This document was translated from English by machine and may contain mistakes. The English original is at https://www.novaracg.com/2026/09/26/100-slat-governance-review-signapse-vendor-responses-and-commitments-september-2026/.

Signapse : sur la feuille de route, pas encore livré

Heather Grizzle · September 26, 2026

Revue de l'IA de langue des signes Signapse : ce que révèlent ses documents de gouvernance, sept engagements datés, comment ses réponses ont évolué, et ce que les acheteurs devraient exiger.

Sommaire

1. Pourquoi ce dossier existe
2. Ce qui existe aujourd'hui
3. Engagements et échéances
4. Comment les réponses ont évolué
5. Évaluation
6. Questions fréquemment posées
7. Sources

26 septembre 2026 · Heather M. Grizzle, Novara Consulting Group

EN BREF

Signapse publie des politiques de gouvernance de l'IA plus solides que la plupart des fournisseurs d'IA de langue des signes, a répondu aux sept questions de NCG, a retiré un chiffre de précision de 95 % non étayé et s'est engagée sur sept corrections datées. Les contrats, registres et divulgations qui rendraient ces politiques opposables ne sont pas encore publics, aussi les acheteurs devraient-ils exiger contractuellement ces documents plutôt que de se fier à une correspondance.

Pourquoi ce dossier existe

En août 2026, Novara Consulting Group a demandé publiquement à Signapse comment elle définit les limites d'usage approprié pour l'IA de langue des signes, en particulier dans les contextes éducatifs impliquant des enfants Deaf. La directrice générale Sally Chalk a approuvé le principe et est allée plus loin. Elle a ajouté les tribunaux, les commissariats de police, les hôpitaux, les services sociaux et les réunions de protection de l'enfance à la liste, et a soutenu qu'à mesure que les enjeux augmentent et que le temps de préparation diminue, un service devrait impliquer davantage de supervision humaine et moins d'IA, voire aucune. C'est la position qu'un acheteur espère entendre d'un fournisseur. Ce dossier pose la question qui en découle : les documents qui sous-tendent l'entreprise confirment-ils cette position ?

Sur le papier, Signapse part d'une position plus solide que la plupart du marché. Son cadre de gouvernance de l'IA publié comprend une politique d'utilisation qui répartit le travail secteur par secteur entre ce qu'un humain doit faire et ce que l'IA peut faire. Lorsque des décisions affectent la santé, la liberté, les droits légaux ou la protection, la politique exige un interprète ou traducteur qualifié et indique que, dans la plupart des cas, Signapse recommandera une autre entreprise. La protection est réservée aux humains, sans exception. Le cadre nomme un Deaf Advisory Board et un Deaf Impact Officer, et énumère les organisations Deaf que l'entreprise consulte, notamment RAD, la BDA et Action Deafness. Peu de fournisseurs d'IA de langue des signes publient quelque chose de comparable. Un cadre, cependant, énonce la façon dont une entreprise entend se comporter. Un acheteur a également besoin des instruments qui rendent ce comportement opposable. Il s'agit notamment des accords avec les personnes Deaf dont la langue des signes et les retours façonnent le produit, des règles régissant les administrateurs qui dirigent également des organisations partenaires, et d'une politique de confidentialité traitant de la vidéo signée, de l'image et des données d'entraînement. L'acheteur a également besoin d'une source publiée pour chaque chiffre de performance cité par l'entreprise. C'est cet écart entre l'intention affichée et le document contraignant que NCG a visé dans ses questions.

NCG reviewed Signapse′s AI Governance Framework, Terms of Service, privacy policy and ASL product page, and put seven questions to the company. Before publishing, NCG sent Signapse its understanding of the answers and invited corrections. Ms Chalk replied on 17 September 2026 and twice on 24 September 2026, the second time with what she described as Signapse′s final comments on the evaluation. Si-

gnapse answered all seven questions. It conceded several gaps in writing, withdrew an accuracy figure it could not source, and attached dates to the fixes it proposed. Its first reply on 24 September changed three of the answers it had given a week earlier. When NCG asked which account was accurate, the company clarified all three the same day. Its final answers largely returned to what it had said on 17 September.

Ce mouvement n'est pas un point négatif pour Signapse, et ce dossier ne le présente pas comme tel. Il montre pourquoi un acheteur ne devrait pas fonder une décision d'achat sur une correspondance. Les lettres sont privées, elles peuvent être révisées, et elles sont écrites à l'intention d'un consultant plutôt qu'à celle de l'institution qui portera le risque d'un déploiement. Un organisme public achetant de l'IA de langue des signes pour un usage auprès de personnes Deaf a besoin de documents qu'il peut lire, citer et opposer à un fournisseur. Ce dossier expose donc ce qui existe aujourd'hui, ce que l'entreprise s'est engagée à changer et d'ici quand, et comment ses réponses ont évolué d'une lettre à l'autre. Chaque déclaration est attribuée à la date à laquelle elle a été faite. Les réponses ne sont citées textuellement que lorsque la formulation exacte importe. Lorsque NCG a vérifié une page web publique, la date de consultation est indiquée.

Signapse est l'un des nombreux fournisseurs d'IA de langue des signes que NCG examine selon la même méthode, exposée dans le cadre du SLAT Index (https://www.slatindex.org/framework/).

Ce qui existe aujourd'hui

Cette section consigne la situation telle qu'elle se présente, document par document. Pour chaque élément, elle expose ce que montre le dossier public, ce que Signapse en a dit et à quelle date, et pourquoi ce point importe pour une institution qui décide d'acheter ou non.

Terms of Service. Deaf feedback is not incidental to Signapse's product. It is how the product gets corrected. The company's Translation Quality Assurance Policy describes monthly user-group meetings in which Deaf participants review generated translations, and it lists consultation with Deaf organisations among its external checks. The terms that govern that feedback therefore matter. The published Terms of Service (https://www.signapse.ai/terms-of-service), last updated 1 October 2023 and unchanged as retrieved on 24 and 26 September 2026, provide that anyone who directly sends Signapse "any question, comment, suggestion, idea, feedback, or other informa-

tion about the Services" assigns all intellectual property in it to the company, which may then use it "without acknowledgment or compensation." A separate provision waives moral rights in the same material. Read against the company's own Ethos, which says captured signing must respect "fair recompense and transparent terms," the clause sits badly. Signapse has given three accounts of it. On 17 September it described the clause as standard boilerplate drafted for commercial customers that "does not reflect how we work with Deaf community contributors," and said paid participants were not yet on a separate written agreement. On 24 September it said the Terms apply only to paying customers, that feedback sessions run off-platform, and that contributors never create accounts or accept the Terms, so the clause has never applied to them. Its final letter the same day said the customer Terms are unaffected by the October work, which instead creates a standard written agreement for feedback session participants. NCG offers no view on whether the clause could bind someone who never accepted the Terms. The point for a buyer is narrower. On the company's own account, what governs Deaf contributors today is not a published document but a series of individual emails, and the agreement meant to replace them does not yet exist.

Contributor compensation. Signapse reports two arrangements. Signers whose own likeness appears in a product are covered by its Reward and Remuneration Policy, which pays 1% of the monthly value of each contract or licence using their image, quarterly in arrears, for the full contract term, split equally where more than one signer appears. Feedback session participants receive $25 per session for attendance, regardless of the content of their feedback. The royalty is the stronger of the two. It ties a signer's income to the commercial life of their likeness, and few providers in this market disclose any comparable arrangement. The company's Use Policy also commits that where recorded human signers are used, "informed consent and appropriate compensation must apply." The difficulty lies in the paperwork rather than the principle. Signapse states there is no standalone contributor contract: the $25 payment is agreed by email with each participant, that correspondence is the written record, and payments are recorded in its payment records. It says this has been the practice since the sessions began. Those records are private and NCG has not seen them. A buyer who wants to confirm either arrangement will need to ask for the policy and the records directly.

Conflicts of interest. Mark Wheatley is a Signapse director and chief executive of RAD, one of the partners named in Signapse's governance framework. Craig Crowley was a

Signapse director from August 2022 to March 2024 while leading Action Deafness, another named partner, and is not a current director. The relationships matter because of where those organisations sit in Signapse's own quality process. Its Translation Quality Assurance Policy lists consultation with RAD and Action Deafness under external review. A buyer reading that list would reasonably assume the organisations are independent of the company they are reviewing. For RAD, that assumption holds only if the connection is disclosed and managed. Signapse states that Article 30 of its Articles of Association has governed director conflicts since 2024, requiring declaration and allowing the board to set conditions or exclude a director from discussion and voting, and that Mr Wheatley's RAD role has been declared under it. A conflicts provision in company articles is not a conflicts register. Signapse confirmed on 17 September that it does not maintain one, and that neither relationship is disclosed in its Quality Assurance Policy.

Deaf Advisory Board escalation. Signapse's Use Policy gives its Deaf Advisory Board oversight of "community impact and cultural/linguistic accuracy." An advisory body is only as strong as its route to the people who decide. Mr Wheatley also sits on the Deaf Advisory Board, and the investment board he joins holds veto authority. On 17 September Signapse acknowledged that this route "depends on one individual holding both seats" with no documented rule behind it. On 24 September it added that matters have been escalated from the Advisory Board to the board on several occasions, as recorded in board minutes. Both statements can be true: escalation has happened, and no written rule yet guarantees it. If Mr Wheatley left either seat, nothing on paper would carry the Advisory Board's concerns upward.

The 95% figure. Asked for the basis of a 95% figure in its materials, Signapse could not locate a source and withdrew it, stating it would be replaced by a figure supported by Deaf user feedback sessions and evaluations. Signapse confirmed on 24 September that this description is accurate. Withdrawing the figure was the right call, and the company made it without argument. Other performance language remains. The ASL page as retrieved on 26 September says both ASL digital signers deliver translations with "an industry-leading level of comprehension," a comparative claim with no stated source or method. The accuracy figures in the Quality Assurance Policy, 60, 80 and 98 percent, are stated as roadmap targets rather than measured results. Until a source, method and denominator are published, a buyer should treat any performance figure from the company as unverified.

Jay and Max. Jay and Max, Signapse's ASL digital signers, are synthetic likenesses: the face on screen is not the face of the person whose signing underlies them, so they fall outside the Reward and Remuneration Policy. The design has a logic of its own. The Use Policy says AI-generated output "must not imply endorsement, identity, or authorship by any individual signer," and a synthetic face keeps any one person's identity off the screen. It does not remove the people behind the signing; it moves the question of their consent and payment out of public view. Signapse states that more than one Deaf signer contributed to Jay and Max, including Certified Deaf Interpreters, under private arrangements that include equity and payment. No individual is named here.

Public pages as retrieved on 26 September 2026. Signapse reported on 24 September that its ASL page update is complete. The ASL page (https://www.signapse.ai/asl) as retrieved by NCG on 24 and again on 26 September introduces Jay and Max as "AI ASL Digital Signers," says they use "photo-realism" and credits "Deaf-led development," but does not state that they are synthetic likenesses or how the people behind them are compensated. The only statement about synthesis is a sitewide footer disclaimer, "Not all videos are synthetic videos," which does not say which videos are. The unfilled template placeholder previously found in the privacy policy (https://www.signapse.ai/privacy-policy) no longer appears. The current policy, version 2.0, now lists photographs, videos and audio recordings as identity data and disabilities as health data, but still says nothing about model training, digital likeness or biometric data.

Engagements et échéances

Signapse has committed to seven changes. Taken together, they would close most of the gaps described above: a conflicts register, a written escalation route for the Deaf Advisory Board, a written agreement for the Deaf people who give feedback, a public disclosure about Jay and Max, a US compliance mapping and a privacy policy that addresses signed video and training data. The list moved between the company's two responses. Two dates came earlier, two became less specific, one item was reported complete, and one dropped out of the final account without comment. On 24 September the company described all of them as "internal plans which may change." That caveat is fair, and it is also the reason this record exists. A plan described in a letter binds no one. The table sets out each commitment with both stated dates, so a buyer can see what was promised, when, and how the promise changed.



Engagements et échéances déclarés par Signapse

Engagement	Déclaré le 17 sept.	Déclaré le 24 sept.
Registre des conflits couvrant les administrateurs et les membres du conseil consultatif, revu annuellement	Octobre 2026	Octobre 2026
Charte du Deaf Advisory Board accordant au président un droit permanent d'escalade vers le conseil d'investissement sans passer par la directrice générale	Soumis au conseil d'investissement pour approbation, décembre 2026	Octobre 2026
Conditions d'utilisation : remplacer la cession des retours par une licence limitée, supprimer la renonciation aux droits moraux, faire passer les contributeurs à un accord de participation	Décembre 2026	Accord écrit standard pour les participants aux séances de retour, octobre 2026 ; conditions applicables aux clients non affectées
La page ASL doit décrire les images de synthèse et la manière dont les contributeurs sont rémunérés	Décembre 2026 ou T1 2027	Achevé
Cartographie de conformité américaine : ADA, articles 504 et 508, règles d'accessibilité des marchés publics des États, lois des États sur la biométrie et l'image, FERPA, COPPA	T1 2027	2027
Réécriture de la politique de confidentialité couvrant la vidéo, les données biométriques et de mouvement, l'image numérique et la	T1 2027	2027

Engagement	Déclaré le 17 sept.	Déclaré le 24 sept.
provenance des données d’entraî-nement		
Annoter la politique d’assurance qualité avec les relations avec RAD et Action Deafness	Aucune date	Non mentionné

Source : Correspondance de Sally Chalk, 17 et 24 septembre 2026

Three of the commitments fall due in October, and they are the ones that bear most directly on governance. The conflicts register is the only item whose date held steady across both letters. It would turn Article 30 from a private rule into a record a buyer can inspect, and it would put Mr Wheatley's two roles on paper, along with any future overlap like them. The Advisory Board charter moved two months earlier and would replace an escalation route that depends on one person holding two seats with a written right that survives changes in membership. The participant agreement also moved earlier, but it shrank on the way. On 17 September Signapse proposed to change the Terms themselves, removing both the assignment and the waiver. By the final letter the Terms were staying as they are, and the commitment had become a separate agreement for feedback session participants. That is still a real improvement on arrangements made email by email, but the feedback clause remains in the published Terms. When these documents appear, a buyer should check three things: that the register names each relationship and how it is managed, that the charter gives the chair the right to escalate in terms and carries the investment board's approval, and that the participant agreement grants a licence rather than ownership, leaves contributors' moral rights intact and states what they are paid.

The ASL page is a different case. In a single week Signapse moved it from a target of December 2026 or early 2027 to complete, which would be the fastest progress on the list if the page showed it. As retrieved on 24 and 26 September, it does not. It is the one item where the company's account and the public record disagree, and NCG records it as open until they match.

The two largest items went the other way, each slipping from a named quarter to an unspecified year. Both matter more than their place at the bottom of the table sug-

gests. A school district, university or state agency will need to know how the ASL product handles Section 508, student records under FERPA, children's data under COPPA and state law on biometric and likeness data before it can sign, so a US buyer should write the compliance mapping into the contract as a deliverable rather than wait for it. The privacy rewrite would give the governance framework the data layer it currently lacks. Version 2.0 of the policy has moved a little, dropping the template placeholder and listing videos as identity data, but it still says nothing about training, likeness or biometric data.

Puis il y a l'engagement qui a disparu. L'annotation de la Politique d'assurance qualité avec les relations RAD et Action Deafness n'avait pas de date le 17 septembre et n'apparaissait plus du tout le 24 septembre. C'est la correction la moins coûteuse de la liste, une divulgation ajoutée à une politique que Signapse publie déjà, et celle qui touche le plus directement à la question d'indépendance soulevée plus haut. Son absence pourrait être un oubli. NCG la considère comme en suspens.

NCG ne considérera chaque élément comme rempli que lorsque le document lui-même sera publié ou fourni. Octobre en sera le premier test.

Comment les réponses ont évolué

A week passed between Signapse's first reply and its second, and the second came back firmer. Several points the company had conceded on 17 September were described on 24 September as settled practice. Three answers no longer matched. A buyer who received only one of those letters would have come away with a different picture of the company depending on which one it was. Rather than choose between them, NCG put the differences back to Signapse and asked which account was accurate. The company answered within the hour. Its final answers are consistent with what it said on 17 September, and they show that the first 24 September letter had overstated two of them.

The first concerned paperwork. On 17 September, Signapse wrote that paid participants "are not currently on a separate written agreement." A week later, the $25 payment "is agreed in writing with each contributor." The distance between those sentences is small in words and large in procurement terms, because the second sounds like a contract. Asked to reconcile them, Signapse said there is no standalone contract. The agreement is made by email with each participant, and that email is the written record. In a narrow sense an email is writing. It is not, however, a standard agreement

with terms a buyer could read and compare, and the company's own October commitment to create one concedes the difference.

The second was a contradiction inside a single letter. The first 24 September letter said the Terms of Service had never applied to feedback participants, and then listed an October update to "Terms of Service for feedback sessions." Both could not be true. Signapse's answer was that the earlier reference should have been described as a standard written agreement for participants, replacing email-by-email arrangements, and that the customer Terms are unaffected. The clarification resolves the contradiction. It also confirms what the commitments table shows: the Terms themselves are not changing.

The third turned out to be less a conflict than an incomplete first answer. On 17 September, the signing behind Jay and Max came from "a real Deaf ASL signer," and the data creators held share options. The first 24 September letter named Certified Deaf Interpreters who receive payment and equity. The two accounts seemed to describe different people. Signapse's final answer was that both are accurate, because more than one Deaf signer contributed, including Certified Deaf Interpreters, under private arrangements that include equity and payment. Nothing here was overstated. The singular version is simpler to tell, but the plural one is the accurate account, and it is the one a buyer should rely on. Because the arrangements are private, neither version can be checked from outside the company, and NCG names no one.

Chacun de ces points a été réglé de la manière dont la correspondance règle les choses, par une autre lettre. Une différence ne peut pas être réglée ainsi. Signapse rapporte que la mise à jour de la page ASL est terminée, mais la page que NCG a consultée les 24 et 26 septembre ne comporte pas la divulgation décrite. N'importe qui peut le vérifier en ouvrant la page, et NCG considérera l'élément comme rempli lorsque la page la comportera.

Évaluation

This record began with a position Sally Chalk stated in public: that as the stakes rise and preparation time falls, a service should involve more human oversight and less AI, or none at all. The question was whether Signapse's documents hold that position up. The answer is that they state it well and do not yet secure it.

Cette déclaration est réelle, et par endroits elle va plus loin que le reste du marché. La Politique d'utilisation classe le travail secteur par secteur, réserve les questions de protection aux humains sans exception, et indique aux clients que pour les travaux touchant à la santé, à la liberté ou aux droits juridiques, l'entreprise les orientera dans la plupart des cas vers un autre prestataire. Signapse mérite également des éloges pour la manière dont elle s'est engagée. Elle a répondu aux sept questions, a nommé ses propres faiblesses en termes clairs le 17 septembre, a retiré un chiffre qu'elle ne pouvait pas étayer, et a assorti ses corrections de dates.

La première lettre du 24 septembre a affaibli ce dossier en présentant plusieurs concessions comme une pratique établie. Mise sous pression, l'entreprise est revenue sur deux d'entre elles pour retrouver, en moins d'une heure, son récit du 17 septembre, ce qui joue en sa faveur. L'épisode n'en reste pas moins significatif. Lorsque Signapse s'est décrite une seconde fois, la description a dérivé vers la version la plus favorable, et seule une question directe l'a ramenée à sa position initiale. C'est un argument pour ancrer tout achat dans les documents plutôt que dans le dernier récit qui en est fait.

The documents are where the gap lies. Almost every protection that matters to the Deaf people behind the product currently sits out of public view. Contributor terms live in individual emails. Conflicts are managed under a provision of the company's articles and recorded in board minutes a buyer has not seen. The Advisory Board's route to the investment board depends on one person holding two seats. Article 30, the board minutes, the contributor emails and the payment records are all private or unpublished, and correspondence is not evidence a buyer can rely on. On today's evidence, Signapse's governance is a credible plan rather than a system anyone outside the company can verify.

That leaves a buyer with two practical steps. The first is to take the company at its published word where its word is strongest. An institution considering sign language AI for a courtroom, a hospital or a child protection meeting, the settings Ms Chalk herself named, already has Signapse's own Use Policy telling it to use a qualified human instead. That is a genuine strength. Few vendors put the limits of their own product in writing, and a buyer should hold Signapse to them. The second is to treat everything else as the company's account until the documents exist in public or are supplied under contract, and to ask for the following:



- The standard written agreement for feedback session participants once adopted, and the date it came into use.
- The conflicts register once adopted, and the text of Article 30.
- The adopted Deaf Advisory Board charter, with the date of board approval.
- Written confirmation, in the contract or the participant agreement, that the feedback clause in the customer Terms of Service does not apply to feedback session participants or other Deaf contributors.
- The Reward and Remuneration Policy, and confirmation of how feedback session payments are recorded.
- The public ASL disclosure describing Jay and Max and how the people behind them are compensated.
- For US deployments, the compliance mapping, written into the contract as a deliverable.
- The source, method and denominator for any replacement accuracy figure.

NCG mettra à jour ce dossier à mesure que chaque engagement arrivera à échéance.

Questions fréquemment posées

+ Qu'est-ce que Signapse ?

Signapse est une entreprise britannique qui produit de la traduction en langue des signes générée par IA, en langue des signes britannique et en langue des signes américaine (ASL). Ses produits comprennent SignStudio, SignStream, des plugins de site web et des API.

+ L'IA de langue des signes de Signapse devrait-elle être utilisée dans les tribunaux, les hôpitaux ou les contextes de protection de l'enfance ?

La propre Politique d'utilisation de Signapse indique qu'un interprète ou traducteur qualifié est requis lorsque des décisions concernent la santé, la liberté, les droits juridiques ou la protection, et que dans la plupart de ces cas, l'entreprise recommandera un autre prestataire. Le travail de protection est réservé aux humains sans exception.

+ Signapse rémunère-t-elle les signeurs Deaf derrière ses produits ?

Signapse indique que les signeurs dont la propre ressemblance apparaît dans un produit reçoivent 1 % de la valeur mensuelle de chaque contrat utilisant leur image, payé trimestriellement, et que les participants aux séances de retour d'expérience reçoivent 25 $ par séance. Les registres de paiement sont privés et NCG ne les a pas vus.

+ Jay et Max, les signeurs numériques ASL de Signapse, sont-ils de vraies personnes ?

Non. Jay et Max sont des ressemblances synthétiques. Signapse indique que plus d'un signeur Deaf y a contribué, y compris des interprètes Deaf certifiés, dans le cadre d'arrangements privés incluant des parts et une rémunération. Tel que consulté le 26 septembre 2026, la page du produit ASL n'indiquait pas qu'il s'agit de personnages synthétiques.

+ À quels changements Signapse s'est-elle engagée ?

Sept éléments : un registre des conflits d'intérêts, une charte du Comité consultatif Deaf et un accord écrit pour les participants aux retours d'expérience, tous prévus pour octobre 2026 ; une divulgation publique ASL qu'elle rapporte comme achevée ; une cartographie de conformité pour les États-Unis et une refonte de la politique de confidentialité, toutes deux prévues pour 2027 ; et une annotation non datée de sa Politique d'assurance qualité. Signapse décrit ces éléments comme des plans internes susceptibles d'évoluer.

+ Que devrait demander une équipe d'achats à Signapse ?

Les documents plutôt que la correspondance : l'accord des participants, le registre des conflits d'intérêts et l'Article 30, la charte adoptée du Comité consultatif, une confirmation écrite que la clause sur le retour d'expérience ne s'applique pas aux contributeurs Deaf, la Politique de récompense et de rémunération, la divulgation

publique ASL, une cartographie de conformité pour les déploiements aux États-Unis, et la source, la méthode et le dénominateur de tout chiffre de précision.

+ **Qu'est-ce que le SLAT Index ?**

Le SLAT (Sign Language Access Trust) Index est le cadre que Novara Consulting Group utilise pour évaluer les fournisseurs d'IA de langue des signes. Sa méthode est publiée à l'adresse https://www.slatindex.org/framework/.

Sources

- Correspondence from Sally Chalk, Chief Executive, Signapse, to NCG, 17 September 2026 and 24 September 2026 (two letters).
- Signapse Terms of Service (https://www.signapse.ai/terms-of-service), last updated 1 October 2023, retrieved 24 and 26 September 2026.
- Signapse ASL page (https://www.signapse.ai/asl), retrieved 24 and 26 September 2026.
- Signapse Privacy and Cookies Policy (version 2.0) (https://www.signapse.ai/privacy-policy), retrieved 24 and 26 September 2026.

TIPS

Know something about a sign language AI system that the public should know? Send it to tips@novaracg.com. Every tip is read by me and kept confidential. If you work in the UK, writing to us is not by itself a protected disclosure under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, so before you share employer information, check your options with Protect (protect-advice.org.uk), the free whistleblowing advice line.

Comment citer

Grizzle, H. M. (2026, September 26). Signapse : sur la feuille de route, pas encore livré. Novara Consulting Group. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23003714