# AOS - GIL v2 comparison and reconciliation

Document: aos-gil-v2-comparison-and-reconciliation-v0-1 · Source revision or record: v0.3

AOS Specifications v1.0 · Edition dated 3 November 2026

Original architecture and specifications: Mark Sweeny, Governance Intelligence. © 2026 Mark Sweeny.

AOS-authored material is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Preserve third-party credits. Referenced external works remain subject to their own terms.

Canonical collection: https://www.governanceintelligence.co.uk/aos

Publication copy with editorial notices, public references and disclosure edits where applicable.

Version: 0.3
Date: 7 October 2026
Status: completed source comparison; Q01/Q02 approved by Mark on 7 October 2026 and recorded as DEC-090/091 in AOS-00/Map v0.26. AOS-20-25/30 functional drafting, 38-disposition allocation and author consistency closure are complete. Operational setup, exact compatibility and assurance remain separate later gates.

## 1. Conclusion and scope

GIL v2 contains a useful foundation for AOS-21 organisation knowledge and corpus stewardship and AOS-23 artefact assessment and monitoring. Its organisation context, sourced assessment criteria, document relationships, evidence-linked findings and explicit blind spots should be reused. It is not a complete specification for the present GI function: synthesis, presentation, oversight, human authority and common kernel controls now have distinct owners.

The material inconsistencies are resolvable using decisions already agreed. GI is the interpretive element of the 1+5 architecture, not a sixth peer sensing domain or an autonomous adjudicator. Its local database, agent and review assumptions must yield to common authority, evidence, data-use, execution, reporting and recovery mechanisms. Protected boardroom deliberation must remain excluded without excluding permitted preparation material and approved human post-meeting records. An assessment of documents must not be presented as proof that governance works in practice.

This is a functional architecture comparison. Database design, endpoints, vendor choices, deployment, numerical settings and executable schemas are later implementation work. The report identifies their disposition without developing replacements. The original GIL document is preserved as historical source material, rather than silently rewritten.

## 2. Sources and authority

**Table row 1**
Source: GIL Technical Specification V2
Baseline used: v2.0, May 2026; V0.1/GIL_Technical_Specification_V2.docx
Role in this comparison: Legacy material being reconciled; all nine sections reviewed

**Table row 2**
Source: Foundational Principles
Baseline used: v4; controlled source documents
Role in this comparison: Foundational constraints

**Table row 3**
Source: AOS Reasoning Principles
Baseline used: v6; controlled source documents
Role in this comparison: Current reasoning, Mode 1/Mode 2, delegation and sensing constraints; supersedes GIL's RP v4 checklist

**Table row 4**
Source: Governance Intelligence Tests
Baseline used: controlled source document
Role in this comparison: Observable technical contribution versus human governance judgement; no self-certification

**Table row 5**
Source: AOS-00 and Specification Map
Baseline used: v0.25; DEC-001-089
Role in this comparison: Current architecture, allocations and agreed decisions

**Table row 6**
Source: AOS-01-05
Baseline used: v0.8
Role in this comparison: Common authority, shared records, data use, agents and platform controls

**Table row 7**
Source: AOS-14 / AOS-20 / AOS-30
Baseline used: v0.4 / v0.3 / v0.3
Role in this comparison: Boundary exchange, GI charter and accountable human workflows

**Table row 8**
Source: Shared / Core / Exchange Register
Baseline used: v0.9 / v0.6 / v0.8
Role in this comparison: Common semantic obligations and component exchanges

**Table row 9**
Source: Control Coordination / Protected Reporting and Recovery
Baseline used: v0.2 / v0.1
Role in this comparison: Material change, execution limits, protected findings and recovery

**Table row 10**
Source: Component template
Baseline used: v0.4
Role in this comparison: Functional specification structure, including own external-research remit

**Table row 11**
Source: GI Material Review and Design Questions
Baseline used: content v0.2, 6 October
Role in this comparison: Seven approved directions, recorded as DEC-079-085

Current architecture and controlled principles govern the reconciliation. GIL's claim to be a self-contained coding brief does not override later decisions. Its references to legal or regulatory standards are source claims requiring currency, jurisdiction and applicability checks when admitted into the corpus; this comparison does not verify those standards or certify compliance.

## 3. Component allocation

**Table row 1**
Destination: AOS-21
Material to develop: Scoped organisation profiles; constitutional, operational and external corpus; artefact catalogue and relationships;

source provenance, currency and supersession; human stewardship; approved precedent and its correction/withdrawal

**Table row 2**
Destination: AOS-23
Material to develop: Ingestion and classification; applicability; document questions and assessment criteria; evidence-linked findings and uncertainty; review states; artefact/source change monitoring and reporting-cycle assessment

**Table row 3**
Destination: AOS-22
Material to develop: Cross-domain synthesis, conflicting evidence, interpretations and options, including infeasible alternatives and their constraints

**Table row 4**
Destination: AOS-24
Material to develop: Faithful presentation of canonical analysis, supporting evidence, limitations, disagreements and approved status

**Table row 5**
Destination: AOS-25
Material to develop: Drift, overrides, blind spots, emergent effects and independent oversight; ordinary evaluation without reopening deferred self-calibration

**Table row 6**
Destination: AOS-30
Material to develop: Human review, accepted duties, decisions, action/outcome feedback and post-meeting approval

**Table row 7**
Destination: AOS-01-05 / AOS-14
Material to develop: Common governing controls, records and permitted external retrieval/exchange; components reference these rather than create competing mechanisms

The allocation is a drafting map, not a claim that the remaining components are already specified.

## 4. Traceable disposition of GIL material

Retain means preserve the business concept in the allocated specification. Revise means preserve its purpose while changing the governing assumption. Retire means remove the stated rule from the current functional baseline. Defer means preserve an implementation candidate without making it a functional requirement. GIL has no comprehensive numbered requirement register; section and table/concept references below provide the source trace.

**Table row 1**
ID: GIL-C01
GIL source and concept: §1, internal organisation-owned GI
Disposition and current direction: Retain organisational ownership and accountability. Do not restore commercial customer/subscription assumptions. Ownership alone does not resolve supplier or corpus licensing.
Destination / governing reference: 20/21; FP v4

**Table row 2**
ID: GIL-C02
GIL source and concept: §1, sixth domain and conscience that adjudicates
Disposition and current direction: Revise to 1+5: GI prepares and interprets; empowered humans adjudicate. GI does not own kernel authority or govern every other component by itself.
Destination / governing reference: 20/22/30; DEC-005

**Table row 3**
ID: GIL-C03

GIL source and concept: §1.1, four operational layers
Disposition and current direction: Retain as useful decomposition of organisation knowledge, assessment and monitoring; extend with current corpus/precedent, synthesis, presentation and oversight responsibilities.
Destination / governing reference: 21-25; Map

**Table row 4**
ID: GIL-C04
GIL source and concept: §§1.1/2.2/8, 121 artefact types
Disposition and current direction: Retain an extensible sourced catalogue. The specification does not supply the full 121-item inventory or its knowledge content; do not claim that seed content has been reviewed or that this number defines complete coverage.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23/25

**Table row 5**
ID: GIL-C05
GIL source and concept: §1.2, not a board portal or compliance certificate
Disposition and current direction: Retain. Analysis may ingest permitted documents and deliver through approved channels; it need not replace the portal. Findings are evidence-qualified analytical conclusions, not automatic legal or governance certification.
Destination / governing reference: 23/24/30; GT

**Table row 6**
ID: GIL-C06
GIL source and concept: §§1.2/2.6/6.2/7.2, boardroom exclusion
Disposition and current direction: Revise blanket exclusion of agendas, minutes and action logs. Exclude protected live/deliberative capture; admit purpose-permitted preparation artefacts and human post-meeting accounts with their actual approval state. A false default flag is not evidence of permitted content.
Destination / governing reference: 03/23/30; DEC-008/087-089

**Table row 7**
ID: GIL-C07
GIL source and concept: §§1.2/3.3, no external contact or API calls; external monitoring elsewhere
Disposition and current direction: Resolve the internal conflict: authorised source retrieval uses Boundary exchange. Outward representations or commitments require applicable human authority. No local agent bypass or blanket API prohibition.
Destination / governing reference: 01/03/04/14; DEC-086

**Table row 8**
ID: GIL-C08
GIL source and concept: §§1.3/6.2/6.3, UDL events and review before recording
Disposition and current direction: Retain canonical recording; revise blanket human review before any UDL write. Provisional material is recorded/accessed with status and restrictions; formal validated reliance requires review. Urgent protected escalation need not wait for ordinary validation.
Destination / governing reference: 02/20/30; DEC-084

**Table row 9**
ID: GIL-C09
GIL source and concept: §1.3, every Mode 1 process traced to an assessed artefact
Disposition and current direction: Revise: valid governing instruments, powers and applied controls establish authority. Artefact assessment supplies evidence and can expose gaps; it neither creates authority nor replaces current-checkpoint control.
Destination / governing reference: 01/04/20/23

**Table row 10**
ID: GIL-C10
GIL source and concept: §§1.4/6.3, continuing monitoring and periodic review/reporting
Disposition and current direction: Retain both ongoing awareness and human review cycles. Monitoring does not eliminate contextual human reassessment. Cadence and reporting scope belong to governed profiles, not universal quarterly defaults.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23/25/30

**Table row 11**
ID: GIL-C11

GIL source and concept: §§1.5/2/5, technology, UUID tables, REST endpoints, named model and hosting
Disposition and current direction: Defer physical design, vendor/model and integration choices. Preserve privacy, residency and security needs as governed requirements/profiles; do not adopt legacy technical settings automatically.
Destination / governing reference: 03/05; implementation

**Table row 12**
ID: GIL-C12
GIL source and concept: §2.1, singleton organisation and annual-report-derived profile
Disposition and current direction: Retain contextual profiles; revise to sourced, versioned and scoped knowledge with human confirmation. Annual reports are one source, not sole truth until next year. Subsidiary scope is approved under Q01/DEC-090 below.
Destination / governing reference: 21; evidence contract

**Table row 13**
ID: GIL-C13
GIL source and concept: §2.1, false/empty defaults for contextual attributes
Disposition and current direction: Retire assumptions that unknown means false or absent. Distinguish unknown, unverified, disputed, restricted and refuted; retain source, assurance and applicability.
Destination / governing reference: 02/21/23; DEC-045-048/062-066

**Table row 14**
ID: GIL-C14
GIL source and concept: §2.2, frameworks, questions, quality criteria and relationships
Disposition and current direction: Retain sourced, effective-dated, jurisdiction/applicability-aware knowledge. Separate legal references, analytical standards and governing powers; a liability flag cannot establish a legal conclusion.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23; 01/02

**Table row 15**
ID: GIL-C15
GIL source and concept: §§2.2/5/6.5, administrator/Company Secretary writes and ARC/board amendment rules
Disposition and current direction: Revise access versus authority. Human Knowledge Steward may perform delegated routine admission/versioning and faithful capture of approved meaning. Disputed authority, new interpretation and normative adoption use empowered review/change routes; no universal admin-write or ARC-minor/board-material shortcut.
Destination / governing reference: 01/20/21/30; DEC-025/079-081

**Table row 16**
ID: GIL-C16
GIL source and concept: §§2.3/6.2, evidenced/asserted/absent/not provided/not applicable
Disposition and current direction: Retain useful descriptive assessment states with explicit uncertainty and evidence. A claim supported in a document differs from a verified fact; silence in a document does not prove absence in practice. Corroboration scope is approved under Q02/DEC-091.
Destination / governing reference: 02/23; assurance contract

**Table row 17**
ID: GIL-C17
GIL source and concept: §§1.1/2.3/6.2/7.4, mandatory confidence scores and weak-match thresholds
Disposition and current direction: Revise to calibrated, explained uncertainty and limitations; scores only where an approved method supports them. Retire universal confidence defaults and numerical caution triggers as functional rules. Confidence cannot substitute for source/fact assurance or human approval.
Destination / governing reference: 20/23; DEC-084; profiles later

**Table row 18**
ID: GIL-C18
GIL source and concept: §2.3, findings, actions, interview packs, overrides
Disposition and current direction: Retain citations, rationale, review and history. Recommendations require accepted accountable ownership before becoming duties; role labels alone are insufficient. Interviews/surveys require permitted purpose and review.
Destination / governing reference: 22/23/24/30; Q02

**Table row 19**

ID: GIL-C19
GIL source and concept: §§2.3/7.4, blind spots including non-applicable/unseeded artefacts
Disposition and current direction: Retain explicit coverage limits and human ownership. Distinguish justified non-applicability, missing evidence, unseeded analysis, unassessed scope and intentional exclusion; they are not interchangeable risks. Committee acknowledgement is not proof that a blind spot is safe.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23/25/30

**Table row 20**
ID: GIL-C20
GIL source and concept: §§2.5/3, one agent per type and fixed schedules/deadlines
Disposition and current direction: Retire mandatory deployment count and inherited numerical defaults. Use bounded common profiles, permissions, capacity, cover and escalation. An artefact type need not be a separately deployed agent.
Destination / governing reference: 04/05/23; DEC-054-057/086

**Table row 21**
ID: GIL-C21
GIL source and concept: §3, external changes and internal document currency
Disposition and current direction: Retain change detection, source versions, effective dates and currency indicators. Record coverage and failure; distinguish no material change from incomplete, failed or unperformed checking.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23; 02/04/14

**Table row 22**
ID: GIL-C22
GIL source and concept: §§3/7.5, agents detect but never assess or judge
Disposition and current direction: Revise: bounded agents may research, analyse, compare and propose; humans retain Mode 2 judgement and adoption. Separate corpus/artefact monitoring, research into component adequacy, and runtime/system oversight.
Destination / governing reference: 20-25; DEC-082/086

**Table row 23**
ID: GIL-C23
GIL source and concept: §§2.5/3.3/7.5, parameter register and hardcoded guarantees
Disposition and current direction: Retain explicit permitted/prohibited actions and independent enforcement. Replace local control duplication with common authority/data-use/execution. An ethics statement, approval flag or permitted-action list alone does not demonstrate safety or impossibility of unauthorised action.
Destination / governing reference: 01/03/04/05; common contracts

**Table row 24**
ID: GIL-C24
GIL source and concept: §§3/4, run logs, source checks, document versions and hashes
Disposition and current direction: Retain provenance, exact revisions and auditable activity as common record views. Do not create a competing evidence silo or require unlimited raw content retention. Hashes identify bytes; they do not establish truth or permitted use.
Destination / governing reference: 02/03/21/23

**Table row 25**
ID: GIL-C25
GIL source and concept: §4, permanent/seven-year/two-year retention and soft-delete-only
Disposition and current direction: Retire blanket retention/no-hard-delete rules. Apply record-class policy, purpose, legal holds and authorised deletion with suitable audit evidence; actual deletion cannot leave the same content indefinitely recoverable by default.
Destination / governing reference: 02/03/05; DEC-045-048

**Table row 26**
ID: GIL-C26
GIL source and concept: §5, functional API operations
Disposition and current direction: Retain ingestion, retrieval, review, amendment proposal and reporting capabilities at semantic level. Defer endpoint/wire design. All operations use common governing controls; authenticated administrator access is not normative approval.
Destination / governing reference: 01-05/21/23/30

**Table row 27**
ID: GIL-C27
GIL source and concept: §6.1, annual-report calibration and profile review
Disposition and current direction: Retain proposed profile/criteria application and human confirmation; distinguish routine faithful application from amendment of governing meaning. Retire autonomous normative calibration and annual-only freshness. Recording calibration completion does not establish outcome feedback.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23/25/30; DEC-018/080/081

**Table row 28**
ID: GIL-C28
GIL source and concept: §6.2, assessment sequence
Disposition and current direction: Retain classification, applicable criteria, evidence analysis, findings/actions/questions and reviewed output. Add permitted-use checks, actual review states, uncertainty, source corrections and affected-consumer notification.
Destination / governing reference: 23; 02/03/20/30

**Table row 29**
ID: GIL-C29
GIL source and concept: §6.3, narrative reporting and approval
Disposition and current direction: Split canonical assessment/synthesis, faithful presentation and human approval. An ARC Chair's report approval is not board minutes/decision approval. Publication, delivery, acceptance of duty and case completion remain distinct.
Destination / governing reference: 22/23/24/30; DEC-087

**Table row 30**
ID: GIL-C30
GIL source and concept: §6.4, safety/welfare handoff and executive review before routing
Disposition and current direction: Revise executive gating of protected findings. Apply mandatory protected internal routes, accepted ownership, cover and implicated-recipient alternatives; no discretionary executive delay. Receipt is not resolution. Retire hardcoded deadlines; use applicable urgency profiles.
Destination / governing reference: 05/20/30; DEC-073-078/083

**Table row 31**
ID: GIL-C31
GIL source and concept: §6.5, amendments wait for next meeting or annual recalibration
Disposition and current direction: Retire universal waiting rules. Material findings and changes require timely governed review, impact identification, notifications and owned reassessment. Preserve exact applied state; no silent bulk recalibration or automatic historical reversal.
Destination / governing reference: 01/02/20/21/23/30; DEC-067-072/089

**Table row 32**
ID: GIL-C32
GIL source and concept: §7, RP v4 compliance checklist
Disposition and current direction: Retire as a current compliance claim. Re-map to all RP v6 domains, FP v4 and relevant GI Tests, stating contributions, limits and planned evidence. Selected schema fields and explanatory assertions do not prove a test passed.
Destination / governing reference: 20-25/30; template

**Table row 33**
ID: GIL-C33
GIL source and concept: §7.1, absence questions instead of infeasible alternatives
Disposition and current direction: Retain absence questions but reject their equivalence to surfacing infeasible options. Both missing evidence and useful options constrained by authority/resources require explicit treatment.
Destination / governing reference: 22/23; RP v6

**Table row 34**
ID: GIL-C34
GIL source and concept: §7, UDL events/ethics fields claimed to close feedback or demonstrate telos
Disposition and current direction: Revise to evidence of actual consequences, human challenge and review. Capture outcomes, unintended effects and constraints. Only the empowered board changes telos; database statements do not enact or validate it.
Destination / governing reference: 22/25/30; DEC-024; FP/GT

**Table row 35**
ID: GIL-C35
GIL source and concept: §§7.5/7.6, transparency and cross-domain access defaults
Disposition and current direction: Retain reviewable explanations and purpose limits. Use independent permission/data-use controls, not audience-role defaults alone. No inferred individual emotional/preference profiles or secondary use merely because records are accessible.
Destination / governing reference: 03/20/30; DEC-049-053/088

**Table row 36**
ID: GIL-C36
GIL source and concept: §8, phased build and one risk-management fixture
Disposition and current direction: Defer build sequencing. A fixture may illustrate assessment but cannot prove full GI/AOS coverage. Preserve the already agreed overdue-repair first demonstration; no build activation is authorised by this comparison.
Destination / governing reference: 40; existing project direction

**Table row 37**
ID: GIL-C37
GIL source and concept: §9, portal, survey, UDL API and seed population questions
Disposition and current direction: Defer channel/form/API choices. Seed completeness is an explicit coverage/content dependency, not a requirement to populate 121 documents before functional drafting. Current shared records settle the semantic UDL direction.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23/24/30; implementation

**Table row 38**
ID: GIL-C38
GIL source and concept: §9, subsidiary scope and annual-report frequency
Disposition and current direction: Apply approved subsidiary scope under Q01/DEC-090. Resolve frequency through governed monitoring and multiple current sources rather than reopening a sole-annual-report assumption.
Destination / governing reference: 21/23; DEC-086

## 5. Coverage beyond GIL's checklist

**Table row 1**
RP v6 domain: 1 - Architecture and completeness
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Account for evidence gaps and useful infeasible alternatives; no single-document fixture completeness claim

**Table row 2**
RP v6 domain: 2 - Mode 1/Mode 2
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Governed operational boundaries; human deliberation and approved post-meeting accounts; no automated normative judgement

**Table row 3**
RP v6 domain: 3 - 1+5
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Cross-domain evidence and synthesis; no sixth peer/adjudication framing

**Table row 4**
RP v6 domain: 4 - Options and Decisions
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Ground options in actual organisational evidence; preserve reasons, rejected options, caveats and human-confirmed context; trace actual decision consequences

**Table row 5**
RP v6 domain: 5 - Blind spots and honesty
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Scoped coverage, uncertainty, disputed evidence and missing/failed monitoring

**Table row 6**
RP v6 domain: 6 - Ethics and Telos
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Preserve board-owned telos, affected residents' circumstances, equity and meaningful challenge/access, including those unable to exit; examine system-wide emergent effects; documentary completeness alone cannot establish ethical governance

**Table row 7**
RP v6 domain: 7 - Radical Transparency
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Explain evidence, uncertainty, constraints and human responsibility in intelligible terms; enable scrutiny without exposing protected personal or deliberative material

**Table row 8**
RP v6 domain: 8 - Agentic delegation
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Bounded permissions, shared cumulative limits, independent controls, meaningful explanations and accepted human handoff

**Table row 9**
RP v6 domain: 9 - Data and sensing
Required treatment in remaining GI specifications: Declared purpose, independent data-use permission, protected deliberation and human-confirmed contextual descriptors

The Governance Intelligence Tests require observable technical evidence and human assessment of governance in practice. The comparison identifies contribution and limits; it does not award passes or substitute AI evaluation for human Mode 2 review.

# 6. Scope choices approved by Mark

## Q01 - Group and subsidiary scope

Should AOS-21 support relevant subsidiaries/group entities as distinct scoped profiles linked to the parent?

Recommendation: yes, within the approved organisational remit. Preserve each entity's powers, governing corpus, applicability and evidence, and identify excluded entities with a responsible human owner. This establishes semantic scope without requiring separate deployments or cross-organisation federation. GIL §9 explicitly leaves this unresolved; the current architecture does not select the organisational perimeter.

Status: approved 7 October 2026; Mark: “Yes, both agreed”. Recorded as DEC-090. AOS-21 drafting must preserve the approved scoped-entity distinction.

## Q02 - Documentary claims and corroborating evidence

Should AOS-23 be allowed to corroborate documentary claims using separately permitted records, outcomes and human-supplied interview or survey evidence?

Recommendation: yes, while reporting document quality, support for a claim and evidence of actual practice separately. Each use must be purposeful, sourced and permitted. No live boardroom observation, inferred personal profiling or automatic certification follows. Broader judgement of governance effectiveness remains with human review and the oversight/workflow/test responsibilities of AOS-25/30/40.

Status: approved 7 October 2026; Mark: “Yes, both agreed”. Recorded as DEC-091. AOS-23 drafting must preserve the three distinct assessment dimensions and permitted-use boundaries.

The seven GI choices already approved as DEC-079-085 settle charter/profile separation, stewardship, precedent, proactive review/research, protected routing, graduated review and independent preparation. They need applying, not asking again.

## 7. Follow-through and completion

The source comparison is complete. Item 7 remains open because the component specifications and their requirement/case allocation are not yet drafted. Q01/Q02 are approved; next draft AOS-21 and AOS-23 using this disposition register. Develop AOS-22/24/25 around their allocated responsibilities. Each new specification must include its own external-research remit/profile and common AOS-04/AOS-02/AOS-01 references under DEC-086/template v0.4, without inventing a separate deployment or cadence.

Draft acceptance should confirm that each applicable GIL-C disposition is carried into a component requirement, constraint, source note or explicit retirement/deferment; that human review/monitoring transitions and affected-consumer correction paths agree with current contracts; and that no legacy confidence, timing, retention or approval default has slipped back in. Planned cases should include disputed/absent evidence, protected deliberation versus permitted records, provisional versus validated outputs, failed source coverage, implicated reviewers and correction of dependent analysis.

Checks performed: ordered GIL text and tables reviewed; dispositions mapped across all nine source sections; current decisions, component allocations and principle domains compared; open choices separated from settled directions. This is an author document comparison, with no executed implementation cases, independent assurance, new DEC, component amendment or build/readiness approval. AOS-30 remains complete at functional specification level. Research pilot item 5b remains open and unchanged.

Approval update, v0.2 - 7 October 2026: Mark approved both recommendations. AOS-00/Map updated to v0.26 with DEC-090/091. The §2 source manifest records the comparison baseline; this approval supplement records the later decision baseline. All 38 disposition IDs preserved. No additional comparison design question remains; AOS-21/23 drafting is next.

## Current drafting and consistency closure - 7 October 2026

Mark authorised GI-CR-01-04 corrections and closure. The GI consistency review v0.2 records the applied amendments and all 38 GIL disposition allocations. AOS-00/Map v0.32, DEC-001-091; AOS-20 v0.5/21 v0.6/22 v0.4/23 v0.5/24 v0.3/25 v0.2/30 v0.5; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4; Shared v0.15/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.14/source matrix v0.15; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. Earlier consultation/drafting-next statements are historical; retained, revised, retired and deferred source dispositions remain unchanged. No legacy vendor/schema/default is reinstated; no operational acceptance claim is made. Next AOS-40.