

# The Public-Claims Vendor Scorecard

Score any Wikipedia provider — including us — on seven publicly checkable claims. No one can guarantee a community-reviewed outcome, so evaluate what vendors state openly, not what they privately promise.

## THE INSTRUMENT

### Seven categories, scored Green / Amber / Red from public claims only

Open three vendor websites and proposals, write G / A / R in a column for each. You are not accusing anyone of anything — you are recording what they chose to say in public. Amber = the vendor is vague; ask more.

#	CATEGORY	GREEN — GOOD SIGN	RED — WALK AWAY	V1	V2	V3
1	<b>Pricing transparency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Publishes real figures or quotes them on first contact; explains what moves price (sources, edition, complexity, maintenance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Refuses any figure until you commit; or a flat price independent of notability and sources</li> </ul>			
2	<b>COI &amp; paid disclosure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Describes the real WP:PAID workflow: declares the client, works via talk pages / Articles for Creation, discloses on-wiki</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Silent on disclosure; or offers to keep the paid relationship hidden or "handle it discreetly"</li> </ul>			
3	<b>Notability-first process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Step one is a written notability and source assessment; willing to say "not yet" and decline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Skips notability; sells a page to anyone; "you're a real company" treated as sufficient</li> </ul>			
4	<b>Post-publication monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Defines monitoring scope, response times and reporting; prices it transparently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No mention of what happens after publication; set and forget</li> </ul>			
5	<b>No-guarantee / honest risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● States plainly that approval and survival are not guaranteed; explains community review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● "100% approval", "guaranteed", "never deleted", "we know the admins"</li> </ul>			
6	<b>Author credentials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Named editors and authors with verifiable profiles; accountable leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anonymous team; stock-photo "experts"; no accountable name anywhere</li> </ul>			
7	<b>Policy citations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cites WP:N, WP:NCORP, WP:COI, WP:PAID and the Terms of Use, with links</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Misstates policy; claims rules that do not exist; or cites nothing</li> </ul>			

## THE GATE RULE

A single Red in **row 2 (disclosure)** or **row 5 (guarantees)** ends the evaluation, regardless of the rest — those two map directly to the Wikimedia Terms of Use and to how Wikipedia is governed. Among vendors that clear the gate, prefer the most Greens in rows 1, 3 and 4: price honesty, notability-first and real maintenance are where your five-year cost and risk actually live.

## QUICK SCREEN

## Red-flag checklist — run it on any website in five minutes

### HARD FAILS — any one = walk away

- Guarantees approval, or that the page “will never be deleted”
- Claims a special relationship with, or influence over, Wikipedia editors or admins
- Offers to keep the paid relationship hidden, “discreet”, or undisclosed
- Says it can bypass notability, or get “anyone” a page
- Promises to suppress negative coverage, plant sources, or pay journalists
- Talks about aged accounts, votes, or multiple accounts to win discussions

### CAUTION FLAGS — each one = ask hard questions

- No figure of any kind until you commit
- No written notability assessment in the proposal
- No mention of paid-editing disclosure steps
- No defined post-publication monitoring or SLA
- Anonymous team; no named, accountable person
- Cites “Wikipedia rules” but links to no actual policy
- Flat price regardless of your sources or notability

A vendor that clears the hard fails with one or two caution flags you are comfortable interrogating is a credible candidate.

**Hold us to the same card.** Our public claims — pricing, disclosure workflow, notability-first process, 90-day monitoring, 80% refund clause — are on [wikibusiness.net](https://wikibusiness.net). The full method, with the RFP question set: [wikibusiness.net/blog/best-wikipedia-page-creation-service](https://wikibusiness.net/blog/best-wikipedia-page-creation-service)