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	**Pricing transparency**	• Publishes real figures or quotes them on first contact; explains what moves price (sources, edition, complexity, maintenance)	• Refuses any figure until you commit; or a flat price independent of notability and sources			
2	**COI & paid disclosure**	• Describes the real WP:PAID workflow: declares the client, works via talk pages / Articles for Creation, discloses on-wiki	• Silent on disclosure; or offers to keep the paid relationship hidden or "handle it discreetly"			
3	**Notability-first process**	• Step one is a written notability and source assessment; willing to say "not yet" and decline	• Skips notability; sells a page to anyone; "you're a real company" treated as sufficient			
4	**Post-publication monitoring**	• Defines monitoring scope, response times and reporting; prices it transparently	• No mention of what happens after publication; set and forget			
5	**No-guarantee / honest risk**	• States plainly that approval and survival are not guaranteed; explains community review	• "100% approval", "guaranteed", "never deleted", "we know the admins"			
6	**Author credentials**	• Named editors and authors with verifiable profiles; accountable leadership	• Anonymous team; stock-photo "experts"; no accountable name anywhere			
7	**Policy citations**	• Cites WP:N, WP:NCORP, WP:COI, WP:PAID and the Terms of Use, with links	• Misstates policy; claims rules that do not exist; or cites nothing			

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 **wikibusines.net**. The full method, with the RFP question set: **wikibusines.net/blog/best-wikipedia-page-creation-service**

 © 2026 WikiBusines · CC BY-ND — free to share unmodified, for personal use