FAR-001 reconciliation with the controlled AOS architecture

Document: far-001-reconciliation-v0-1 · Source revision or record: FAR-001 reconciliation v0.1, 3 October 2026

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.

Table row 1
Document control: Record
Value: FAR-001 reconciliation, version 0.1

Table row 2
Document control: Date
Value: 3 October 2026

Table row 3
Document control: Scope
Value: FAR-001's 12 propositions, ten architectural rules, component template v0.2 and OQ-001-014

Table row 4
Document control: Controlling architecture
Value: AOS-00 draft v0.6 and specification map draft v0.3, 28 September 2026

Table row 5
Document control: Governing sources
Value: Foundational Principles v4; AOS Reasoning Principles v6; Governance Intelligence Tests

Table row 6
Document control: Working quality standard
Value: AOS-QS v0.1, 18 September 2026

Table row 7
Document control: Project owner and current approver
Value: Mark Sweeny

Table row 8
Document control: Review
Value: Assistant author analysis and project-owner decision; no independent review performed

Table row 9
Document control: Status
Value: Reconciliation record; editorial/template corrections applied, one new design direction confirmed by the project owner; detailed requirements and mechanisms remain proposed

Outcome

FAR-001 is compatible with the controlled architecture when its proposals are interpreted within the existing source hierarchy and responsibility allocation. It supplies useful drafting refinements, not a replacement architecture. The review found three defects in the component template: the lack of an explicit requirement register, incomplete quality-standard review/handover coverage, and traceability wording that could omit requirements and planned verification. The reconciled template corrects these defects.

The ten architectural rules can remain as drafting guidance, subject to the qualifications recorded below. The system-wide enforcement function remains in AOS-01/03/05 with the AOS-04 agent contract; AOS-14 remains Boundary Intelligence and external exchange. No additional intelligence domain, deployment unit or universal technical enforcement mechanism is introduced.

The owner confirmed that semantic explanations should be a required default, with recorded exceptions for security, privacy or feasibility. This is the sole new substantive design direction resolved during this reconciliation. Its implementation requirements and acceptance cases are still to be drafted and approved.

1. Evidence and authority

Table row 1
Material examined: FAR-001, 29 September
Locator and use: All 12 propositions, source-section index, critical reconciliation and record-integrity rule

Table row 2
Material examined: Architectural Rules working draft, 29 September
Locator and use: Rules 1-10 and allocation note

Table row 3
Material examined: Component template v0.2, updated 30 September
Locator and use: Document control, sections 1-19 and component summary

Table row 4
Material examined: AOS-00 v0.6
Locator and use: §§1-3 scope, authority and 19 responsibilities; §§4/4.1 proposed REQ-001-049; §9 planned VER-001-022; §10 DEC-001-026; status and review limits

Table row 5
Material examined: Specification map v0.3
Locator and use: Suite structure, ownership, D01-D13 and reconciliation state

Table row 6
Material examined: AOS-QS v0.1
Locator and use: QS-01-28, G1-G4, Appendix A and review checklist

Table row 7
Material examined: FP v4
Locator and use: Printed principles 1-10; especially purpose/function, permanent human Mode 2, structural integrity, transparency, imperfection, humility and emergence

Table row 8
Material examined: RP v6
Locator and use: Nine domains and 41 principle records; the complete supplied text, including tests, failure modes and implementation references

Table row 9

Material examined: Governance Intelligence Tests
Locator and use: M1.1-M1.14 and M2.1-M2.15, as operational and human governance assessment obligations

Table row 10
Material examined: Architecture Issues Register
Locator and use: OQ-001-014 and research-agent intake allocation

Table row 11
Material examined: Source Traceability Matrix v0.1
Locator and use: Existing source-item allocation record; no row status is changed by this reconciliation

The evidence supports conceptual alignment and document corrections. It does not prove that the proposed mechanisms are secure, technically sufficient, implemented or legally conformant. No new legal interpretation, supplier evaluation or external-standard conformity claim was made. FAR-001 is an indexed synthesis; its cited original twenty-section conversation was not independently retrieved in full during this review. Substantive adoption therefore rests on the reviewed controlled sources and explicit owner decisions, rather than unseen passages.

REQ and VER identifiers below have the full prefixes AOS-00-REQ- and AOS-00-VER-. They identify existing proposed requirements and planned cases. A link may provide partial coverage; thematic alignment is not a complete traceability chain.

Decisions confirmed in this session

Table row 1
Local record: FAR-R-001
Decision: Use AOS-QS v0.1 as the project working standard for now; independent review is deferred because Mark is the sole human project participant.
Authority and effect: Mark's instruction, 3 October. Record author/project review accurately. Do not waive QS-24/25/28 or claim G3 where the required separate review is absent. Organisational independent review of GI interpretation under DEC-010-012 is unaffected.

Table row 2
Local record: FAR-R-002
Decision: Constraint explanations are a required default: meaning, authority basis and escalation route; exceptions for security, privacy or feasibility need a recorded reason and review.
Authority and effect: Mark selected this option on 3 October. Allocate to AOS-01/03/04/05, applied by AOS-14. Explanation cannot itself grant permission or replace independent enforcement. Exact requirement wording remains draft.

These local record IDs are reconciliation locators, not new AOS-00 DEC identifiers. FAR-R-002 needs incorporation into the controlled architecture decision register during its next revision, preserving source and approval evidence. No existing decision is superseded.

2. FAR-001 proposition dispositions

“Retain” means retain the proposition within the stated existing constraints. It does not approve a new mechanism or every phrase of the original conversation.

Table row 1
FAR proposition: 1. Legitimate objective, illegitimate means
Disposition: Retain
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP1/2/3; RP Agentic Delegation and Data/Sensing; DEC-003/005/007; REQ-005-007/025/031/040; VER-003/004/013/017
Remaining obligation: Purpose and authority must be assessed separately; action cannot proceed on telos alignment alone.

Table row 2
FAR proposition: 2. Telos, ethics, authority, knowledge and transparency
Disposition: Retain with precision
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP2-6; RP Ethics/Telos, Blind Spots, Transparency, Delegation; QS-16-19; REQ-005-007/012/014/040
Remaining obligation: No mandatory serial reasoning pipeline or recoverable private reasoning is implied. AOS-04/20/22 define observable assessments and escalation.

Table row 3
FAR proposition: 3. Semantic boundaries plus independent enforcement
Disposition: Retain with owner-confirmed default
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FAR-R-002; DEC-005; REQ-006/007/023/040; VER-004/013/017 supply partial coverage
Remaining obligation: New explanation fields, exception governance, version alignment and acceptance cases required in AOS-01/03/04/05.

Table row 4
FAR proposition: 4. Character, constraint and accountability
Disposition: Retain as rationale
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP3-6; RP Ethics/Telos, Transparency and Delegation; QS-18/19/23
Remaining obligation: “Character” describes intended behaviour, not moral authority. Threat modelling must assess combined control failures.

Table row 5
FAR proposition: 5. Organisational legibility
Disposition: Retain with evidence qualification
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP4; RP consequential decision records and transparency; QS-13/19; REQ-010/012/014/024; VER-006/008/018
Remaining obligation: Evidence must distinguish observations, model outputs, approved human rationale and retrospective explanation; lawful access, retention and minimisation remain explicit.

Table row 6
FAR proposition: 6. Cumulative, population, emergent and capability effects
Disposition: Retain as assurance concern
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP10; RP emergence and Mode 2 pressure; GT M1.13; QS-18/23; REQ-019/034; VER-010/015
Remaining obligation: Partial coverage only. AOS-04/25/40 must define indicators, populations, horizons and change triggers. Does not reopen deferred self-calibration DEC-018.

Table row 7
FAR proposition: 7. Cross-organisation duties/federation
Disposition: Retain existing exchange duties; defer federated model
Controlling basis and existing coverage: DEC-005/014/016/020; REQ-011/035-037/040; VER-007/015/016
Remaining obligation: OQ-012 stays open. No new duty to notify externally, shared instance or federation protocol is assumed; explicit authority and verified obligations are prerequisites.

Table row 8
FAR proposition: 8. Functional prescription and contract hierarchy
Disposition: Retain with corrected traceability
Controlling basis and existing coverage: DEC-001/005/015/019; QS-07/12/21/22; REQ-001/003/020/021/030/036; VER-001/002/012/015
Remaining obligation: Capability/function/contract views complement requirement records. Preserve requirements and planned verification, even when no capability/function decomposition is needed. No product mandate or sector-independent rescoping.

Table row 9
FAR proposition: 9. Publication package and normative foundation
Disposition: Retain existing sequence
Controlling basis and existing coverage: FP/RP hierarchy in AOS-00 §2.2; DEC-021-026; 28 September publication decision; REQ-017/041; VER-011/019
Remaining obligation: First package is architecture draft, manifesto and bounded overdue-repair example. Reference implementation follows separately. No publication approval follows from this record.

Table row 10
FAR proposition: 10. Observe → Challenge → Evolve
Disposition: Retain proposal-only research; defer amendment process
Controlling basis and existing coverage: QS-20/26; DEC-007/024/025; REQ-015/025/045-048; VER-009/017/020/021
Remaining obligation: Agents observe and propose; approved humans decide. Organisation telos authority is distinct from authority to amend the AOS specification. Change Constitution remains to be drafted.

Table row 11
FAR proposition: 11. Transferable governance
Disposition: Retain role-based design
Controlling basis and existing coverage: DEC-009; QS-01/08/16; REQ-033; VER-014
Remaining obligation: Mark currently holds project roles. Appointment, succession and conflict handling belong in the Change Constitution; no fictional independent role is filled.

Table row 12
FAR proposition: 12. Living Specification as recursive demonstration
Disposition: Defer later RI-001 scope; reject first-example substitution
Controlling basis and existing coverage: DEC-021-026 and existing publication direction
Remaining obligation: OQ-014 stays open for later implementation design. RI-001 does not replace the overdue-repair first example.

3. Ten architectural-rule dispositions

Table row 1
Rule: 1 Functional prescription
Result: Retain
Reconciliation and destination: DEC-019 and QS-07; technical choices may be required before the relevant build but must remain separately authorised and justified.

Table row 2
Rule: 2 Purpose does not confer authority
Result: Retain
Reconciliation and destination: DEC-003/005/007 and RP Delegation; no change to scope or authority.

Table row 3
Rule: 3 Independent constraint
Result: Retain with wording correction
Reconciliation and destination: Prevent unilateral change to effective authority. An actor may interpret evidence or ask for clarification, but its interpretation cannot activate broader permission. Threat-model independence remains OQ-003/D08.

Table row 4
Rule: 4 Organisational legibility
Result: Retain with wording correction
Reconciliation and destination: Align “reasoning” with QS-19: captured evidence, model output, applied rules and approved human rationale. No private chain-of-thought requirement or unrestricted disclosure.

Table row 5
Rule: 5 Defence in depth
Result: Retain as design direction
Reconciliation and destination: QS-18/23 and FP5/10; test failure combinations rather than claim invulnerability. Physical/control-plane separation is not yet prescribed.

Table row 6
Rule: 6 Semantic boundaries
Result: Strengthen per FAR-R-002

Reconciliation and destination: Required explanatory default with reasoned/reviewed exceptions. Exception does not waive the constraint. Exact schema and approver roles belong in component specifications.

Table row 7
Rule: 7 Governed evolution
Result: Retain
Reconciliation and destination: Project specification amendment governance is separate from each organisation's protected telos/schedule amendments. DEC-018 remains deferred.

Table row 8
Rule: 8 Cross-architectural coherence
Result: Retain
Reconciliation and destination: QS-21/26; impact assessment must expose unknown dependencies rather than claim complete automatic discovery.

Table row 9
Rule: 9 Transferable governance
Result: Retain
Reconciliation and destination: Role definitions may outlive founder; independent project review remains explicitly unfilled/deferred.

Table row 10
Rule: 10 Conformance through contracts
Result: Retain with scope qualification
Reconciliation and destination: QS-22/23/25; declare component/profile scope and evidence. Conformance is not established by product choice or contract existence alone. OQ-011 remains open for the claim model.

The corrected rules remain a working drafting aid. The controlling FP/RP, recorded decisions and AOS-QS govern where their wording differs. No rule is silently converted into a stable component requirement.

4. Component-template reconciliation

Table row 1
Template coverage: Document control
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: QS-01/03; Appendix A control fields
Result and correction: Add author, reviewer/vacancy, working QS version, gate/evidence, release scope and manifest. Separate custodian from approval authority.

Table row 2
Template coverage: §§1-3 purpose, sources, responsibilities
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 1-3; QS-10/11/17
Result and correction: Retain; add explicit architecture/context view and FP/RP/GT applicability. Source hierarchy is precedence, not a mandatory approval step for every derived record.

Table row 3
Template coverage: §4 capabilities/functions
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 4; QS-04-09
Result and correction: Add §4.3 explicit requirement register with all QS-08 attributes. CAP/FUN IDs are useful decomposition, not replacements for REQ IDs.

Table row 4
Template coverage: §5 state model and §10 workflows
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 6; QS-14/16
Result and correction: Retain. Required state detail is applicable where persistent/governed state exists; explain non-applicability.

Table row 5

Template coverage: §6 contracts
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 5; QS-12
Result and correction: Add complete interface attributes: schemas, units, timing, receipt, ordering, duplicates, retries and revocation, or reasoned non-applicability. Cross-reference authoritative shared contracts.

Table row 6
Template coverage: §§7-9 authority, principles, data
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 2/5/6/7; QS-13/16-20
Result and correction: Retain; add new semantic default, complete three-source applicability and distinction between sensing/authority/capability.

Table row 7
Template coverage: §§11-13 failure, evidence, qualities
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 7-8; QS-14/15/18/19
Result and correction: Retain; clarify evidence meaning, distinguish deterministic enforcement from probabilistic inference, require model-change review and evaluated limits.

Table row 8
Template coverage: §14 invariants
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: QS-05-08/21/22
Result and correction: Retain as optional decomposition where useful. Each binding invariant needs a REQ record or explicit linkage to one.

Table row 9
Template coverage: §15 conformance
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 9; QS-22/23
Result and correction: Add VER records and all QS-22 attributes. CR claims and VER cases are distinct; execution evidence is separately versioned and dated.

Table row 10
Template coverage: §§16-17 dependencies/issues
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 10; QS-09/25
Result and correction: Retain, with requirement impact and explicit review gate; no default answers.

Table row 11
Template coverage: §18 implementation guidance
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: QS-04/07
Result and correction: Retain non-normative status; approved implementation choices belong in a separately controlled implementation baseline.

Table row 12
Template coverage: §19 traceability/change
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 12; QS-21/24/26
Result and correction: Restore REQ and VER in traceability; distinguish derivation path from universal sequence.

Table row 13
Template coverage: New §20 build and handover
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 11; QS-25/28
Result and correction: Specify allowed scope, exclusions, fixed contracts/configuration, discretionary implementation choices and builder stop conditions.

Table row 14
Template coverage: New §21 review and control
AOS-QS Appendix A / rules: Appendix A 12; QS-24-28
Result and correction: Include QS checklist/evidence, separate quality/design conclusions, findings/tailoring, reviewer/approver and gate evidence. Record independent review as deferred.

Identifiers CAP, FUN, CON, INV and CR introduced by the working template do not retire the existing REQ/IF/DEC/VER conventions. A contract may be referenced through an interface; either way identity and semantic ownership must remain unambiguous. This reconciliation supplies no new contract ownership approval under the still-open DEC-002.

5. Open-question disposition

Table row 1
Issue: OQ-001 ethics representation
Current disposition: Open detailed design
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-04/20 with AOS-01; novel cases and RP applicability. No simplistic ethical score adopted.

Table row 2
Issue: OQ-002 boundary classes
Current disposition: Direction constrained; classification open
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-01/03/05/30; identify non-waivable core versus authorised operational parameters and lawful exceptions.

Table row 3
Issue: OQ-003 constraint independence
Current disposition: Open technical assurance
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-01/04/05/40; threat model, privileges, bypass/race/restart cases. Logical allocation alone is insufficient evidence.

Table row 4
Issue: OQ-004 ethical conflicts
Current disposition: Human Mode 2 settled; process open
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-20/22/30; authorised recipients, dissent, timing and unresolved outcomes.

Table row 5
Issue: OQ-005 human-reserved decisions
Current disposition: Core settled; organisation schedule open
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-01/04/30; DEC-004/021/024/025 and organisation classification, never hidden thresholds.

Table row 6
Issue: OQ-006 material-action records
Current disposition: Open operational definition
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-02/04/30/40; proportionality, source obligations and versioned evidence schema.

Table row 7
Issue: OQ-007 cumulative/emergent effects
Current disposition: Open design
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-04/25/40 with domain contributors; scenarios, indicators, horizons and false positives. AOS-14 covers external signals only.

Table row 8
Issue: OQ-008 dependency discovery
Current disposition: Existing change duty; mechanism open
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-00/02/40; contract registry, manual/automated discovery limits and change-impact cases.

Table row 9
Issue: OQ-009 change evidence/challenge
Current disposition: Open constitutional procedure
Owner specification / next evidence: Change Constitution; proposal evidence, dissent, authority and closure.

Table row 10
Issue: OQ-010 protected AOS constitution

Current disposition: Open project governance
Owner specification / next evidence: Change Constitution/AOS-00; distinguish specification changes from organisation telos.

Table row 11
Issue: OQ-011 conformance claim model
Current disposition: Open detailed design
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-40/02; scope, assessor, evidence, expiry and partial claims.

Table row 12
Issue: OQ-012 federation
Current disposition: Deferred beyond existing exchange obligations
Owner specification / next evidence: AOS-14/01/02/03; explicit future scope and verified duties before adopting any federated mechanism.

Table row 13
Issue: OQ-013 Boundary naming/allocation
Current disposition: Resolved for working terminology
Owner specification / next evidence: Use “Boundary Intelligence and external exchange” for AOS-14; “shared authority and data-use enforcement” for systemwide controls. DEC-005 remains controlling. D08 mechanisms remain open.

Table row 14
Issue: OQ-014 RI-001 sequencing
Current disposition: First-example question resolved; later scope open
Owner specification / next evidence: Overdue repair first; later RI-001 scope/acceptance remains deferred. No new implementation authorisation.

Additional drafting obligation: semantic explanation schema and exception approval remain to be specified under FAR-R-002. Material choices in these open items return to Mark as the component work progresses. They are not inferred by this record.

6. Changes and readiness

Applied document corrections: Architectural Rules revised to identify working guidance, precise evidence and authority wording, and FAR-R-002. Component template advanced to v0.3 with requirements, planned VER records, complete QS coverage, build handover and review. Issue register records terminology disposition and the semantic-default direction. To-do items 5 and 5a record the owner instruction and completed reconciliation, while detailed design obligations remain with the component work and Change Constitution.

AOS-00 v0.6, its REQ/VER catalogue, the 19 specification boundaries and the source fingerprints are preserved. The next architecture revision should incorporate FAR-R-002 into its decision register and update source references; exact component requirements and tests require their normal approval. There is no claim that any component passes G2/G3, or that a constraint is impossible to bypass. No source-traceability row is promoted to confirmed here.

Specification-quality conclusion: the reconciliation identifies and corrects template omissions and makes residual gaps explicit; populated specifications must still be reviewed individually against AOS-QS.
Design-adequacy conclusion: the FAR proposals align within the recorded qualifications; semantic explanation default is owner-confirmed, while enforcement sufficiency, federated governance and change mechanisms remain open.
Independent review: deferred and unperformed.
Next work: review the AOS-14 research pilot (item 5b), then draft the shared authority/data/agent contracts together (item 6), using the reconciled template and source matrix.