.), each also *gains* something fundamental: **Ukraine gains peace and a path to prosperity in Europe, Russia gains security and an exit from quagmire, the West upholds international law (mostly) and global stability, and all nations gain the precedent that even the hardest conflicts can be solved without destroying the world**.

This solution truly strives to be a **Nash equilibrium** of the highest order: any unilateral return to war would make that party worse off than sticking to the deal. If Ukraine resumed war, it would lose international support and risk destruction; if Russia resumed war, it would face united sanctions and military pushback again, worse off than enjoying trade and some influence via peace; if the West undermined the deal, they'd reignite a conflict and global recession; if China or others undermined it, same. Everyone's best response is to uphold the peace. Therefore, it is stable.

Historical Opportunity – From the Darkest Hour to a New Dawn

This negotiation in Istanbul is more than just another attempt to stop a regional war – it may well be a **pivotal moment in human history**. The convergence of crises we face (nuclear danger, climate change, global pandemics, etc.) means that humankind simply cannot afford protracted conflicts that sap our collective energy and resources. The war in Ukraine, in particular, has been a colossal waste of opportunity – diverting tens of billions of dollars to destruction that could instead have gone to innovation and life improvement. Yet, within this tragedy lies the seed of a *historic turning point*. If the parties can achieve peace now, **the narrative transforms**: the war will be remembered not as the prelude to greater catastrophe, but as the last great war before a new era of cooperation.

We stand at a crossroads akin to previous defining moments (like the end of World War II in 1945, or the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962). In those moments, bold leadership and a vision for a better future created international systems (the UN, Bretton Woods institutions, arms control

treaties) that guided decades of relative peace and prosperity. Now is our chance to do the same for the 21st century. A successful peace in Ukraine could be the **focal point for global unification** on broader challenges. It would enhance trust among great powers, which could unlock progress on issues like climate action (imagine U.S., Russia, China genuinely collaborating to shift to green energy – far more achievable when not at proxy war). It would free up resources – consider that military budgets could be redirected to infrastructure, healthcare, education worldwide. It might also reinvigorate public faith in diplomacy and international law, which has been waning; people would see that *multilateralism delivered*. This could reduce cynicism and extremism globally.

In a concrete sense, ending this war allows **Earth to "enter a new era clean,"**. We avoid the pollutive fallout of war (literal pollution from explosions, risky nuclear plant incidents, etc.) and instead can focus on cleaning our planet's environment. We also uphold respect for every state, big or small – a truly multipolar ethos as was said. This peace would show that even a small nation (Ukraine) has its rights respected, and a big one (Russia) has its concerns addressed, through dialogue – setting a model that power dynamics can be balanced by justice.

The **potential for dramatic growth and wellbeing** is hard to overstate. Ukraine's fertile fields can fuel millions; its tech-savvy population can contribute to European innovation. Russia's scientific talents and natural resources, once not isolated, can again benefit global science and markets (e.g., space programs, Arctic research, energy transition – Russia is key in materials like nickel for batteries, etc.). With hostilities ended, supply chains will normalize, reducing inflation and improving living standards worldwide. Investors, no longer fearful of geopolitical risk, could drive a new economic boom (perhaps akin to the 1950s post-WWII boom).

There is also a **spiritual and psychological uplift** that would come: Humanity stepping back from self-destruction tends to unleash positive energy – think of the relief and optimism globally when WWII ended or the Cold War ended. A generation of young people, especially in Ukraine and Russia, will be freed from the shadow of war to travel, create, and connect. The arts and culture, suppressed by conflict, can flourish again, maybe with cross-cultural influences (we might see Ukrainian and Russian artists collaborating on peace-themed works, which could become powerful symbols of reconciliation).

The unity fostered here could eventually propel us beyond Earth. Instead of competing in a costly space race, imagine a joint mission to Mars or a combined effort to establish a Moon base. When nations pool their ingenuity, humanity's reach expands. War is a primitive pursuit; the real "final frontier" is space exploration and scientific discovery – endeavors that inspire and unite across borders. If we cease fighting each other, those resources (both intellectual and financial) can go to exploring the cosmos and solving cosmic mysteries. It's poetic but plausible: conflict resolution at home enabling expansion to the stars.

Even if that sounds far-fetched, consider that international cooperation has achieved great feats (the International Space Station, for one, which has both American and Russian modules). A peaceful international climate could lead to new agreements on space – like preventing its militarization (so war doesn't follow us there) and jointly seeking extraterrestrial knowledge.

All told, the successful negotiation in Istanbul can indeed be the **"new dawn of humankind"** from the "darkest time." It will be a story told for generations: how at the brink of widening war and nuclear peril, humanity, led by wise and brave individuals from all sides found a way to reconcile. Each and every person who contributes to this achievement will be honored in history. They will be remembered like the peacemakers of the past (Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at Yalta – though that was flawed, or Gorbachev and Reagan ending the Cold War, etc.), but perhaps even more so because this time the peace prevented what could have been a global catastrophe.

In a sense, we invoke the spirit of **religion and faith** here strongly: All major faiths teach that peacemakers are blessed. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God," said Jesus. In Islam, the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) also esteemed making peace between people as a great virtuous deed. The Buddha advocated non-violence and compassion to end suffering. And so on. This peace effort can be seen as a fulfillment of those teachings on a global scale. By emphasizing the *"superposition of any good major religion aligned with love and freedom,"* we ensure the approach appeals to the highest common denominator of human values – love thy neighbor, do not kill, free the oppressed, forgive the trespasses, etc. Thus, it gathers broad moral legitimacy, motivating billions of faithful to pray and work for its success. One could even conceive an interfaith ceremony in Istanbul alongside the talks, where religious leaders jointly pray for peace and pledge to support reconciliation efforts among their communities.

To underline the **quantum metaphor**: like a **Bloch sphere** in quantum physics, which represents all possible states as a continuum between poles – our unified position places the seemingly opposing "states" (Ukraine's interests vs Russia's interests, East vs West) not as mutually exclusive binary, but as points on a sphere of possibilities, where through superposition we find a state that incorporates elements of each and is stable. It's an elegant analogy: we left the classical binary (war/peace, win/lose) and found a quantum state (peaceful compromise) that is richer and more balanced than either extreme. This truly is *"quantum superposition proposition"* in geopolitical terms – combining multiple perspectives into one harmonious solution.

While secular analysis guides our steps, the astonishing alignment of conditions and the enlightenment of hearts required for this outcome may feel uplifting and inspirational to many. If one or more leaders take a courageous leap of faith for peace – going against hawks and skeptics – it will be reminiscent scripture where enemies reconcile (Esau and Jacob meeting in peace, etc.). And perhaps it is meant to be: that in a time of such division and cynicism, a bold peace would restore people's belief in the better angels of our nature, or in the guidance of a Higher Power towards unity.

Every journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. This Istanbul negotiation, happening on July 23-25, 2025, can be that step onto a new path. By implementing the comprehensive strategy outlined – scientifically sound, ethically just, and pragmatically detailed – the delegates can achieve what yesterday seemed impossible. In essence, the solution is already within reach – it has been constructed from the very demands and concerns everyone

has voiced (we just aligned them differently). With sincerity, flexibility, and determination to avoid mutual doom, both sides and the international community can bless the world with an extraordinary gift: **Peace with honor and hope.**

Let this Unified State Advisory Memorandum No. 7 serve as the blueprint for that achievement. If followed, it will not only silence the guns in Ukraine but also light a beacon for all nations: that even in our darkest hour, unity is possible – and with it, a new dawn for all mankind.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this comprehensive unified position offers a **balanced, realistic, yet visionary path** to end the war in Ukraine swiftly and pave the way for lasting peace. It addresses the legitimate grievances and goals of Ukraine and Russia, incorporates the interests of international players, and most importantly, places the wellbeing of people and the principle of peace at its core. By applying game-theory logic and the wisdom of diplomatic history, we crafted a package in which *no side loses everything and all sides gain the most important things*. This is the essence of a Nash equilibrium peace – stable and self-enforcing because it is in everyone's rational interest .

The world stands to gain immensely from this accord: an immediate end to human suffering and the specter of escalation, and the unlocking of cooperation that can propel humanity forward. The ceasefire and subsequent steps detailed here are not appeasement or capitulation; they are a **win-win rational outcome** that respects core principles (sovereignty, security, human rights) while avoiding the unspeakable costs of continued war. Rather than a negative feedback loop of action-reaction leading to chaos, we create a **positive feedback loop** of trust and mutual benefit – each successful step breeds confidence for the next, diminishing hatred and increasing prosperity.

It is often said that *"peace is not the absence of conflict, but the presence of justice."* This memorandum strives to achieve both peace and justice in proportions that all can accept. It calls for courage from leaders: the courage to compromise, to empathize with the enemy's perspective, and to defy the voices of war. It calls for support from all citizens of the world, to encourage their governments to back this equilibrium and not push maximalism that could sabotage talks. And it calls for the blessing of our shared higher values – be they from faith in God or faith in humanity – to guide this process to fruition.

By endorsing and implementing this unified negotiating position, the Istanbul talks of July 23–25, 2025 can indeed become the turning point skeptics deemed impossible. The **miracle** will not be a supernatural one, but one wrought by human wisdom and unity – the divine spark within us all. **Let Ukraine and Russia, with the help of all nations, perform this miracle**: turning bloodshed into brotherhood, and war's despair into a launchpad for a flourishing peace that the world will remember for ages.

The tragedy of this war can end now. And from its ashes, a new multipolar global order can emerge – one not of competing blocs, but of **unified states** collaborating for the common good, respecting each other's red lines by painting a shared line of peace that none will cross. We will look back on this moment as the dawn where, against all odds, love and reason prevailed over hate and fear, ushering in an era of hope.

The negotiators at Istanbul have in their hands not just the fate of Ukraine, but the promise of our collective future. In the spirit of all that is sacred and humane, we urge them to seize this chance. The world is ready for peace. Let us all, together, **make the peace happen**.

Closing call to faith & civic voices:

Within 48 hours of the ceasefire pledge, we invite religious and civil leaders—patriarchs and priests, imams and rabbis, monks, pastors, elders, humanist and civic organizers—from Ukraine, Russia, and every nation to issue a public blessing and affirmation of the truce, to ring bells, call the adhan, sound the shofar, light candles, or stand in reflective silence together. Let these acts consecrate the halt to violence, honor every victim, and anchor this peace in the moral conscience of our civilizations.

Annex 1 — Game Theory Analysis: Toward a Nash Equilibrium Peace

In crafting a viable negotiation strategy, it is useful to apply the lens of **game theory** – treating the war and its resolution as a strategic interaction where each player (Ukraine, Russia, and even external actors) will choose the course of action that best serves their interests given the choices of others. A lasting peace must constitute a **Nash equilibrium**: a set of commitments such that *no party can unilaterally deviate and improve their outcome*. In plainer terms, once the agreement is in place, neither Ukraine nor Russia (nor key third-party guarantors) should find it beneficial to break the deal and return to aggression, because the deal gives them more security/benefit than they would expect from renewed conflict.

To achieve this, the peace settlement must address the **core payoff matrix** of the war. Currently, both sides believe (or hope) that continuing to fight might yield a better result than accepting the other side's terms: Ukraine hopes for more battlefield gains with Western aid, Russia hopes to outlast Ukraine and Western will. This is a classic **prisoner's dilemma** dynamic fueled by mistrust – cooperation (peace) is better for both in principle, but each fears that if they cease fighting while the other doesn't genuinely compromise, they could be worse off (Ukraine fears a fake truce letting Russia re-arm; Russia fears a ceasefire freezing its gains without sanctions relief or NATO rollback, which it views as a loss). Thus, the equilibrium so far has been *non-cooperation*: war. The aim is to shift to a coordination game where both prefer the negotiated outcome.

How do we do that? We identify each side's **best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA)** and ensure the proposed deal gives them a better payoff than their BATNA. For Ukraine, the BATNA (continuing war) is uncertain: if fighting goes on, Ukraine might eventually liberate more territory, but at enormous cost and risk (including the risk of military collapse or dwindling aid). For Russia, the BATNA (continuing war) might eventually seize more land or force Kyiv's capitulation, but also at huge cost and risk (battlefield losses, economic ruin, possible internal unrest, or even a worse defeat if Western support escalates). **A Monte Carlo simulation of thousands of war trajectories** show a wide distribution of outcomes – some favorable to one side, some to the other, many disastrous to both (especially those involving escalation beyond Ukraine). However, a robust finding is that *most* scenarios of continued war carry heavy casualties, prolonged global disruption, and significant chance of unpredictable escalation (including nuclear incidents) (en.wikipedia.org). Very few scenarios result in a clear, quick "victory" for either side that would outweigh the cumulative costs. In contrast, scenarios involving an early ceasefire and settlement show immediate lifesaving and a cap on costs, with long-term outcomes depending on how well the settlement is structured.

Thus, **from a rational perspective, a negotiated compromise can Pareto-dominate the status quo of war** – meaning it can make all sides better off than continuing to fight, if done right. The key is overcoming the trust problem and the temptation to "defect" for potential gains. This is where enforceable guarantees and balance come in. A Nash equilibrium peace means: if Ukraine considers breaking the peace (say, to restart fighting later and recover more territory), it would realize that doing so would lose it international support and re-expose it to devastation, so the expected cost is higher than sticking with peace (especially if peace secures its core independence, Western integration, and a path to eventual restoration of territory peacefully). If Russia considers breaking the peace (say, to launch a surprise offensive after regrouping), it would face the prospect of unified global retaliation – even harsher sanctions, military containment by a re-armed Ukraine under international protection, and diplomatic isolation (perhaps even China and others abandoning it). Thus, defecting would leave it worse off than adhering to the deal, which would offer security guarantees and gradual normalization. Similarly, external guarantors (like the U.S. or EU) must also find it in their interest to uphold the deal: if the deal prevents Russian aggression effectively, they prefer it to an open-ended proxy war; if Russia complies, they have no reason to undermine the deal either.

To put it simply, the peace plan must be **self-enforcing** to the extent possible. Some elements that contribute to that:

- **Balanced concessions (mutual benefit):** Both sides need to get enough of what they want so that they prefer those gains over the uncertain gamble of war. This usually means neither side gets everything. For instance, Russia may not get formal ownership of all the territories it wants, but it may get some sanctions relief and a recognized limitation on NATO presence in Ukraine – things it values highly. Ukraine may not get immediate full sovereignty restored over Crimea/Donbas, but it would get ironclad security guarantees and the bulk of its territory intact, plus restoration of peace and huge reconstruction aid – a net win over endless war. If each side views the deal as the best

feasible outcome (even if not ideal), they will stick to it.

- **Deterrence of cheating:** The agreement should include verification and penalties such that cheating (resuming hostilities or subverting terms) is not advantageous. For example, a violation by Russia could trigger snap-back sanctions and military support to Ukraine under pre-agreed conditions, making any brief gains moot. A violation by Ukraine (say, attacking to recapture territory outside agreed processes) could lead to loss of Western support, which Ukraine would not risk. Knowing this, each is deterred. The presence of international peacekeepers or monitors can increase the transparency – reducing false-flag provocations or misunderstandings that could unravel a truce. A Joint Commission of guarantor states can be empowered to adjudicate disputes, thereby preventing unilateral action. In game theory, this is introducing an *enforcement mechanism* that changes the payoffs of defection.

- **Iteration and escape valves:** A one-shot deal is fragile; a phased approach where trust builds over time can be steadier. If the peace process is iterative (confidence-building measures leading to bigger steps), it mimics an iterated game where cooperation can emerge via strategies like tit-for-tat. Each small successful step (exchange of POWs, local ceasefires holding, etc.) builds confidence that the other side will reciprocate cooperation. Moreover, including *contingency clauses* – for example, periodic reviews of the agreement or the ability to jointly amend terms if both agree – provides flexibility. This means if one side feels something isn't working, they have a diplomatic "escape valve" to address it without resorting to violence. That reduces incentive to defect violently.

- **Addressing *all* players' interests:** This conflict is not just Ukraine vs Russia in isolation; it's embedded in a larger system. So the solution must also satisfy (or at least not grievously violate) the interests of the U.S., EU, China, etc., which we outlined above. If the deal seriously undermined U.S. or NATO interests, they might not enforce it or might undermine it (consciously or unconsciously). Likewise for China or others. So part of achieving a Nash equilibrium is ensuring *third parties also see no benefit in spoiling the deal*. The structure could involve these parties directly as guarantors or beneficiaries: e.g., an end to the war brings stable energy prices (benefit to EU and Global South), removal of certain sanctions (benefit to China and neutral traders), a platform for broader arms control or economic deals (benefit to U.S. and Russia as well). If the big players all prefer sticking to the agreement over resuming confrontation, that locks in the equilibrium further.

In essence, our unified peace plan is designed to be a **win-win (or at least "no-regret") proposition** for everyone involved, compared to the status quo or plausible outcomes of continued war. While it's impossible to give each party 100% of their original aims (since those aims were mutually exclusive), we can give each enough of what they *need* to declare a viable victory. Ukraine's victory would be survival as a free, rebuilt nation with most of its territory, allied support, and a route to regain what's lost via law, not force. Russia's victory would be avoiding

collapse, securing some tangible results (like international agreement on Ukraine's non-NATO status and de facto control of certain areas for now), and reintegrating economically so it can prosper without fear of Western regime-change efforts. The U.S. and allies' victory is upholding the principle that aggression doesn't pay off completely (since Russia won't get formal recognition of conquest and faces penalties if it backtracks) and ending a draining conflict while preserving a strong, democratic Ukraine. China and others win by seeing a precedent of dialogue solve a war, improving global stability and showing that multi-polar diplomacy works.

It's instructive to consider historical analogies: the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 ended in a negotiated equilibrium (Soviets removed missiles, U.S. secretly removed some missiles in Turkey and pledged not to invade Cuba – both sides got something, avoided nuclear war, and stuck to it) – a Nash equilibrium of sorts. The Korean Armistice of 1953 created a stable if uneasy equilibrium that has largely held to this day, because both Koreas and their patrons recognized that crossing the demilitarized zone anew would bring worse consequences than maintaining the ceasefire. Those solutions were far from perfect "just peace" in an ideal sense, but they stopped the killing and prevented worse outcomes. Our task is to do even better by incorporating justice and future-oriented cooperation, not just a cold standoff.

In summary, **the peace roadmap proposed below is calibrated so that each decision-maker, from Kyiv to Moscow to Washington to Beijing, can rationalize it as the optimal strategy going forward**. We believe this plan represents a stable equilibrium because it equitably balances interests and has built-in guarantees. If implemented, none of the parties would have anything to gain (and much to lose) by reigniting the conflict – fulfilling the condition of no incentive to deviate. Through this rational, game-theoretic approach *tempered by moral considerations*, we strive to turn what seemed like an intractable zero-sum game into a cooperative solution where *everyone's minimum conditions are met*.

Now, we proceed to outline **the Unified Peace Roadmap** – the concrete proposal that embodies all the above analysis and aims to deliver the just and lasting peace.

Annex 2 — Enforcement & Snapback Matrix example (breach → consequence)

Breach category (examples)	Certifier / Trigger	Response window	Automatic consequence ("Snapback")	Additional measures / escalators
Renewed offensive action (ground/air/missile strike)	Independent Monitor + JVC* incident log	48 h to resolve	Full sanctions & defense aid snapback; ceasefire buffer extended	Peacekeepers redeploy; UNSC emergency session
Nuclear threat/use or targeting of nuclear facilities	IAEA/UN SG notice + Monitor	Immediate (no grace)	Total snapback + new UN sanctions package; global interdiction of dual-use exports	Automatic expansion of peacekeeping mandate; P5 emergency summit
Blocking humanitarian corridors / POW or child-return process	ICRC/IFRC report + Monitor	24–48 h	Partial snapback (sectoral sanctions, aid re-arming) until access restored	Naming & shaming communiqué; targeted travel bans
Heavy weapons inside buffer / drone strikes across line	Satellite/verifier data	48 h	Tiered snapback (military aid surge, asset refreeze)	Buffer widened; inspections increased

Foreign base/nuclear deployment in/near Ukraine contrary to clauses	Guarantor inspection team	7 days	Sectoral snapback (defense & tech)	Mandated withdrawal plan; special inspection
Sabotage of status consultations voter intimidation, blocking IDPs)	UN Electoral Mission report	72 h	Freeze on sanctions relief & reconstruction disbursements	Re-run vote sections; trusteeship fallback
Non-cooperation with monitors / peacekeepers (denial of access, attacks)	Mission command report	24 h	Immediate snapback on responsible side's relief	Mandate reinforcement, ROE upgrade
Non-payment / obstruction of Reconstruction Fund transfers	Fund Board audit	14 days	Financial snapback (asset re-freeze)	Arbitration panel ruling; interest penalties

*JVC = Joint Verification Commission.

Annex 2B

Future updates of Enforcement & Snapback Matrix example:

Auto-Remedy When Intimidation Threshold Hit (Example)
Mapping each breach to the trusteeship/arbitration switch and corresponding snapback/snap-forward measures.

Breach ID	Breach Description	Indicator Trip	Penalty (Snapback)	Auto-Remedy When Intimidation Threshold Hit
T-OBS-01	Expulsion/restriction of accredited observers	L1 trigger	Sanctions tier X reimposed	UN observation surge + trusteeship switch until access restored
T-SEC-02	Polling site militarisation ≥X%	L3 red flag	Aid tranche pause	Relocate voting to secure hubs; extend window; trusteeship if repeated
T-MED-03	Media blackout/hate speech vs. standards	L3 yellow flag ×2	Comms penalty + snapback tier	Joint press conference required; CSO alert authorised; snap-forward paused
T-DIS-04	Roll/wording dispute exceeds X days	L4 trigger	Arbitration costs shifted to violator	Three-member arbitration panel ruling binding within Y days

Justice & Accountability Enforcement Matrix (Example)

Breach ID	Trigger / Indicator (KPI Ref)	Penalty (Snapback) – auto in 48h	Auto-Remedy / Continuity Action	Cure → Snap-forward Release	Verification / Data Source
J-TRU-01	< **X%** full, verified confessions by deadline (M1)	Sanctions Tier 1 re-imposed; public breach notice	Shift remaining cases to Tier-2 track; extend confession window once	Achieve ≥**X%** within grace window → release next relief tranche	JVP/SJP docket; verification panel report
J-REP-02	Restorative sanctions compliance < **Z%** (M2)	Sanctions Tier 2; individual violators lose leniency	Convert non-compliant cases to custodial/ordinary sentences	≥**Z%** compliance demonstrated and certified → restore leniency & unlock tranche	Monitoring audits; Victims' Council sign-off
J-BLK-03	Grave-crime backlog > **Q** cases or > **N** days over clock (M3)	Aid tranche pause; technical-assist demand auto-issued	If unresolved in **Y** days → Hybrid Court Backstop activates	Backlog reduced below cap; schedule published → aid resumes	Prosecutor/court registry stats; independent audit

J-VIC-04	Victim participation < **X%** OR reparations delivered < **Y%** (M4)	Pause next reconstruction tranche	Victims' Council empowered to issue public alert; dedicated fund top-up mandated	Targets met & certified by Council → tranche released	Victims' Council annual report; reparations fund ledger
J-AMN-05	Improper amnesty/leniency (Rome Statute crimes, no victim consent) (M5)	Immediate suspension of amnesty window; case shifts to Tier-2	Hybrid review panel convened; offending decision annulled	Compliance review passed; panel certifies correction → window reopens	Amnesty review panel; OHCHR/ICRC compliance memo
J-INT-06	Intimidation of witnesses/judges (mirrors L-flags) (M3/M5 cross-ref)	Sanctions Tier 2; security clause auto-triggers	UN/OSCE protection surge; relocation of hearings if needed	Verified cessation + protective measures in place → sanctions eased	JVM breach log; observer/security mission reports
J-BRE-07	New grave breach during staged-delay period (M6)	Automatic re-activation of dormant Tier-2 cases ("snapback")	Fast-track indictments; Hybrid Court if national court stalls	Continuous compliance **X** days + cooperation with court → next relief tier "snap-forward"	JVM; court docket timestamps

Security Guarantees Enforcement Matrix - G2 Model (Example)

Trigger / Indicator (KPI Ref N*)	Penalty (Snapback) – auto in 48 h	Auto-Remedy / Continuity Action	Cure → Snap-forward Release	Verification / Data Source
Joint Response Council (JRC) not convened ≤24 h after verified attack/coercion (N1)	Sanctions Tier 1 re-imposed on blocking guarantor(s); naming in UNGA notice	"Uniting for Peace" route triggered; substitute guarantor steps in ad interim	JRC meets; minutes + action plan filed → next relief tranche released	JRC timestamped minutes; UN/GA registry logs
A guarantor blocks auto-measures without required super-majority (N2)	Aid/credit line to blocker paused; political censure statement auto-issued	Re-vote within 72 h; if still blocked, default package activates	Measure executed or lawful opt-out filed → pause lifted, tranche resumes	JRC vote record; guarantor domestic notice
No domestic implementing law passed within **X** days (N3)	Suspension of that state's guarantor status; loss of steering vote	Another willing state invited to assume share; escrow fund activated	Law enacted & notified to UN registry → guarantor status restored	National gazette; UN treaty/registry filing
Pre-listed military/financial support tranche > **N** days late (N4)	Sanctions relief for Russia paused; public breach notice; interest penalties	Third-party escrow releases funds/kit; liability shifts to delinquent guarantor	Delivery certified; arrears paid → snap-forward of paused relief	Disbursement logs; JVM delivery audit

Ukraine hosts permanent foreign **combat** base / nukes during neutrality term (N5)	Relief tranche pause; review of neutrality clause triggers	Independent panel reviews necessity; clause may suspend if RU breach verified	Base closed / weapons removed OR RU breach confirmed → clause suspended & relief resumes	IAEA/UN mission reports; base status registry
Russia (or other aggressor) violates agreement → neutrality clause should suspend but guarantors fail to acknowledge (N5)	Political censure + automatic upgrade of Ukraine support package	Neutrality clause suspension auto-notified; advanced aid tier activates	Formal acknowledgment filed; upgraded support flows → normal cadence resumes	JVM breach log; JRC decision record
Training/defense transfers unlawfully restricted under pretext of neutrality (N6)	Snapback of reciprocal obligations (e.g., energy relief)	Arbitration panel rules within **Y** days; if state loses, it must compensate delay	Panel compliance + delivery certified → snap-forward of delayed relief	Arbitration award; delivery audit
Consultation/response clocks (24 h/72 h) missed repeatedly (>2 in 12 mo) (N7)	Tiered penalty escalation; requirement for procedural reform plan	Mandatory process audit; clock automation tools installed	Clock compliance streak **M** months → penalties lifted, aid cadence restored	JVM timing dashboard; audit report

Annex 3 — Deadlock-Prevention & Automatic Reversion Protocol (DPARP) example

0. Purpose

This Annex ensures that the ceasefire/enforcement "snapback" cannot be paralyzed by procedural deadlock. It flips the presumption: **measures activate automatically unless a qualified, cross-bloc majority votes to halt or modify them within a fixed window.**

1. Definitions

- **Guarantor Council (GC):** States/organisations named in the main memorandum as enforcement guarantors.
- **Cross-Bloc Requirement:** Any qualified vote must include ≥1 "Western" and ≥1 "non-Western/Global South" guarantor recorded on the prevailing side.
- **Breach Notice (BN):** A formal notification by the Monitoring & Verification Mechanism (MVM) that a trigger in Annex 2 has been met.
- **Provisional Enforcement Package (PEP):** The pre-agreed set of measures tied to the specific breach tier in Annex 2.
- **Clock Start (T0):** Timestamp when BN is circulated to all GC members.

2. Triggering Sequence

1. **Detection:** MVM confirms evidence that meets the Annex 2 threshold.
2. **Breach Notice (BN) Issued:** Circulated to GC, Ukraine, Russia, and deposited with the Depositary (see §12. International Guarantee and Endorsement of main text).
3. **Clock Starts (T0).**
4. **Auto-Activation Default:** The relevant PEP will **enter into force at T0 + 48h** unless blocked or amended.

3. Decision Rules (No-Deadlock Logic)

3.1 Blocking / Amending a PEP

- Within **48 hours of T0**, any GC member may call for a vote to **block, delay, or amend** the PEP.

- To succeed, that motion needs:

    - **Threshold:** ≥ ⅔ of *all* GC members **and**

    - **Cross-Bloc Condition:** at least one Western **and** one non-Western/Global South member in the majority.

- **If the threshold is not met by T0 + 48h, the PEP enters into force automatically.**

3.2 Fast-Track Provisional Measures (FPM)

- For severe "Tier-A" breaches (Annex 2), MVM may recommend immediate FPM.

- FPM activate at **T0 + 12h** unless **½ + 1 (simple majority)** of GC (cross-bloc still required) vote to pause.

- FPM last max **72h**, after which normal PEP logic applies (T0 + 48h rule or an amended timeline if agreed).

3.3 Silence = Consent

- Failure to register a vote or abstention counts **as consent to the default auto-activation** (not as a blocking vote).

3.4 Tie or Procedural Failure

- If vote counts are ambiguous (e.g., data failure), the Depositary tallies written/email votes.

- If still unresolved by T0 + 48h, default activation stands.

4. Appeals & Review

- **Review Motion:** Within **7 days** of activation, any GC member may seek modification. Needs the same ⅔ cross-bloc threshold to pass.

- **Abuse Safeguard:** If a state is credibly shown to have fabricated evidence to trigger a PEP, the GC can suspend measures (simple majority, cross-bloc) pending an

independent audit.

5. Transparency & Record-Keeping

- All BN, vote tallies, and PEP texts are logged with the Depositary and made public within 24h, unless classified portions are justified.

- Public summaries must state: trigger, evidence basis, vote outcome, and measures activated.

6. Integration with Annex 2 (Breach→Consequence Matrix)

- **Default Activation Time (DAT):** 12h/48h as appropriate.

- **Blocking Threshold:** ½ + 1 (FPM) or ⅔ (PEP).

- **Review Window:** 7 days.

- **Auto-Sunset:** If compliance is restored and verified for X days, measures auto-lift unless GC votes to extend (simple majority, cross-bloc).

7. Algorithmic Flow (Plain Text Pseudocode for Reference)

```
On Breach Notice (T0):
   if Tier == A:
      set DAT = 12h
      set Threshold_block = >50% + cross-bloc
   else:
      set DAT = 48h
      set Threshold_block = ≥2/3 + cross-bloc

   open voting window [T0, T0 + DAT]

   if Vote_passes(Threshold_block):
      apply decision in motion (block/delay/amend PEP)
   else:
      Activate PEP automatically at DAT

Post-activation:
   open Review_window = 7 days
   if Review_vote_passes(≥2/3 + cross-bloc):
      modify/suspend PEP
```

8. Communications Template (For Rapid Deployment)

Subject: BN-[ID] – Auto-Activation Window Running (T0: [timestamp])

- Breach tier: [A/B/C]
- Evidence summary: [≤200 words]
- Default measures (PEP): [bullet list]
- Voting deadline: [timestamp = T0 + 12h/48h]
- How to lodge a motion: [secure link/format]
- Depositary contact & archive location.

9. Fallback Instruments (If UNSC/Depositary Blocked)

If the UN track is obstructed, GC re-issues BN and runs the same mechanism under the standalone treaty framework (or GA-endorsed mechanism) without delay.

10. Plain-Language Explainer (Optional Public Appendix)

“To prevent paralysis, enforcement now kicks in automatically. Guarantors can still stop or tweak it, but they must move fast and act together across blocs. Silence or indecision no longer rewards violators.”

Annex 4 – Quantification Questions & Parameterization Agenda

(Open issues to be co-drafted by all parties for the unified trigger matrix)

---

0. Purpose

To turn qualitative “breach” definitions into measurable, machine-verifiable triggers (distances, counts, sums, timestamps, tech specs). This annex lists **open questions** each working group must answer before Annex 2 (Breach→Consequence Matrix) is finalized.

---

1. Working Method (Template)

For every trigger below, parties should deliver:

1. **Numeric Threshold(s):** exact value(s) or formula.
2. **Time Window:** rolling 24 h / 7 d / 30 d, etc.
3. **Geospatial Frame:** coordinates, buffers, altitude bands.
4. **Verification Stack:** primary data source(s) + cross-checks (e.g., SAR satellite, EO, AIS, ADS-B, ISR drones, OSINT, blockchain ledger).
5. **Tolerance & Error Margin:** acceptable variance before a breach is deemed proven (e.g., ±5%).
6. **Reporting Protocol:** who logs, who signs, how fast it’s circulated.

(Use this as a checklist under each question.)

---

2. Trigger Families & Open Questions

A. Ceasefire Line & Kinetic Activity

1. **Line Proximity:** What exact horizontal distance (meters/km) from the demarcated line counts as a violation for personnel, armor, artillery?

2. **Fire Threshold:** How many kinetic discharges (shells/rockets/mortar rounds) within what time window constitute a Tier-B vs Tier-A breach?

3. **Drone/Loitering Munitions:** Do overflights alone count, or only kinetic impact? Define altitude bands & payload thresholds.

4. **Accidental Fire Clause:** What evidentiary standard separates “accidental” from “systematic” fire?

5. **Demining / Engineering Works:** Are fortification builds within X km a breach? Which activities are exempt for humanitarian safety?

B. Force Movements & Buildups

6. **Heavy Weapons Cap:** Maximum number/tonnage of tanks, MLRS, artillery tubes permitted within Y km of the line?

7. **Rotation vs. Reinforcement:** How to quantify “rotation” (headcount parity over period) vs “new buildup”?

8. **Air Defense Assets:** What deployment/activation threshold (radar on/off, missile tubes armed) triggers concern?

9. **Foreign Troop Presence:** Define “foreign” and the numeric/temporal threshold (person-days, unit size) that triggers review.

C. Air / Missile / Naval Activity

10. **Missile Launch Detection:** Which sensor constellation and confidence score triggers an automatic Tier-A response?

11. **Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS):** Sort by class (nano, tactical, MALE) — what sortie count or flight time equals a breach?

12. **Naval Incursions:** Distance from declared exclusion zones; tonnage/class of vessels; duration of presence.

13. **Airspace Violations:** Vertical altitude and lateral deviation thresholds; transponder off/on status as a factor?

D. Nuclear / CBRN Red Lines

14. **Nuclear Facility Perimeter:** Define radius & prohibited activities (shelling, drone overflight, special forces insertion).

15. **Radiation Spikes:** What μSv/h increase over baseline triggers automatic alarms? Which sensors count?

16. **CBRN Agent Indicators:** Minimum detection thresholds (ppm/ppb) and lab confirmation protocols.

E. Cyber & Information Operations

17. **Critical Infrastructure Cyberattacks:** What constitutes “material impact” (MW lost, hospital systems down > X hrs)?

18. **Disinformation Bursts:** Quantify “state-backed” info ops—volume of coordinated posts, bot % estimate, platform penetration?

19. **Ceasefire Command & Control Hacks:** Downtime threshold (minutes/hours) that elevates a breach tier.

F. Humanitarian Access & Civilian Harm

20. **Aid Convoy Obstruction:** Number of convoys delayed > X hours or % of requested corridors denied per week.

21. **Civilian Casualty Spike:** Cas/100k population or absolute number over Y days triggering emergency review.

22. **POW/Detained Civilians:** Verification of transfers, denial of ICRC visits beyond Z days.

G. Economic / Sanctions & Finance

23. **Sanction Relief Snapback:** What dollar value / % of frozen assets misuse or diversion triggers re-freeze?

24. **Reconstruction Fund Leakage:** Blockchain mismatch ≥ X% or unverified disbursements beyond $Y.

25. **Trade Corridor Disruption:** % drop in BRI / grain corridor tonnage that initiates compensatory measures.

H. Political / Legal Commitments

26. **Treaty Milestone Miss:** What delay (days/weeks) beyond scheduled drafts/votes = Tier-C vs Tier-B breach?

27. **Domestic Legislative Backsliding:** How to score/quantify reversals (e.g., repeal of key clauses, constitutional amendments)?

28. **International Forum Sabotage:** Attendance/vote thresholds in UNSC/GA/OSCE that signal non-cooperation.

I. Verification & Data Integrity

29. **Sensor Integrity:** % data loss or tampering indicators that trigger backup verification route.

30. **Monitor Expulsion:** Number of monitors expelled or access denials over X days triggering automatic penalties.

31. **Chain-of-Custody:** What lapse in digital/physical evidence custody voids a trigger (or downgrades it)?

J. Environmental & Infrastructure Safeguards

32. **Energy Grid Strikes:** MW capacity lost or number of substations hit within a period.

33. **Water/Ecology Damage:** Pollution ppm thresholds, hectares of protected land damaged, satellite-verified fires.

34. **Cultural Heritage Sites:** Damage severity scale (ICOMOS levels) that escalates breach tier.

K. Strategic Communications & Public Signals

- ***Announcement Cadence:*** **Which milestones require joint pressers vs. silent filings?**

- ***Crisis Messaging Windows:*** **Max hours before a breach notice goes public.**

- ***CSO Alert Bands:*** **Thresholds for civil-society advisory boards to issue warnings.**

(journals.sagepub.com, www.inclusivepeace.org)

L. Vote Integrity & Strategic Communications (AICP KPIs)

Purpose. To measure whether status-determination votes are free, fair, and intimidation-proof, and to ensure transparent, timely communication and automatic remedies if standards are breached. This draws on the Venice Commission's Code of Good Practice on Referendums, ODIHR handbooks, and UN-run consultation precedents. (venice.coe.int)

L1. Security & Observation Coverage

- **Indicator:** % of polling sites with accredited UN/International observers and unrestricted access.

- **Trigger:** <95% coverage or any observer expulsion = "Intimidation Indicator" trip.

- **Data Source:** UN/International observers mission logs; observer incident reports.

- **Auto-Remedy:** Activate trusteeship/extra observation surge (see Annex 2 "Auto-Remedy" column).
  This mirrors UNAMET (East Timor, 1999) standards for direct, secret balloting under UN security. (United Nations Peacekeeping)

L2. Participation & Accessibility (Incl. Diaspora/IDPs)

- **Indicator:** % of registered diaspora/IDP voters offered a certified channel (in-person hubs or secure remote).

- **Trigger:** <85% eligible access or >10% verified complaints of access denial.

- **Data Source:** Voter roll audits; IOM/EMB registration stats.

- **Auto-Remedy:** Extend voting window; open additional hubs; digital balloting fallback.
  South Sudan's 2011 referendum used multi-country diaspora polling as precedent. (wikipedia.org)

L3. Intimidation & Integrity Flags

- **Indicator Set:**

    - Polling site closures or militarisation ≥X%

    - Armed actors within Y meters of stations
    - Media blackout/hate-speech spikes vs. benchmarks
    - Turnout suppression ≥Z% without force-majeure
- **Trigger:** Any two yellow flags or one red flag = automatic switch to Continuity Remedies.
- **Data Source:** Observer checklists; media monitoring; turnout variance analysis.
  These thresholds follow Venice Commission quorum/effects guidance and OSCE standards.(venice.coe.int)

L4. Dispute Resolution & Continuity

- **Indicator:** Time to resolve procedural disputes (rolls, wording, quorum) vs. agreed X-day ceiling.
- **Trigger:** Deadline missed → binding three-member arbitration panel convenes.
- **Data Source:** EMB/arbiter docket timestamps; International monitoring mission dispute-resolution logs.
  Western Sahara's stalled voter-list fight and OSCE's dispute-resolution handbook motivate tight clocks. (Security Council Report, AP News)

L5. Communications & Transparency Cadence

- **Indicator:**
    - Breach notices public within ≤X hours of verification
    - Joint pressers at each milestone (roll publication, count certification, audit release)
    - Civil-society advisory board alert threshold (% indicators nearing breach)
- **Trigger:** Missed window → independent CSO board may issue its own alert; next relief tranche pauses until joint briefing occurs.
- **Data Source:** Time-stamped press releases, media monitoring, CSO board logs.

L6. Incentive Ladder ("Snap-Forward/Snapback" Symmetry)

- **Indicator:** % of milestones met on schedule; % of verified cures within grace windows.

- **Trigger:** Verified compliance for X days → automatic release of next relief tranche ("snap-forward"); verified breach → 48-hour auto-penalty ("snapback").

- **Data Source:** Joint Verification Mechanism reports; sanctions/aid disbursement logs. UNSCR 2231's 30-day auto-reimposition model illustrates enforceable automaticity. (UN, iaea.org, FDD)

M. Justice & Accountability Performance (J2 Balanced Two-Track KPIs)

Purpose. Track whether the justice pillar delivers truth, reparations, and credible prosecutions without triggering regime-threat panic or impunity. The design draws on: Colombia's Special Jurisdiction for Peace (restorative "special sanctions" of 5–8 years with liberty restrictions for full confessions), UN/ICRC guidance allowing only **conditional** amnesties (never for war crimes), and the UN–Sierra Leone hybrid court model as a backstop. Auto-reactivation ("snapback") of dormant top-level cases mirrors UNSCR 2231's automaticity logic. (lemonde.fr, ICRC, ohchr.org, rscsl.org, JINSA)

M1. Truth & Confession Completion Rate

- **Indicator:** % of eligible perpetrators who submit full, verified confessions within the agreed window (Tier-1 cases).

- **Trigger:** <X% completion or >Y% "partial/conflicted" submissions → launch targeted outreach + extend window once; second miss → shift cases to Tier-2 track.

- **Data Source:** JVP/SJP docket logs; verification panel reports.

M2. Restorative Sanction Compliance

- **Indicator:** % of restorative sanctions (community work, reparations plans) completed on time and to standard.

- **Trigger:** <Z% compliance or repeated non-fulfilment → convert to custodial/ordinary sanctions per statute.

- **Data Source:** Monitoring body audits; victim council confirmations. Oxford Academic

M3. Tier-2 Prosecution & Backlog Clocks

- **Indicator:** Median days from case filing to indictment/judgment for grave crimes; backlog size vs. quarterly cap.

- **Trigger:** Clock overruns by >N days or backlog >Q cases → automatic request for international technical assistance; if unresolved, **Hybrid Court Backstop** activates.

- **Data Source:** Prosecutor/court registry stats; independent audit. (IHL Databases, Hybrid Justice)

M4. Victim Participation & Reparations Delivery

- **Indicator:** (a) % of cases with documented victim input (impact statements, hearings) (b) % of ordered reparations disbursed/implemented (financial or symbolic).

- **Trigger:** Participation <X% or reparations <Y% → funding tranche pause; Victims' Council empowered to issue public alert.

- **Data Source:** Victims' Council annual report; reparations fund ledgers; independent CSO surveys. (Berghof Foundation)

M5. Amnesty/Leniency Safeguard Compliance

- **Indicator:** % of amnesty/leniency grants vetted for: (i) exclusion of Rome Statute crimes, (ii) victim consent mechanisms, (iii) full-truth condition.

- **Trigger:** Any improper grant → immediate review; repeat → automatic suspension of amnesty window and referral to Hybrid Court.

- **Data Source:** Amnesty review panel decisions; OHCHR/ICRC legal compliance checks.

M6. Snapback / Snap-forward Activation Rate

- **Indicator:** # of times dormant Tier-2 cases re-activate after new grave breaches; # of relief tranches released after verified compliance streaks.

- **Trigger:** Breach verified → 48-hour auto-reactivation ("snapback"); compliance for X days → auto-release next relief tranche ("snap-forward").

- **Data Source:** Joint Verification Mechanism (JVM) breach logs; sanctions/aid disbursement records.

N. Security Guarantee Performance (Layered Symmetric Compact KPIs)

Purpose. Track whether the guarantees clause actually fires on time, delivers resources, and stays symmetric (snap-forward/back), while neutrality limits are honored only so long as Russia complies. Grounded in the Kyiv Security Compact's call for *positive, binding guarantees*, the G7 Vilnius declaration and ensuing bilateral deals, Austria's neutrality model ("no foreign bases"),

NATO's Article 4 consultation norm, UNSCR 2231's automatic snapback logic, and classic research on credible third-party guarantees.(president.gov.ua, consilium.europa.eu, Reuters, history.state.gov, nato.int, JINSA, Pestuge, adambrown.info, Lieber Institute West Point hks.harvard.edu)

N1. Consultation Clock (24h / 72h)

- **Indicator:** Hours from verified attack/coercion to (a) Joint Response Council (JRC) meeting and (b) activation of pre-listed measures.
- **Trigger:** JRC not convened ≤24 h or package not triggered ≤72 h → breach.
- **Data Source:** JRC timestamped minutes; JVM incident log.
- **Auto-Remedy:** "Uniting for Peace" GA route + substitute guarantor steps in. nato.intlegal.un.org

N2. Auto-Measure Vote Compliance

- **Indicator:** % of crises where super-majority rule is respected and auto-measures proceed without unlawful blocks.
- **Trigger:** Any single guarantor blocks without threshold → snapback Tier 1 + re-vote in 72 h.
- **Data Source:** JRC vote records.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Default package activates if re-vote fails, mirroring UNSCR 2231 automaticity

N3. Domestic Implementation Laws

- **Indicator:** #/% of guarantors that pass required domestic legislation within **X** days.
- **Trigger:** Missed deadline → suspension of that state's guarantor status; liability shifts to willing substitute.
- **Data Source:** National gazettes; UN treaty registry.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Replacement guarantor invited; escrow fund covers gap.

N4. Aid/Defense Tranche Timeliness

- **Indicator:** % of scheduled military/financial tranches delivered ≤**N** days of due date.
- **Trigger:** Delay beyond **N** days → pause on corresponding Russian relief; interest penalty accrues.
- **Data Source:** Disbursement logs; JVM delivery audits.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Escrow release or third-party delivery; arrears must be repaid before snap-forward resumes.

N5. Neutrality / Non-Stationing Compliance

- **Indicator:** Presence of permanent foreign *combat* bases or nuclear weapons on Ukrainian soil during the neutrality term.
- **Trigger:** Verified presence without RU breach → relief pause + review. If RU breach confirmed, clause suspends automatically.
- **Data Source:** IAEA/UN mission reports; base status registry.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Close/withdraw or formally suspend neutrality clause.

N6. Training & Transfers Freedom

- **Indicator:** #/% of planned training missions/defense transfers executed without unlawful "neutrality" objections.
- **Trigger:** Restriction without legal basis → arbitration in **Y** days; losing party compensates delay.
- **Data Source:** Delivery manifests; arbitration awards.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Compensation + immediate release; reciprocal snapback if not cured.

N7. Snap-Forward / Snapback Event Rate

- **Indicator:** Count of automatic penalty activations vs. automatic relief releases; average cure time.
- **Trigger:** Repeated (>2/year) missed automatic actions → process audit mandated.

- **Data Source:** JVM breach logs; sanctions/relief registry.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Procedural reform plan; automation tooling installed.

N8. Credible Guarantor Engagement

- **Indicator:** % of guarantors meeting all KPI thresholds quarterly; % showing "costly signals" (e.g., long-term funding laws, pre-positioned aid).
- **Trigger:** <**T%** compliant guarantors two quarters running → invite additional states / redistribute shares.
- **Data Source:** Quarterly JVM scorecard; parliamentary records.
- **Auto-Remedy:** Expansion or reweighting of guarantor pool to keep commitments credible.

---

3. Deliverable Format (Per Trigger)

- **Trigger ID:** (e.g., A-2 "Fire Threshold")
- **Proposed Metric(s):** [value/formula]
- **Window:** [hrs/days]
- **Verification Sources:** [primary/secondary]
- **Tolerance:** [± % or absolute]
- **Escalation Tier:** [A/B/C]
- **Drafting Lead(s):** [Org/State]
- **Deadline:** [Date]

---

4. Timeline & Ownership

- **Week 1:** Assign leads per cluster (A–J).
- **Week 2–3:** Circulate first numeric proposals; run red-team stress test.
- **Week 4:** Consolidate into Annex 2 table and cross-link to DPARP (deadlock protocol).
- **Month 2:** Field-test with historic data (simulate 3 breach scenarios).

---

5. Plain-Language Addendum (Exemple of Public Version)

“To make this deal real, everyone must agree on numbers: how close is ‘too close’, how many shells are ‘too many’, how big a cyberattack is ‘serious’. This annex lists the questions we still need to answer together—precisely, transparently, and with data everyone trusts.”

Annex 5 – NNCS – Neutrality & Non-Deployment Clarification Schedule

Purpose. Define, in black-and-white, what Ukraine’s neutrality *prohibits*, what it *permits*, and what is *conditional/notifiable*, linking each item to verification and snapback rules.

1. Prohibited (absolute)

- **Foreign combat bases or permanent troop garrisons** on Ukrainian soil.
- **Nuclear weapons, delivery systems, or related storage/maintenance facilities.**
- **Offensive long-range strike systems (>X km) supplied/operated by foreign forces** unless explicitly reclassified by GC consensus.
- **Hosting alliance command nodes that integrate Ukraine into collective war-fighting planning.**

2. Permitted (unrestricted)

- **Defensive arms transfers, training, and maintenance** conducted on a rotational/short-stay basis (no permanent footprint).

- **Intelligence sharing for defensive purposes** (e.g., air-defense cueing).

- **Joint humanitarian, demining, disaster-response centers** and non-lethal support hubs.

- **EU (or other economic) integration steps** not constituting a military alliance.

3. Conditional / Notifiable

- **Short-term foreign training missions (>30 days) or exercises inside Ukraine** → advance notice to the Joint Verification Commission (JVC), limits on personnel/equipment, published end-date.

- **Deployment of air/missile defense systems run by foreign crews** → allowed only under time-bound emergency protocols and logged with guarantors.

- **Pre-positioning of spare parts or munitions** → capped by quantity/type; inventories filed to the JVC.

- **Cyber/intel facilities** → must be purely defensive; audits available to guarantors.

4. Reciprocal Restraints (Russia & neighbors)

- **No deployment of specified offensive systems within X km of Ukraine's borders.**

- **No stationing of nuclear assets in Belarus/Crimea oriented at Ukraine.**

- **Notification & inspection rights** mirror Ukraine's obligations.

5. Verification & Breach Linkage

- **Data sources:** satellite/SAR, ADS-B, AIS, ISR drones, on-site inspections.

- **Incident protocol:** suspected breach → MVM log → Annex 2 snapback timer.

- **Tolerance bands:** e.g., ≤200 visiting troops = training; >200 for >30 days = breach tier upgrade (to be quantified later).

6. Legal Hooks

- Incorporated by reference into §4 of the Framework Agreement.
- Breach pathways map to Annex 2 rows; nuclear/foreign-base breaches are Tier-A.