



Australian Government

data
standards
body

DSB Regulatory Data Standards Development Framework

September 2026



Contents

1. Foreword	1
2. Executive summary	2
3. Role of Regulatory Standards.....	2
4. Foundations for Regulatory Data Standards	3
A) Characteristic Foundations	3
B) Strategic Foundations	4
5. Standards Development Lifecycle	5
5.1 Observe	7
5.2 Assess.....	7
5.3 Discover.....	8
5.4 Validate	8
5.5 Decide	8
5.6 Release	9
5.7 Support.....	9
6. Engagement and Evidence.....	9
6.1 Evidence Sources.....	10
6.2 Cost-benefit and Impact Assessment.....	10
7. Change pathways and Proportionality.....	11
8. Release and Implementation	11
9. Transparency and publication.....	12
10. Continuous Improvement.....	13

1. Foreword

Australia's consumer data right (CDR) and digital identity (Digital ID) systems are vital pathways of our digital economy. Together, by enabling Australians to safely share their data and digitally verify who they are, they empower engagement with our data ecosystem in a way which encourages innovation, promotes inclusion, and supports confidence in our digital lives.

Regulatory data standards are an essential foundation of CDR and Digital ID, supporting the laws and rules by setting out how key elements of the systems are implemented. The Data Standards Body (DSB) has been involved in their development since 2018. Now, as CDR matures and Digital ID progresses, is a good time to set out a framework to support the efficiency and effectiveness of the way standards are made and changed.



The regulatory data standards development framework set out in this document is the result of the extensive industry feedback received on reforms proposed to these processes including through the recently completed consultation. There is much detail in the pages which follow, but key elements can be summarised as providing clarity in the purpose, scope, process, and timing of changes to standards:

- *Purpose - Why changes are made.* Changes to standards should take into account the function and context of the data standards within CDR and Digital ID, particularly their alignment with policy intent and strategic outcomes. They should support the broader direction articulated for each system.
- *Scope - What changes are made.* Changes to standards should allow for the role and nature of the data standards, namely that they are binding regulatory standards and that their coverage is set out in the laws and rules governing each system. Consequently, evidence and analysis of costs and benefits are fundamental.
- *Process - How changes are made.* Changes to standards should be transparent, inclusive, and accessible for the broader range of participants, users and stakeholders now engaged with the CDR and Digital ID systems, not all of whom have a technical background. The process should be iterative, flexible, and responsive to the proportionality of the changes considered.
- *Timing - When changes are made.* Changes to standards should be predictable and aligned to consider the planning and delivery cycles of participants who need to implement them. The framework should ensure that changes are deliverable as a practical matter and timings are realistic.

Going forward, this framework should further enable connection with, and encourage participation in, our CDR and Digital ID systems by providing greater certainty, consistency, and assurance of a proportionate regulatory burden. The clarity intended by this framework should also facilitate coordination, prioritisation of issues, engagement with the ecosystem, and the use of evidence and analysis in making standards changes. In doing so, the framework is intended to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of regulatory data standards in meeting the requirements of the CDR and Digital ID systems. However, this framework does not mark the end of our journey. We need to make it work to encourage the development of a sustainable and stable foundation for Australian consumers and businesses to engage with and safely benefit from their data as a valuable resource.

I am very grateful to the many people who contributed their expertise and experience to the development of this framework, including the participants and stakeholders engaged in the consultation process and the officers of the Data Standards Body. The enthusiasm of those invested in CDR and Digital ID has been inspiring. With continued collaboration across the ecosystem, these fundamental digital economy systems should be in very good hands.



Dr Scott Farrell

2. Executive summary

The Data Standards Body (DSB) develops, maintains and supports regulatory data standards (the standards) for the Consumer Data Right (CDR) and Digital ID programs. This DSB Regulatory Data Standards Development Framework (the Framework) establishes the DSB's approach to standards development and describes the principles, lifecycle, stakeholder engagement approach, evidence requirements and release practices used to develop, maintain and improve standards.

The Framework is intended to provide a clear and enduring reference point for how the DSB identifies issues, assesses the need for standards intervention, develops options, consults on proposed changes, supports formal decision-making, publishes standards and monitors implementation outcomes. The DSB will apply a structured standards development lifecycle that is transparent in its operation, proportionate to the scale and impact of the issue, and focused on practical implementation across the ecosystem.

The Framework applies to new standards, amendments to existing standards, standards maintenance and continuous improvement activities. It supports both the identification and development of standards changes and the publication, implementation support and monitoring activities that follow a standards release.

The Framework takes effect from August 2026 and reflects reforms developed following the 2026 public consultation on regulatory data standards development.

3. Role of Regulatory Standards

Standards form part of a broader regulatory architecture of the CDR and Digital ID programs. They operate alongside legislation, rules, guidance, regulatory activity, policy settings, operational processes and communications. Within this architecture, standards translate legislative and policy requirements into technical requirements that can be implemented consistently across participating organisations and systems. They provide technical specificity where that specificity is required to give practical effect to policy and regulatory objectives, including in areas such as security, interoperability, data structure and the operation of data-sharing processes.

Standards development therefore occurs within a broader program and regulatory context and is informed by legislative requirements, policy direction, program objectives, operational experience and ecosystem needs. The DSB works with the agencies responsible for policy development, regulation and program administration to ensure standards remain aligned with that wider context. The DSB does not treat standards change as the default response to every ecosystem issue. Standards are one of several mechanisms available to government to achieve policy objectives. In some circumstances, the more appropriate response may be guidance, operational support, regulatory action, policy consideration, rules change or another government activity.

Standards development is driven by a clearly defined problem or opportunity rather than a predetermined technical solution. Before progressing, a standards change, the DSB assesses the nature of the problem, its likely causes, its impact on the ecosystem, the outcomes being sought and whether standards intervention is the most appropriate and proportionate response. Potential interventions are assessed against policy objectives, regulatory settings and broader ecosystem impacts, with standards changes pursued only where they are the most appropriate mechanism to achieve the intended outcome. Standards changes are intended to address systemic issues, regulatory requirements or broader ecosystem needs, rather than isolated implementation preferences or issues affecting a limited number of participants. Alternative approaches are also considered to ensure issues are addressed in the most effective, efficient and proportionate manner.

This approach helps maintain an appropriate distinction between policy, regulation and standards while ensuring those elements work together coherently. It also supports stability by avoiding unnecessary standards changes, while retaining the capacity to update standards where changes are required to respond to policy direction, legislative requirements, emerging risks, operational experience or evolving ecosystem needs.

4. Foundations for Regulatory Data Standards

The DSB uses standards foundations to guide the purpose, scope and design of standards. The foundations are applied as practical tools within standards development, not merely as high-level principles. They support consistent assessment of proposed changes, help identify trade-offs and provide discipline in determining whether a standards change should proceed.

The foundations are not organised in a hierarchy. Their application requires judgement and consideration of context. In some cases, foundations may require trade-offs. For example, a desire for harmonisation with existing standards may need to be balanced against implementation efficiency or program-specific requirements.

The foundations apply to future standards development and to the ongoing assessment of existing standards. They support targeted and incremental improvement over time, rather than implying a comprehensive redesign of current standards.

A) Characteristic Foundations

Characteristic foundations define what ‘good’ standards are, articulating their core characteristics and inherent qualities. These foundations are intended to be high level and have applicability across both CDR and Digital ID standards. The foundations include:

Characteristic Foundation	Description
Harmonisation	The standards should align and set consistent expectations with whole-of-government, industry, and international standards, where possible and appropriate. This includes considerations of potential trade-offs (i.e. dis-harmonisation) across related policy and regulatory settings which may have competing objectives.
Efficiency	The standards should minimise complexity and cost in proportion to impact, support timely and pragmatic outcomes, and enable efficient implementation and use.
Technology Neutrality	The standards should promote flexibility by remaining technology agnostic as a default, specifying technologies only where neutrality would not adequately meet a clearly defined requirement or risk.
Clarity	The standards should set clear, unambiguous requirements that support consistent interpretation, implementation, application and enforceability, including explicit signalling where flexibility is allowed.
Enforceability and Auditability	The standards should set requirements that support independent assessment, verification, testing, accountability and assurance.

B) Strategic Foundations

The strategic foundations are intended to provide clarity of the content and coverage of the standards, made under CDR and Digital ID legislative frameworks. The standards are currently limited to specific technical, security, user and privacy-related matters prescribed by the CDR and Digital ID Rules. While the topics covered in each set of standards is broadly consistent, the content and policy emphasis on certain outcomes differs across each program.

Strategic Foundation	CDR	Digital ID	Overarching Description
User control	The standards should ensure consumers can provide voluntary, informed and express consent for the collection, use and disclosure of their data.	The standards should ensure individuals can provide informed consent, and can withdraw their consent for the collection, use and disclosure of personal information.	The standards should ensure individuals are able to provide informed, voluntary and express consent, and to effectively manage permissions for the collection, use and disclosure, of their data in an accessible and transparent manner.
User experience	The standards should require clear, intuitive, and accessible communication, ensuring consumers can easily understand and engage with CDR processes.	The standards should define simple, consistent user interactions to promote usability and accessibility of Digital ID services.	The standards should require clear, consistent and accessible interactions, supported by intuitive communication to ensure consumers can easily understand, engage and navigate within systems.
Privacy	The standards should set minimum requirements for protecting the privacy of consumer data to be disclosed, including controls that limit disclosure to authorised parties and for explicit uses.	The standards should define minimum requirements to limit the collection, use and disclosure of personal information.	The standards should set minimum requirements for the secure and proportionate disclosure of data, including protections for data confidentiality, restrictions on use to explicit purposes and mechanisms to support minimal and privacy-preserving disclosure.
Security	The standards for security requirements should be the minimum necessary to ensure secure data disclosure and transit.	The standards should define minimum-security requirements to protect personal information used in Digital ID service.	The standards should set minimum requirements to protect data, identify information and credentials, ensuring secure handling and transmission.
Data	The standards should define uniform data schemas and data quality requirements, sufficient to supporting consistent	The standards should define common identity data and data quality requirements to support	The standards should define uniform data schemas and data quality requirements, supporting structured data, broad

Strategic Foundation	CDR	Digital ID	Overarching Description
	interpretation by diverse service providers.	consistent and reliable Digital ID services.	reuse and consistent interpretation by diverse service providers.
System performance	The standards should ensure system performance, capacity and reliability are aligned to program objectives and discoverable.	The standards should ensure the integrity and correct behaviour of identity systems and data across the identity lifecycle.	The standards should support reliable, well-functioning systems across their lifecycle, ensuring integrity, correct behaviour, and sufficient performance and capacity in line with program objectives and operational transparency.
Interoperability	The standards should set minimum interoperability requirements to facilitate communication between participant systems.	The standards should define minimum technical interoperability requirements to enable reliable identity verification using common protocols and data structures.	The standards should establish minimum interoperability requirements, including common protocols, to enable communication between participants.

5. Standards Development Lifecycle

The DSB develops and maintains standards through a continuous standards development and delivery lifecycle. The lifecycle provides a structured and repeatable process for progressing an identified issue or opportunity from initial observation and problem assessment through solution design, validation, decision-making, release, implementation support and ongoing monitoring. It establishes a common approach across standards development activities and provides stakeholders with greater visibility of how issues are examined, how proposed changes are developed and how approved changes are introduced into the ecosystem.

The lifecycle supports standards development by ensuring that work begins with an understanding of the problem or opportunity. It creates defined points at which the DSB considers the relevant policy and legislative context, available evidence, stakeholder perspectives, technical feasibility, implementation impacts, costs, benefits and risks. This helps ensure that proposed standards changes are supported by a clear rationale, align with policy intent and can be implemented in practice.

The DSB coordinates the development and maintenance of standards, activities across the lifecycle may involve collaboration with policy agencies, regulators, program administrators, technical specialists, regulated entities, service providers, consumer and user representatives, and other affected stakeholders.

The lifecycle (set out below) consists of seven phases. However, it is iterative rather than strictly linear. Issues may move between phases as the evidence base develops, stakeholder perspectives are tested, options are refined or implementation considerations become clearer. For example, engagement during the Discover or Validate phases may identify a need to revisit the problem definition, gather further evidence, modify the proposed technical approach or reconsider the appropriate intervention. The scale and formality of activities may vary depending on the potential impact, risk and complexity of the issue or proposed change.

Progression through the lifecycle is informed by the standards development principles and foundations set out in this Framework. These provide a consistent basis for assessing problems, evaluating options and considering trade-offs. Evidence and engagement are incorporated throughout the lifecycle rather than confined to a single phase. This enables the DSB to progressively develop its understanding of an issue, test assumptions, assess practical impacts and maintain alignment between the proposed technical response and the intended policy or regulatory outcome.

The lifecycle continues beyond the formal making and publication of a standard. Release and implementation support are integral parts of standards development, as they help participants understand and prepare for approved changes. Monitoring implementation and operation provides evidence about whether a standard is working as intended and whether further guidance, support or standards development may be required. These insights feed back into the beginning of the lifecycle, creating a continuous process of observation, learning and targeted improvement.

The standards development and delivery lifecycle framework consists of seven phases: observe, assess, discover, decide, release, and support. They are set out in the following diagram and considered in turn below.



Phase	Purpose	Typical outputs
Observe	Identify emerging issues, implementation challenges, risks or opportunities from ecosystem signals.	Signals, observations and evidence inputs.
Assess	Determine whether an issue warrants further action and whether a standards pathway may be appropriate.	Problem statement, issue assessment and evidence to inform analysis.
Discover	Explore solution options and develop evidence to support the preferred approach.	Options analysis, solution direction and design materials.
Validate	Test proposed changes through consultation and structured stakeholder engagement.	Consultation package, submissions analysis, initial impact assessment and refined proposal.
Decide	Support formal consideration of proposed standards changes by the relevant decision-maker.	Decision package and decision outcome.
Release	Publish approved standards changes and supporting release materials.	Formal standards release, release notes and implementation information.
Support	Support implementation, monitor operation and capture insights for future improvement.	Guidance, support interactions and monitoring insights.

The typical outputs outlined in the table above may be either internal documentation or publications that are shared externally. Information on publications that are produced throughout the process is outlined in Section 8 of this paper.

5.1 Observe

The Observe phase identifies signals about how standards and the broader ecosystem are operating. Signals may arise from implementation experience, support interactions, stakeholder feedback, operational information, regulator observations, policy or legislative developments, and broader market or technology trends.

Activities may include:

- Monitoring implementation outcomes and behaviour.
- Capturing feedback from participants and stakeholders.
- Reviewing support queries, incidents and recurring implementation issues.
- Considering regulatory, policy, legislative and program developments.
- Identifying patterns that may indicate systemic issues or opportunities for improvement.

The Observe phase does not determine itself that a standards change is required. It captures evidence and identifies matters that may require further assessment.

5.2 Assess

The Assess phase determines whether an observed signal represents a sufficiently defined and material problem or opportunity that warrants further action. This phase strengthens the problem definition and ensures the DSB understands the underlying root causes, scale and potential impacts of an issue before standards development proceeds.

Activities may include:

- Defining the problem and desired outcome.
- Assessing the scale, severity and ecosystem impact of the issue.

- Considering alignment with policy objectives, legislative boundaries and program priorities.
- Undertaking root cause analysis where appropriate.
- Considering whether standards change, guidance, operational support, regulatory action or another pathway is most appropriate.

Issues progress beyond Assess where there is a clearly articulated problem, sufficient evidence of impact and a reasonable basis to explore standards-based or related solutions.

5.3 Discover

The Discover phase develops and evaluates possible responses to the identified issue. Where standards intervention is likely to be appropriate, the DSB undertakes technical exploration and considers implementation impacts.

Activities may include:

- Developing solution options and assessing trade-offs against the standards foundations.
- Considering technical design, implementation feasibility, policy alignment and regulatory implications.
- Assessing costs, expected benefits, risks, dependencies and the cost of inaction.
- Engaging with stakeholders to test assumptions, understand implementation impacts and refine options.

Discovery may identify a preferred approach, establish that further investigation is required, return the matter to Assess or conclude that standards intervention should not proceed.

5.4 Validate

The Validate phase tests the proposed response with affected stakeholders. It confirms whether the approach is likely to achieve the intended outcome, can be implemented in practice and avoids unintended consequences.

Formal public consultation will generally be the primary validation mechanism for substantive standards changes. Validation may also include targeted engagement, technical workshops, testing, implementation exercises and follow-up discussions.

The DSB considers stakeholder feedback alongside technical, operational, policy and regulatory evidence. Consultation is not treated as a numerical vote. Feedback is assessed according to its relevance, supporting evidence and relationship to the intended outcome.

Validation may confirm the proposal, result in refinement, identify a need for further discovery or assessment, or demonstrate that the proposal should not proceed.

5.5 Decide

The Decide phase supports formal consideration of whether a proposed standards change should proceed. Decision materials bring together the problem definition, evidence, options analysis, consultation outcomes, impact assessment, implementation considerations and recommended approach.

The Data Standards Chair makes or amends regulatory data standards within the authority provided by the relevant legislative framework. The DSB supports this function by preparing standards artefacts, undertaking analysis and providing advice informed by the lifecycle process.

A decision may approve the proposal, approve it with modifications, request further work, defer the matter or determine that it should not proceed.

5.6 Release

The Release phase publishes approved regulatory data standards changes and communicates the information stakeholders need to prepare for implementation.

Activities may include:

- Finalising and publishing updated standards.
- Publishing release notes, change logs and decision materials.
- Confirming commencement dates and implementation periods.
- Communicating transition, versioning or compatibility arrangements.
- Providing explanatory and implementation support materials.
- Briefing affected stakeholders and implementation communities.

Release activities are proportionate to the nature and impact of the change. Publication marks the formal release of a change, but the lifecycle continues through implementation support and monitoring.

5.7 Support

The Support phase focuses on implementation assistance and monitoring. Support activities may involve DSB working with relevant policy, regulatory and program agencies, to assist participants and other stakeholders to understand and implement standards changes, while capturing insights about how the standards operate in practice.

- Responding to implementation queries and support interactions.
- Providing clarifications or supporting materials where appropriate.
- Monitoring implementation outcomes and operational experience.
- Identifying issues that may require future guidance, support, regulatory consideration or standards improvement.

Insights from the Support phase feed back into Observe, ensuring the lifecycle operates as a continuous improvement loop.

6. Engagement and Evidence

Engagement and evidence are embedded throughout the standards lifecycle. Engagement provides a mechanism for stakeholders to share operational experience, test problem definitions, provide technical and implementation input, comment on proposed changes and support readiness for implementation.

The DSB applies an engagement approach that is purpose-driven, proportionate, inclusive, transparent and evidence-informed. The form of engagement depends on the lifecycle phase, the stakeholders affected and the nature of the issue under consideration.

Phase	Purpose of engagement	Typical stakeholders
Observe	Gathers ecosystem insights about emerging issues and implementation experience.	Participants, regulators, industry bodies, policy teams and other relevant stakeholders.
Assess	Tests the scale and impact of identified issues and supports problem definition.	Participants, regulators, policy teams and affected stakeholder groups.
Discover	Provides detailed input to support design of potential standards changes.	Technical implementers, participants, policy teams, vendors and subject matter experts.
Validate	Seeks structured feedback on proposed changes and implementation impacts.	Full ecosystem through formal consultation and supporting engagement.
Release	Supports readiness and understanding of standards changes.	Participants, implementers, vendors and affected stakeholder groups.
Support	Captures feedback from implementation and operational experience.	Participants, regulators and support channels.

6.1 Evidence Sources

Evidence informs each phase of the standards development lifecycle. The DSB uses qualitative and quantitative evidence to identify and define problems, assess their causes and impacts, develop and compare options, support decision-making and monitor implementation outcomes.

The evidence base is developed progressively and proportionately. The nature and depth of evidence required will depend on the lifecycle phase and the complexity, impact, risk and uncertainty associated with the issue or proposed change. Evidence may include:

- Stakeholder feedback gathered through engagement, workshops, technical discussions, formal consultation and support interactions.
- Implementation experience, including recurring queries, incidents and operational observations.
- Information from onboarding, testing, technical analysis and conformance activity.
- Regulator observations, monitoring information and policy, legislative or program insights.
- Evidence about costs, benefits, risks, dependencies, implementation feasibility and cumulative burden.
- Research, ecosystem reviews, user and service journey analysis, and relevant industry or international practices.
- Monitoring and support information about how released standards operate in practice.

Evidence may vary in availability, quality and certainty. Quantitative information is used where it is available and reliable, while qualitative evidence may provide important insight into implementation experience, stakeholder impacts and matters that cannot readily be quantified. Where evidence is incomplete, the DSB identifies relevant assumptions, limitations and uncertainties.

6.2 Cost-benefit and Impact Assessment

Cost-benefit analysis is integrated into the standards development lifecycle and is undertaken progressively through the Assess and Discover phases, with the nature and depth of analysis developing as the problem is better understood, evidence becomes available and potential solutions are identified. Cost-benefit analysis

supports decision-making and transparency. It is not intended to operate as a rigid or prescriptive barrier to necessary change. The level of analysis should be proportionate to the significance, complexity and risk of the issue or proposed standards change.

During the Assess phase, analysis supports the definition of the problem or opportunity, consideration of its scale and significance, and an initial assessment of the impacts of action and inaction. During the Discover phase, analysis is refined to compare potential responses, test assumptions and examine the likely costs, benefits, risks and implementation implications of proposed standards changes.

Cost-benefit analysis is intended to improve the quality and transparency of decision-making. It does not operate as a rigid methodology or a prescriptive threshold that a proposed change must satisfy before it can progress. The DSB considers financial and non-financial impacts, incremental costs directly attributable to proposed changes, the cost of inaction, ecosystem-wide impacts, distributional impacts, uncertainty in available data and cumulative implementation burden.

The outcomes of cost-benefit and impact assessment inform, but do not replace, judgement. Analysis is considered alongside legislative and policy requirements, the standards foundations, stakeholder feedback, technical feasibility, implementation readiness and broader ecosystem considerations. Together, these elements provide a transparent basis for determining whether a standards change should proceed, which option should be preferred and how the change should be implemented.

7. Change pathways and Proportionality

The DSB applies proportionality to determine how standards issues and proposed changes progress. Not all issues require the same level of analysis, consultation, governance or implementation planning. The pathway should reflect the nature of the issue and the potential impact of the response.

The DSB considers the impact, risk, complexity, urgency, level of uncertainty, implementation effort and policy alignment of a change when determining the appropriate pathway. Proportionality supports disciplined decision-making and timely standards development. It allows the DSB to apply more detailed analysis and engagement where the impact is substantial or uncertain, while enabling streamlined treatment of lower-impact, well-understood or non-breaking changes where appropriate.

- Higher-impact or complex changes generally require deeper analysis, broader engagement, formal consultation and detailed implementation planning.
- Lower-impact changes may be progressed through streamlined pathways where there is no material participant uplift or where the change clarifies existing intent.
- Urgent issues, including security, legislative or operational issues, may require out-of-cycle treatment where justified by risk and context.
- Some issues may be addressed through guidance, support or referral to policy or regulatory processes rather than standards change.

8. Release and Implementation

The DSB seeks to balance predictable release planning with the need to remain responsive to urgent, emerging or lower-impact issues. Release practices are intended to provide participants with greater forward visibility, support implementation planning and reduce unnecessary regulatory burden.

For CDR standards, approved standards changes are generally incorporated into planned releases. The release model supports up to two scheduled releases each year, with April and October release windows. Decision

documents may be published when approved, while changes are incorporated into scheduled standards releases where appropriate.

Implementation planning is linked to assessed change impact and practical delivery considerations. For CDR changes, indicative implementation periods are 12 months for low-impact changes, 18 months for moderate-impact changes and 24 months for substantial or complex changes. These timeframes may be adapted where the context, impact or implementation requirements justify a different approach.

Change impact	Indicative implementation period	Typical characteristics
Low impact	12 months	Small or isolated updates requiring minimal implementation effort.
Moderate impact	18 months	Coordinated system updates across multiple components or business areas, without major redesign.
Substantial or complex	24 months	Major uplift, integration redesign or introduction of new operational or data handling capability.

Implementation planning considers participant diversity, sector-specific constraints, vendor dependencies, testing and transition requirements, cumulative burden and ecosystem readiness. This supports realistic implementation expectations and reduces the risk of poorly coordinated or overlapping change.

Digital ID data standards operate under separate legislative and publication arrangements. The lifecycle principles in this Framework apply across DSB standards development, while release and implementation practices may differ to reflect the legislative context, program maturity and requirements of each system.

9. Transparency and publication

Transparency is supported through lifecycle artefacts, publication points and communications. The DSB publishes information to help stakeholders understand the rationale for change, the stage of development, consultation opportunities, decision outcomes and implementation expectations.

Lifecycle stage	Publication	Purpose
Assess	Problem definition or equivalent issue assessment material.	Explains the problem, rationale, drivers and basis for progressing further work.
Validate	Consultation package.	Sets out proposed standards changes, supporting explanatory material, consultation questions and impact considerations.
Decide	Decision document or equivalent decision material.	Confirms approved changes and provides visibility of rationale, timing and implementation expectations.
Release	Published standards and release artefacts.	Provides updated standards, release notes, change logs and related implementation information.

The DSB uses multiple communication channels to support awareness and accessibility. Formal consultations are intended to be accessible to a broad range of stakeholders, including non-technical stakeholders, while technical channels and targeted engagement may continue to support detailed implementation and design discussions.

The DSB also seeks to improve forward visibility of standards activities through lifecycle communications and publication of relevant artefacts. This enables stakeholders to plan engagement, allocate resources and prepare for implementation more effectively.

10. Continuous Improvement

The standards development lifecycle operates as a continuous improvement loop. Implementation experience, support activity, stakeholder feedback, regulatory insights and ecosystem monitoring inform future standards development and maintenance activities.

The DSB will continue to review and refine both this framework and the standards development processes it describes. Standards artefacts, engagement approaches, evidence practices, release arrangements and lifecycle processes may be updated over time to reflect implementation experience, stakeholder feedback, regulatory insights and evolving ecosystem needs. This ensures regulatory data standards remain effective, practical, aligned with policy objectives and responsive to the evolving needs of the CDR and Digital ID ecosystems.