AOS-01 - Authority, constitutional controls and change

Document: aos-01-authority-constitutional-controls-and-change · Source revision or record: v0.12

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.

DEC-104 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.12. Each mandatory protected-finding category requires assessed technical-failure and implicated-person interference arrangements with an appropriately independent authorised alternative and no implicated sole release gatekeeper. Decision/amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-104-protected-reporting-and-implicated-recipients-2026-10-29.md). External reporting is conditional on justified lawful authority, not a default. Exact profiles/permissions, protected_finding v0.3 compatibility and actual evidence remain gates; amended wording retains ordinary separate review and cases are planned/unexecuted. Earlier contrary or narrower baselines are history for this scope.

DEC-103 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.11. Decision validity/effective time, attributable evidence/authentication, minutes approval and permission to execute are separate. DEC-087 is partly superseded; decision/amendment and legal-source record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-103-decision-validity-evidence-and-minutes-2026-10-29.md). No universal later-minutes or second decision-record approval gate. Exact instruments/evidence policy, KX-06 v0.3 compatibility and ordinary separate review/readiness gates remain required; cases unexecuted. Earlier contrary wording is historical only where explicitly identified.

DEC-102 adopted - 29 October 2026: Mark approved demonstrated adequacy of organisation-defined classifications/settings against governing constraints. Current document revision 0.10; see the decision and amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-102-classification-and-configuration-adequacy-2026-10-29.md). Earlier baselines are dated history. DEC-099-101 retained; detailed amended requirements remain subject to separate review/readiness gates and cases remain planned/unexecuted.

DEC-100 adopted - 29 October 2026: Mark approved separate advance-authorised minimum control-metadata access. Current document revision 0.9; this notice supersedes earlier baseline notices for the affected scope only. See the decision and amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-100-control-metadata-access-2026-10-29.md). DEC-099 remains approved. Requirements remain proposed wording implementing the approved direction; cases remain planned/unexecuted and ordinary separate review/readiness gates apply.

Editorial edition - 29 October 2026: Mark authorised documentary corrections D-01-09. This edition reconciles navigation, count/revision pointers, conformance links and historical scope labels; existing technical meanings, requirement/IF/decision identities and proposed/planned status are retained. The internal version below identifies the retained functional baseline; this dated editorial edition identifies the corrected document. See the current document inventory (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-current-document-inventory-2026-10-29.md) and correction record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-documentary-corrections-2026-10-29.md). Earlier dated adoption baselines are historical snapshots; exact logical family/view revisions are in Exchange Register §4.

Table row 1
Document control: Version / date

Value: 0.12 / 29 October 2026

Table row 2
Document control: Status
Value: Review draft; all component requirement wording proposed

Table row 3
Document control: Architecture baseline
Value: AOS-00/Map v0.25, DEC-001-089; AOS-30 functional alignment 7 October 2026

Table row 4
Document control: Source baseline
Value: Foundational Principles v4; AOS Reasoning Principles v6; Governance Intelligence Tests, controlled supplied source set

Table row 5
Document control: Accountable component owner / custodian
Value: Roles required; appointments unresolved

Table row 6
Document control: Project baseline approver
Value: Mark Sweeny

Table row 7
Document control: Operational approvers
Value: Relevant organisation's board and authorised governance/operational roles, as specified below; actual appointments and instruments unresolved

Table row 8
Document control: Author
Value: Codex, at Mark's request

Table row 9
Document control: Reviewer
Value: Independent project review deferred; separate reviewer unassigned

Table row 10
Document control: Quality / template
Value: AOS-QS v0.1; component template v0.4

Table row 11
Document control: Release scope
Value: Whole-component logical specification; bounded implementation not authorised

Table row 12
Document control: Readiness
Value: Author-reviewed draft; no formal G1/G2/G3/G4 approval

Table row 13
Document control: Approval record
Value: Existing architectural directions retain their standing; no whole-document, exact requirement, build or activation approval

Table row 14
Document control: Change history
Value: 0.1 initial principle-derived component draft. 0.2 incorporates approved DEC-042-044; clarifies REQ-024, adds REQ-039-044 and VER-019/020, extends VER-012 and distinguishes settled direction from residual detailed dependencies. 0.3 - 6 October: common decision-baseline/status/interface reconciliation (KR-09 label portion), preserves historical approvals and proposed/planned records; register formatting repaired where applicable (KR-10); see §19.1. 0.4 - DEC-062-066 common exchange adoption; five new proposed

adoption REQs/six planned cases; AOS-03 REQ-040 sequencing clarified where applicable. 0.5 - DEC-067-072 control coordination/withholding notification; eight proposed REQs/eight planned cases and reciprocal source/field adoption; original records preserved. 0.6 - DEC-073-078 protected reporting/recovery and standards provenance; six proposed REQs/six planned VERs; prior records preserved. v0.7 - DEC-086 external-research support, reciprocal AOS-04/02/01 allocation and own component profile; previous records preserved. 7 October - authorised AOS-30 functional adoption, Chair/board approval propagation and material-correction alignment; no new identifiers or operating power.

Current catalogue inventory - editorial reconciliation, 29 October 2026

The normative tables contain 70 retained numbered requirement records and 46 planned verification case identities. These are catalogue counts, not independent obligations, active-scope coverage, executed tests or accepted results. Earlier totals in dated adoption supplements describe those steps only. The current document inventory (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-current-document-inventory-2026-10-29.md) records the suite baseline and count method.

1. Purpose and scope

1.1 Purpose

AOS-01 defines how organisational authority is represented, validated, changed, restricted and evidenced across the AOS. Its purpose is to preserve the distinction between the organisation's human-conferred purpose and the functions its software can perform.

An agent that can execute an operation is not thereby entitled to execute it. A technically successful action is not evidence of valid delegation. AOS-01 supplies the shared authority semantics against which executors are controlled; it does not replace the people or institutions whose powers make the authority valid.

1.2 Architectural problem

Without this component, each intelligence or supplier could infer permission from its own interpretation, technical access, previous actions or operational usefulness. Accumulated interpretation could silently become constitutional authority. The system could also withhold a prohibited external action while failing to route a separately permitted internal escalation.

1.3 Intended outcome

For a proposed action, the AOS can establish which current instrument permits or prohibits it, the applicable domain/context/conditions, the accountable human role, and any reserved human decision. Uncertainty withholds dependent execution. Changes follow the required approval route and produce reconstructable evidence.

1.4 Scope

Authority instruments; permission and prohibition semantics; Mode 1 parameters and Mode 2 reservation; organisation-approved consequential-action classification; human/agent delegation; contextual determination; constitutional and schedule change; suspension, revocation and reinstatement policy; protected escalation obligations; activation conditions; accountability and explanation interfaces.

1.5 Exclusions

AOS-02 owns common record structures and provenance. AOS-03 owns identity/access/consent/data-use determinations. AOS-04 defines agent execution behaviour; AOS-05 runtime enforcement and resilience. AOS-13 tracks operational workflows; AOS-14 governs external exchange; AOS-20-25 interpret, prepare, present and review governance material. AOS-30 supports human decisions; AOS-40 owns assembled acceptance and commissioning.

Repair dates, completion evidence, contact-channel selection, procurement limits and employment procedures belong to their relevant profiles/components. They do not define universal authority principles.

2. Authority and sources

2.1 Source standing

FP v4 and RP v6 govern. AOS-00 records approved design directions and proposed system requirements. GT supplies governance assessment tests, not a software certification scheme. Books and working notes remain explanatory/proposal sources within that hierarchy.

Sources read for this draft: FP v4 and RP v6 text extracted from the controlled supplied DOCX files; GT supplied text; AOS-00 v0.10, Map v0.7, AOS-QS v0.1 and template v0.3; Shared Contracts, Core Record Contracts and Operational Profiles v0.1 with their 4-5 October dispositions. The original source manifest remains unchanged. No new legal or supplier standard is adopted or verified here.

2.2 Approved architecture directions used

Table row 1
Direction: Non-waivable core; human adjudication; withhold uncertain authority
Controlling locator: DEC-003/004/006; REQ-005-007/023/031/032
Meaning for AOS-01: Operational configuration cannot waive foundational constraints

Table row 2
Direction: GI prepares; humans adjudicate; shared controls enforce
Controlling locator: DEC-005; REQ-040
Meaning for AOS-01: An intelligence cannot approve its own interpretation as permission

Table row 3
Direction: Delegation governance; authoritative human records
Controlling locator: DEC-007/008/009; REQ-024/025/033
Meaning for AOS-01: Grants/expansions need formal human approval; authoritative decisions require empowered human approval

Table row 4
Direction: Purpose and schedule protection
Controlling locator: DEC-024/025; REQ-045-048
Meaning for AOS-01: Board-only telos amendment; executive proposal, Committee review, board sign-off for schedule amendment; authorised temporary suspension/reinstatement

Table row 5
Direction: Consequential classification
Controlling locator: DEC-021; REQ-049
Meaning for AOS-01: Organisation supplies classification within non-waivable core

Table row 6

Direction: Explanation; current control; correction; reconciliation
Controlling locator: DEC-027-030
Meaning for AOS-01: Explain constraints by default; check current authority before effect; reassess affected work; reconcile unknown effects

Table row 7
Direction: Handoff and fallback
Controlling locator: DEC-033/034
Meaning for AOS-01: Acknowledgement of responsibility is distinct from delivery; fallback needs its own authority

Table row 8
Direction: Resident-agreed channels
Controlling locator: DEC-041
Meaning for AOS-01: Applicable resident communications require evidenced agreement as well as permission; AOS-11/03 own the detail

DEC-031/032/035-040 supply demonstration/evidence/profile directions. They are not general rules that all expenditure or every operational promise must always receive per-action human approval. Their approved overdue-repair scope remains intact.

2.3 Vocabulary and authority boundaries

Authority instrument: an approved governance record defining powers, obligations, prohibitions and applicable conditions. Delegation: a specific power conferred by an empowered human institution or role; no subdelegation right is inferred. Determination: an evidenced result for an exact proposed action/context, not a new grant. Activation: making approved configured capability available after prerequisites; approval and activation are distinct.

Mode 1: operation within board-authorised governance parameters. Mode 2: human adjudication of incommensurable values, permanently reserved. Consequential classification: an organisation's operational classification; it does not redefine or waive Mode 2.

Suspension: temporary removal of usable permission under the approved schedule. Revocation: withdrawal under an approved withdrawal instrument/process; detailed commissioning procedure remains open. Reinstatement: restoration through the approved schedule route, not a technical restart.

Trust boundaries: organisational instance; human institution versus software; requester versus independent control; governance approval versus technical administration; authority versus data use; internal escalation versus external contact; interpretation/precedent versus constitutional amendment.

DEC-100 - independent minimum control-metadata access

The organisation shall authorise in advance a separate, tightly bounded permission for its checking services to read only the minimum control information necessary to assess a request. That permission must be verifiable independently of whether the requested business action is allowed. It grants no wider access to resident, employee or other operational information. If the required permission or current control information cannot be verified, the affected action remains withheld and the uncertainty is referred for accountable handling.

The control profile identifies the checking service/identity, approving authority and instrument, organisation, permitted metadata records/fields and read operations, assessment purpose, validity/withdrawal/currentness evidence and accountable review route. A service does not obtain this permission from the business request, a model instruction or a favourable result issued by the other check. AOS-01 owns authority for the checking operation; AOS-03 owns permitted metadata use; AOS-02 preserves controlled records; AOS-05 enforces the declared access boundary. Startup and recovery must establish the advance permission/current state through an independently usable approved verification path; no unbounded bootstrap identity, data

access or outage privilege is inferred. Separately permitted service/human fallback retains its own authority and duties. Exact profile, verification mechanism and compatibility/evidence are prerequisites before dependent reliance; this direction supplies no credentials, wire schema or live operating permission.

DEC-102 - classification and configuration adequacy

Organisation-defined classifications and settings must demonstrate that they preserve AOS governing constraints before they can be relied upon. Accountable competent assessment is required before use and after material changes; authorisation alone does not establish adequacy. Missing or inadequate settings block the affected reliance and require owned resolution.

Classification considers actual effects on organisational commitments, protected information, rights, services, financial exposure and resource use, including cumulative effects; financial and resource consequences remain distinct. Settings cannot transfer permanently reserved human judgement to automation, remove mandatory reporting, manufacture data-use permission or bypass a prohibition. “Consequential” triggers the applicable controls; it does not automatically require individual human approval for every properly delegated routine action. Organisations retain responsibility for justified local values and legitimate powers. No universal threshold, duration, moral weight or permission is supplied by this decision.

The profile identifies its owner/approver and competent assessor, scope, governing constraints, chosen values/class definitions and reasons, financial/resource units and aggregation assumptions, normal/boundary/cumulative/adverse examples, assessment evidence/limitations, material-change triggers and action on missing or inadequate settings. An AI recommendation or approval record is insufficient by itself. Actual effect and applicable constraints govern assessment, not the label assigned to an operation. A smaller action cannot evade a bound by splitting related work; mandatory reporting and reserved judgement remain protected. AOS-01 owns the governing validation obligation with relevant domain/control owners; AOS-40 assesses scope-specific gate evidence; profile owners supply the actual configuration and review. Dependent effects remain withheld where required, while separately permitted service/reporting duties retain their own powers and owners.

DEC-104 - protected reporting under failure and implicated-person interference

Each mandatory protected-finding category shall have an approved reporting arrangement assessed against both technical failure and interference by implicated people. The profile shall identify the intended recipient, possible conflicts and an appropriately independent authorised alternative; an implicated person shall not be the sole gatekeeper deciding whether the required finding reaches its authorised audience.

Authority/use permissions, minimum report content, recipient verification, custody, route/change dependencies, tracking ownership, acceptance, cover and escalation are established in advance. An external route is included where justified and lawfully authorised; external reporting is not a universal default and a finding creates no extra disclosure power. Planned exercises address failed infrastructure, unavailable/implicated recipients, apparent alternatives controlled by the same implicated gatekeeper and attempted suppression. Missing adequate arrangements remain an explicit owned gap, prevent claims of operational protected-reporting assurance and withhold affected dependent reliance under existing gates; they do not create false delivery, ownership transfer or blanket shutdown of separately authorised service. Original tracking duty persists until actual scoped acceptance.

The organisation’s profile binds each required finding class to normal/alternate authorised audiences, conflict criteria/evidence and accountable assessment, disclosure basis/minimal payload, independently verifiable recipients/permissions, credentials/custody and route/reconfiguration controls, failure/compromise assumptions, tracking/cover/escalation, human fallback, evidence and review triggers. Test both infrastructure/common-dependency independence and organisational release/recipient/custody control; neither implies the other. No administrator, executive sign-off or report-validation step may silently remove a required duty. The declared threat/governance scope and residual limitations must be visible: this is not an unlimited guarantee against every holder of legal/constitutional change powers. Inadequacy returns to an empowered accountable reviewer; the reporting agent cannot invent a recipient or grant itself onward-disclosure authority.

3. Responsibilities

Table row 1
Responsibility: Governance authority
AOS-01 owns: Meaning and validation of instruments, grants, limits and reserved decisions
Other authoritative responsibility: Organisation creates lawful valid powers; AOS-30 records approved decisions

Table row 2
Responsibility: Determination
AOS-01 owns: Context-bound permission/prohibition result
Other authoritative responsibility: AOS-03 authenticates actors and determines data use; AOS-04/05 prevent dependent execution

Table row 3
Responsibility: Change
AOS-01 owns: Required approval sequence and activation conditions
Other authoritative responsibility: AOS-02 versioned records; AOS-30 approval workflow; platform implements activation

Table row 4
Responsibility: Restriction
AOS-01 owns: Suspension/revocation/reinstatement semantics
Other authoritative responsibility: Authorised people decide; AOS-04/05 enforce and AOS-13 handles affected tasks

Table row 5
Responsibility: Protected escalation
AOS-01 owns: Required classes/audiences and change protection
Other authoritative responsibility: GI/domain charters define findings; AOS-13/30 track accountable handoff; AOS-05 provides enforcement assurance

Table row 6
Responsibility: Boundary defence
AOS-01 owns: Evidence needed for Mode 1/2 and constitutional review
Other authoritative responsibility: Board judges; AOS-25 monitors; AOS-40 tests system behaviour

The project owner approves specification direction, not live powers for a future organisation. A custodian manages records only within separately conferred powers. IT administration does not imply authority to grant, expand or reinstate delegation.

3.1 Component external-research responsibility

Under DEC-086, AOS-01 has an assigned research agent/capability with a controlled profile inheriting AOS-04 v0.7 §§3.1/6.6. Its remit covers external authority/delegation and constitutional-change practices, regulatory governance expectations and authority-control incidents relevant to its own function and specification. The accountable component owner owns relevance and substantive implications. External access/source verification follows AOS-14; common evidence/profile/run/finding/disposition views follow AOS-02 v0.7 §6.6. A shared research service may execute the profile, retaining distinct remit, coverage and accountable review. Sources, jurisdictions, cadence/triggers, rubric, recipients/deadlines/cover and appointments remain profile dependencies; no activation or legal finding is claimed. Internal control/record monitoring remains separately specified.

4. Capabilities, functions and requirements

4.1 Capabilities

All IDs in this section carry prefix AOS-01.

Table row 1
CAP ID: CAP-001
Outcome: Controlled instruments and classifications
FUN IDs: FUN-001/002

Table row 2
CAP ID: CAP-002
Outcome: Current contextual authority determination
FUN IDs: FUN-003/004

Table row 3
CAP ID: CAP-003
Outcome: Protected change and activation
FUN IDs: FUN-005/006

Table row 4
CAP ID: CAP-004
Outcome: Controlled restriction and reinstatement
FUN IDs: FUN-007/008

Table row 5
CAP ID: CAP-005
Outcome: Accountable protected referral and explanation
FUN IDs: FUN-009/010

Table row 6
CAP ID: CAP-006
Outcome: Govern research delegation and candidate-change powers, including AOS-01’s own external-research remit
FUN IDs: FUN-011

4.2 Functions

Table row 1
FUN ID: FUN-001
Trigger / inputs: Proposed instrument plus approval/provenance
Behaviour and output: Validate organisation, issuer powers, exact revision and applicable constraints; admitted draft or validated approved instrument
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No self-approval; conflicting/missing authority stays unresolved

Table row 2
FUN ID: FUN-002
Trigger / inputs: Proposed action classification/Mode 1 parameter
Behaviour and output: Validate board-authorised instrument and reserved boundaries; configuration result
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No inferred threshold; invalid/unapproved configuration cannot enable affected capability

Table row 3
FUN ID: FUN-003
Trigger / inputs: Exact action request with actor/context/instruments
Behaviour and output: Evaluate explicit grant, prohibitions, conditions, reservations and current restrictions; REC-A result
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No allow from absence of prohibition; missing/conflicting material input produces unresolved

Table row 4
FUN ID: FUN-004
Trigger / inputs: Execution checkpoint or material evidence/control change

Behaviour and output: Revalidate affected action revision and current restrictions; fresh result/invalidation evidence
Authority / uncertainty / failure: Last enforceable point profile required; no instantaneous-revocation claim

Table row 5
FUN ID: FUN-005
Trigger / inputs: Proposed telos or schedule amendment
Behaviour and output: Verify required human approval sequence and exact proposed version; eligible/rejected/pending result
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No activation from analytical recommendation or draft decision

Table row 6
FUN ID: FUN-006
Trigger / inputs: Activation request for approved version
Behaviour and output: Validate effective period, compatible controls/configuration and release prerequisites; activation evidence
Authority / uncertainty / failure: Approved-but-not-active remains distinct; failed partial activation cannot claim whole-path readiness

Table row 7
FUN ID: FUN-007
Trigger / inputs: Authorised suspension/withdrawal request
Behaviour and output: Validate scope and suspender/withdrawer powers; restrict affected delegation and notify control dependencies
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No new grant; evidence/control delivery limits reported

Table row 8
FUN ID: FUN-008
Trigger / inputs: Reinstatement request
Behaviour and output: Validate approved route, current conditions and exact scope; permitted restoration or withheld result
Authority / uncertainty / failure: Restart and elapsed timeout cannot supply approval

Table row 9
FUN ID: FUN-009
Trigger / inputs: Unresolved authority or protected finding
Behaviour and output: Supply separately authorised internal referral and required audience constraints
Authority / uncertainty / failure: Cannot invent recipient; delivery is not acknowledgement; failures remain visible

Table row 10
FUN ID: FUN-010
Trigger / inputs: Constraint result or review request
Behaviour and output: Supply permitted explanation, source/version and referral route or recorded reviewed exception
Authority / uncertainty / failure: Disclosure restricted by AOS-03; exception never waives enforcement

Table row 11
FUN ID: FUN-011
Trigger / inputs: Research profile/change finding and human disposition
Behaviour and output: Validate remit/decision powers; retain candidate versus approved version and authorised response
Authority / uncertainty / failure: No authority from source publication, proposal acceptance or task configuration; current controls apply

4.3 Requirement register

All IDs below have prefix AOS-01-REQ-. Each is a proposed component obligation unless marked I (interface) or D (design constraint). Source markers S/E mean source-derived translation/engineering derivation, not approval status.

Shared metadata: origin v0.1, 5 October 2026; proposed; release whole-component logical baseline, implementation scope unapproved; owner AOS-01 component custodian (unassigned); project approver Mark; operational instruments require the organisation's board/authorised roles. Change history initial derivation. Blocking dependencies are in §§6/16/17; VER identifiers have prefix AOS-01-VER-. Parent REQs are proposed AOS-00 v0.11 wording. REQ-001-038 originated in v0.1; REQ-024 is

clarified in v0.2. REQ-039-044 originate in v0.2, 5 October, with the same proposed status and shared metadata. DEC directions retain their recorded approval standing.

Table row 1
ID: 001
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall admit an instrument as authoritative only with evidence of approval by an issuer empowered for its scope.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; RP v6 domain 8 “The agentic delegation framework is a governance document…”; REQ-025; valid source of power
FUN / dependency: 001; ISS-001/002
VER: 001

Table row 2
ID: 002
Proposed obligation: An authority instrument shall identify its organisation instance and exact effective revision.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/identity/E; AOS-00 REQ-035, REC-R01; avoid cross-instance/stale grants
FUN / dependency: 001; CON-002
VER: 001

Table row 3
ID: 003
Proposed obligation: A grant shall identify the permitted action scope, domain, context and conditions.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/delegation/S; RP8 “Agent authority is domain-specific…”; REQ-006; explicit bounds
FUN / dependency: 001/003; ISS-002
VER: 002

Table row 4
ID: 004
Proposed obligation: A delegation instrument shall identify its applicable explicit prohibitions.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/delegation/S; RP8 “Agents operate under explicitly delegated authority…”; prohibit implied exceptions
FUN / dependency: 001/003; ISS-002
VER: 002

Table row 5
ID: 005
Proposed obligation: An agent action authority result shall require an explicit applicable permission.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; RP8 same principle; REQ-006; no grant by silence
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-001
VER: 002

Table row 6
ID: 006
Proposed obligation: An authority result shall not permit an action contrary to an applicable non-waivable constraint.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-004, REQ-031; no configuration waiver
FUN / dependency: 003; ISS-002
VER: 003

Table row 7
ID: 007
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall withhold an allow result when material authority evidence is missing or inconsistent.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/E; DEC-003, REQ-007; no uncertain grant
FUN / dependency: 003; ISS-003
VER: 004

Table row 8
ID: 008
Proposed obligation: Each authority determination shall bind to the exact action revision and material context evaluated.

Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/authority/E; REC-R06, SC-R04, RP8 contextual principle; no substitution
FUN / dependency: 003/004; CON-001
VER: 005

Table row 9
ID: 009
Proposed obligation: Each allow result shall identify the accountable human role for the governing delegation.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/accountability/S; RP1 “The ‘AI said so’ test…” and RP7 audit principle; REQ-012
FUN / dependency: 003; ISS-001
VER: 001/005

Table row 10
ID: 010
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall invalidate an affected pending determination when a material change defeats its governing conditions.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/E; DEC-028/029, REC-R08; selective reassessment
FUN / dependency: 004; ISS-003/004
VER: 005/006

Table row 11
ID: 011
Proposed obligation: The authority service shall provide current determination evidence at the profile-defined last enforceable checkpoint before consequential effect.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-028, REQ-040; current permission
FUN / dependency: 004; ISS-004
VER: 006

Table row 12
ID: 012
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall not grant data-use permission by virtue of an action delegation.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: boundary/E; REQ-004/040, REC-R15; independent AOS-03 determination
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-001/004
VER: 007

Table row 13
ID: 013
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall reserve adjudication between incommensurable values to authorised humans.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; FP2; RP2 “Mode 2 is permanently human”; REQ-005
FUN / dependency: 002/003; ISS-002/005
VER: 008

Table row 14
ID: 014
Proposed obligation: A Mode 1 parameter shall require a documented board-authorised governance instrument before use.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; RP2 “Every Mode 1 boundary is a governance instrument…”; no technical appetite setting
FUN / dependency: 002; ISS-002/005
VER: 008

Table row 15
ID: 015
Proposed obligation: The action capability activation check shall require the organisation's approved consequential-action classification and evidence that it satisfies the governing-constraint adequacy assessment under DEC-102.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; DEC-021/102, REQ-049; no universal threshold
FUN / dependency: 002/006; ISS-005
VER: 008/014

Table row 16

ID: 016
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall reject delegation of the board's telos-amendment decision.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; DEC-024, REQ-045; board acting as body
FUN / dependency: 005; CON-003
VER: 009

Table row 17
ID: 017
Proposed obligation: A telos amendment shall become eligible for activation only with board-body approval of that exact amendment.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: change/S; DEC-024, REQ-045; exact human decision
FUN / dependency: 005/006; ISS-006
VER: 009

Table row 18
ID: 018
Proposed obligation: A schedule amendment shall become eligible for activation only after executive proposal, Committee review and board sign-off of the same amendment.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: change/S; DEC-025, REQ-046; protected sequence
FUN / dependency: 005/006; ISS-006
VER: 010

Table row 19
ID: 019
Proposed obligation: A grant or expansion of agent delegation shall require the formal human approval route applicable to the equivalent human delegation.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: change/S; DEC-007, REQ-025; agent powers are governance
FUN / dependency: 005; ISS-002/006
VER: 010

Table row 20
ID: 020
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall reject analytical learning or accumulated precedent as approval to amend authority.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: change/S; RP6 “Where the organisation's purpose is interpreted…”; REQ-015; no silent drift
FUN / dependency: 005; CON-003
VER: 011

Table row 21
ID: 021
Proposed obligation: The authority service shall permit temporary suspension only by a person or role authorised for that scope in the operational schedule.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: restriction/S; DEC-025, REQ-047; restriction without expansion
FUN / dependency: 007; ISS-001/007
VER: 012

Table row 22
ID: 022
Proposed obligation: A suspended delegation shall remain unusable for its affected action scope until valid reinstatement.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: restriction/E; DEC-025, REC-R20; no stale grant
FUN / dependency: 003/007/008; CON-002
VER: 006/012

Table row 23
ID: 023
Proposed obligation: Reinstatement shall require the process approved in the operational schedule.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: restriction/S; DEC-025, REQ-048; no administrator assumption
FUN / dependency: 008; ISS-007
VER: 012

Table row 24
ID: 024
Proposed obligation: Permanent withdrawal of an individual grant shall require withdrawal powers explicitly conferred by the operational schedule.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: restriction/S; DEC-043, RP8 explicit delegation; distinct from schedule amendment
FUN / dependency: 007; ISS-007
VER: 012

Table row 25
ID: 025
Proposed obligation: Authority change notification shall identify affected scope, exact version and effective restriction boundary.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/change/E; QS-12, REC-A §4 lifecycle; ordered current control
FUN / dependency: 004/007; CON-002
VER: 006/013

Table row 26
ID: 026
Proposed obligation: An unresolved authority referral shall use an independently authorised internal route.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: escalation/S; RP8 “Internal escalation…”; REQ-009/023; no invented emergency permission
FUN / dependency: 009; ISS-008
VER: 004/013

Table row 27
ID: 027
Proposed obligation: The authority profile shall identify findings with protected delivery obligations and their required audiences.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; RP8 “Certain classes of finding must reach…”; constitutional operating condition
FUN / dependency: 001/009; ISS-009
VER: 013

Table row 28
ID: 028
Proposed obligation: Ordinary administration shall not disable a protected delivery obligation outside its approved governance change route.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: protection/E; RP8 protected-finding principle; REQ-040; mechanism/threat model open
FUN / dependency: 005/009; ISS-009
VER: 013

Table row 29
ID: 029
Proposed obligation: An authority result shall explain constraint meaning, authority basis and referral route unless a recorded reviewed exception applies.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/explanation/S; DEC-027, REC-R10; legibility within disclosure controls
FUN / dependency: 010; ISS-010
VER: 015

Table row 30
ID: 030
Proposed obligation: An explanation exception shall not change the underlying permission or prohibition.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-027; no waiver through redaction
FUN / dependency: 003/010; ISS-010
VER: 015

Table row 31
ID: 031
Proposed obligation: Approval status shall remain distinguishable from activation status.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/change/E; QS-09/25, REC-A lifecycle; no draft activation
FUN / dependency: 006; CON-002/003

VER: 014

Table row 32
ID: 032
Proposed obligation: Activation shall require validation of the applicable approved organisation authority configuration.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-006, REQ-032; configured permission before capability
FUN / dependency: 006; ISS-002/004/005
VER: 014

Table row 33
ID: 033
Proposed obligation: Authority records shall preserve earlier revisions and amendment evidence under approved retention/access rules.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/evidence/E; QS-13/19, REQ-012; reconstructability without unlimited retention
FUN / dependency: 001/005/007; CON-002
VER: 016

Table row 34
ID: 034
Proposed obligation: A human decision used as authority shall identify the decision-maker's powers for the exact decision scope.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/approval/S; DEC-008, REQ-024, REC-R09; signature is not unlimited power
FUN / dependency: 001/003/005; CON-003
VER: 001/009

Table row 35
ID: 035
Proposed obligation: AOS-01 shall not accept AI observation or real-time capture of board deliberation as an authority-record input.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: D/governance/S; RP2 boardroom principle; REQ-008; post-meeting approved record only
FUN / dependency: 001; CON-003
VER: 009

Table row 36
ID: 036
Proposed obligation: A consequential repetition request shall require the approved reconciliation result before a new authority determination permits repeat.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: recovery/E; DEC-030, REC-R19; authority is not proof of no prior effect
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-004
VER: 017

Table row 37
ID: 037
Proposed obligation: AOS-01 shall supply governance review evidence for board determinations defending the Mode 2 boundary on the approved cycle.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: governance/S; RP2 “The Mode 1/Mode 2 boundary is under continuous pressure…”; no silent erosion
FUN / dependency: 002/010; ISS-005; AOS-25/30
VER: 018

Table row 38
ID: 038
Proposed obligation: A delegation affecting external contact shall reference the applicable human authorisation and resident-channel agreement where relevant.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; RP8 external-action principle; DEC-041; permission and agreement distinct
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-004; AOS-03/11/14
VER: 007/017

Table row 39
ID: 039
Proposed obligation: Agent-to-agent delegation shall require explicit permission to delegate in the originating agent’s approved

instrument.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-042; no inferred delegation
FUN / dependency: 003; ISS-002
VER: 019

Table row 40
ID: 040
Proposed obligation: A receiving agent’s authority shall be established independently within the originating delegation’s scope and restrictions.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-042; no expanded downstream powers
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-001/002
VER: 019

Table row 41
ID: 041
Proposed obligation: An agent-to-agent delegation shall retain its originating and receiving authority trail.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-042; accountable lineage
FUN / dependency: 001/003; CON-002
VER: 019

Table row 42
ID: 042
Proposed obligation: Task assignment shall not constitute transfer of authority.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-042; capability and permission distinct
FUN / dependency: 003; CON-001
VER: 019

Table row 43
ID: 043
Proposed obligation: An applicable explicit prohibition shall prevent an allow result for the affected action.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-044; prohibition cannot be ignored
FUN / dependency: 003; ISS-002
VER: 020

Table row 44
ID: 044
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall not invent instrument precedence to resolve an unresolved conflict.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: authority/S; DEC-044; refer unresolved authority under REQ-007/026
FUN / dependency: 003/009; ISS-002
VER: 020

Table row 45
ID: 045
Proposed obligation: Each component exchange shall reference the common definition, exact revision and profiles allocated to its CON in the Kernel Exchange Register.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; KXR-01/08; DEC-002/065; QS-12/21
FUN / dependency: §6.3/§19.2; AOS-02 with semantic owner; register v0.1
VER: 021/025

Table row 46
ID: 046
Proposed obligation: A receiving exchange shall reject or hold unresolved an unsupported revision unless an explicitly reviewed translation preserves required meaning and restrictions and declares accepted loss.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; KXR-02/07; DEC-065; FP4/6; RP9
FUN / dependency: §6.3/§19.2; AOS-02 with semantic owner; register v0.1
VER: 021

Table row 47

ID: 047
Proposed obligation: Reliance on a fact for a conclusion or action shall evaluate its linked assurance against the required profile for that exact fact revision and intended use.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; KXR-04; DEC-062/063; FP4/6; RP7
FUN / dependency: §6.3/§19.2; AOS-02 with semantic owner; register v0.1
VER: 022/026

Table row 48
ID: 048
Proposed obligation: An exchange acknowledgement shall identify its actually evidenced stage without implying subsequent application, human responsibility or effect.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; KXR-06; DEC-066; RP1; GT M1.13
FUN / dependency: §6.3/§19.2; AOS-02 with semantic owner; register v0.1
VER: 024

Table row 49
ID: 049
Proposed obligation: A checkpoint or later enforcement/effect record shall link to the exact original permission-evaluation revision without rewriting its original result or presenting a pending evidence link as enforcement proof.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; KXR-05; DEC-064; RP7 auditability
FUN / dependency: §6.3/§19.2; AOS-02 with semantic owner; register v0.1
VER: 023

Table row 50
ID: 050
Proposed obligation: The authority service shall supply exact current authority and restriction evidence for the operation-bound combined checkpoint.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-067; KCR-01; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 027/028

Table row 51
ID: 051
Proposed obligation: Authority activation shall remain incomplete for affected functions until every required dependency evidences compatible applied state, while effective restrictions prevent dependent permission.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-068; KCR-02; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 028

Table row 52
ID: 052
Proposed obligation: An authority change shall identify affected work and track required consumer application or an owned unresolved exception.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-069; KCR-03; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 029/030

Table row 53
ID: 053
Proposed obligation: Authority instruments for cumulative bounds shall identify approved linked-work scopes, units, values and review powers.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-070; KCR-04; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 031/032

Table row 54
ID: 054
Proposed obligation: An authority result for cumulatively bounded work shall not be treated as proof of reserved capacity.

Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-071; KCR-05; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 031

Table row 55
ID: 055
Proposed obligation: Authority reconsideration of uncertain effects shall preserve their accounting exposure until unused capacity is evidenced.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-071; KCR-06; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 032

Table row 56
ID: 056
Proposed obligation: An authority-related withheld operation shall retain its separately authorised notification and acknowledged-handoff obligation.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-071; KCR-07; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 033/034

Table row 57
ID: 057
Proposed obligation: Brake release requiring organisational power shall use the approved powers and reconciled current evidence without authorising automatic replay.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-072; KCR-08; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7/8/9
FUN / dependency: §6.4/§19.3; AOS-01-05 respective owner; Control Coordination v0.1
VER: 030/034

Table row 58
ID: 058
Proposed obligation: Authority governance shall establish advance powers for each mandatory protected-finding class’s approved normal/independent alternative reporting arrangement, assessed against technical failure and implicated-person interference without an implicated sole release gatekeeper.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-073/104; KPR-01; STD-05 CP-8/CP-8(2)/(3), IR-6/IR-8; STD-01/02/03/04 scope alignment
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.2; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 035

Table row 59
ID: 059
Proposed obligation: Advance authority for minimal failure reporting shall be bounded by scope, recipients, validity and separately permitted data use.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-074; KPR-02; STD-05 AC-6; STD-03/04 scope alignment
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 036

Table row 60
ID: 060
Proposed obligation: Authority-related protected handoff shall retain its tracking owner until explicit responsibility acceptance and preserve failed-route escalation and cover duties.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-075; KPR-03; STD-05 IR-6/IR-8; STD-01 scope alignment; AOS-specific acceptance/continuing duty
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 037

Table row 61
ID: 061
Proposed obligation: Recovery shall establish the complete current authority and withdrawal state for affected scope from authoritative

evidence before favourable reliance.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-076; KPR-04; STD-05 CP-9/CP-9(1), AU-9; STD-02/03/04 scope alignment; AOS-specific currentness/completeness
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 038

Table row 62
ID: 062
Proposed obligation: Authority recovery shall not revive withdrawn powers from a restored snapshot or treat technical restoration as permission to execute.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-077; KPR-05; STD-05 CP-10/CP-10(2)/(4)/(6); STD-01/02 scope alignment; AOS-specific current restriction/effect gate
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 039

Table row 63
ID: 063
Proposed obligation: Scoped recovery release shall require the approved powers and accepted evidence, with human acceptance for compromise or unresolved consequences where required.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: I/S; DEC-078; KPR-06; STD-05 CP-4/CP-4(4); STD-01/02 scope alignment; AOS-specific release/duty gate
FUN / dependency: §6.5/§19.4; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004
VER: 040

Table row 64
ID: 064
Proposed obligation: Research delegation shall identify the approved component profile and the permitted observe/analyse/challenge/propose powers.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: C/E; DEC-086; research has bounded powers
FUN / dependency: FUN-011; AOS-04/02 §6.6
VER: 041

Table row 65
ID: 065
Proposed obligation: Research-profile configuration shall not remove mandatory reporting duties or expand the applicable delegation.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: D/E; DEC-086/075; settings cannot rewrite authority
FUN / dependency: FUN-011/009; AOS-04/05/30
VER: 041/042

Table row 66
ID: 066
Proposed obligation: An accepted research candidate shall remain distinct from an approved amendment or authority instrument.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: D/E; DEC-086/082; acceptance is not activation
FUN / dependency: FUN-011/005/006; AOS-02/30
VER: 042

Table row 67
ID: 067
Proposed obligation: A credible urgent research implication shall be referred through the applicable separately authorised human-response route without waiting for specification amendment.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: C/E; DEC-086; response duties survive drafting delay
FUN / dependency: FUN-011/009; AOS-13/30
VER: 043

Table row 68
ID: 068
Proposed obligation: A research-derived amendment shall bind the required empowered human approval to its exact revision before controlled activation.

Category / exact derivation and rationale: C/E; DEC-086/024/025; no source-to-power shortcut
FUN / dependency: FUN-011/005/006; AOS-30/04/05
VER: 044

Table row 69
ID: 069
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall access the control metadata needed to assess a request only through a separately established, advance-authorised minimum-access permission verifiable independently of the requested business action’s outcome.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: C/I; DEC-100; independent bootstrap without implied business/data permission
FUN / dependency: CON-001/002; DEC-100 approved control profile and verification gate
VER: 045

Table row 70
ID: 070
Proposed obligation: The authority control shall withhold dependent reliance on an organisation-defined classification or setting unless accountable competent assessment before use and after material change evidences preservation of the applicable governing constraints.
Category / exact derivation and rationale: C/governance; DEC-102 approved direction; approval alone is insufficient
FUN / dependency: CON-001/002; relevant semantic/profile owners; approved adequacy method and evidence
VER: 046

5. State model

Instrument, delegation and action-determination states are distinct objects. Proposed vocabularies are logical, not an imposed database encoding. Every transition retains actor, scope, version, time/effect boundary and governing approval evidence.

Table row 1
Object / state: Instrument draft / proposed
Entry and permitted transition: New proposal; may be revised, withdrawn or submitted
Authority / evidence / expiry: No usable grant; proposal identity and source

Table row 2
Object / state: Instrument under review
Entry and permitted transition: Required reviewers considering exact version
Authority / evidence / expiry: Review is not approval; pending/no-response remains visible

Table row 3
Object / state: Approved, not active
Entry and permitted transition: Valid approval chain complete
Authority / evidence / expiry: Activation prerequisites outstanding; effective date alone is not readiness

Table row 4
Object / state: Active
Entry and permitted transition: Valid activation under applicable schedule/control configuration
Authority / evidence / expiry: Current restrictions still apply; expiry/supersession/suspension reevaluates affected grants

Table row 5
Object / state: Rejected / withdrawn / superseded
Entry and permitted transition: Recorded disposition or approved replacement
Authority / evidence / expiry: History preserved under retention; no usable new grant from old revision

Table row 6
Object / state: Delegation usable
Entry and permitted transition: Current scope/conditions and required approvals established

Authority / evidence / expiry: Each action still determined; usable is not an unrestricted token

Table row 7
Object / state: Suspended / revoked / expired
Entry and permitted transition: Valid restriction or defined expiry
Authority / evidence / expiry: No allow for affected scope; reinstatement or new grant only through approved route

Table row 8
Object / state: Determination pending / unresolved
Entry and permitted transition: Request incomplete, inconsistent or awaiting reserved decision
Authority / evidence / expiry: Dependent effect withheld; separately authorised referral

Table row 9
Object / state: Determination allow / deny
Entry and permitted transition: Exact evaluated action/current context
Authority / evidence / expiry: Allow subject to defined checkpoint/currentness; deny conveys prohibition/referral

Table row 10
Object / state: Determination invalidated / consumed / expired
Entry and permitted transition: Material change, profile-defined consumption or expiry
Authority / evidence / expiry: New current determination required; repeat also needs reconciliation

No universal validity period, timeout or one-use grant convention is selected. An applicable explicit prohibition prevents execution. Conflicting effective instruments unresolved by approved precedence produce unresolved authority and an authorised human referral. AOS-01 does not invent “latest wins” or a general exception hierarchy.

6. Semantic contracts and interfaces

6.1 Contract catalogue

CON IDs have prefix AOS-01. CON-001 preserves AOS-01-IF-001; CON-002 maps to existing AOS-01-IF-002 - Policy amendment and activation. CON-002 also carries related instrument/current-state/restriction views; this mapping does not make every view a separate IF. CON-003 uses AOS-30-IF-001 human-decision evidence; CON-004 participates in AOS-13-IF-001 escalation and REC-D/REC-X companion records. Exact view/schema adoption remains open.

Table row 1
Contract: CON-001 / IF-001
Purpose / owner: Authority determination; AOS-01 semantics
Producer → consumer: Authority control → AOS-04/05/13/14 and requesting components
Minimum meaning / shared definition: Exact action/request/actor/context, organisation, instruments, restrictions, allow/deny/unresolved, limitations, checkpoint and explanation; Core Records REC-A

Table row 2
Contract: CON-002 / AOS-01-IF-002
Purpose / owner: Instrument/current-state/change exchange; AOS-01 semantics, AOS-02 common structure
Producer → consumer: Governance/authority records → controls, executors, review
Minimum meaning / shared definition: Exact revision, approval/effective status, restriction scope, supersession and notification evidence; Shared Contracts §4.6 AOS-01-IF-002 policy amendment/activation, plus related REC-A instrument/current-state references; exact view adoption open

Table row 3
Contract: CON-003
Purpose / owner: Human approval/amendment record; AOS-30 authoritative decision process

Producer → consumer: Authorised human decision workflow → AOS-01
Minimum meaning / shared definition: Exact proposal, empowered decision-maker/body, sequence, rationale/conditions and approved post-meeting record; current AOS-30/DEC-103 distinguishes decision validity/evidence, record authentication, minutes approval and execution permission; parent debrief/activation contracts

Table row 4
Contract: CON-004
Purpose / owner: Referral and execution/reconciliation dependency; relevant shared semantic owners
Producer → consumer: AOS-01 ↔ AOS-03/04/13/14/30
Minimum meaning / shared definition: Separately permitted internal route, recipient/accountability, data-use and applicable channel agreement, execution effect/reconciliation evidence; REC-D/REC-X and escalation brief

AOS-02 owns common record structures; each semantic owner owns meaning. Every participant adopts the same controlled definition. This draft allocates AOS-01 obligations; it does not declare the other component interfaces fully adopted.

6.2 Common interface rules and blockers

Inputs identify exact supported schema/revision, organisation, actor/principal, action/target/payload/context and policy revisions. Missing mandatory scope or unresolved units/condition operators is invalid/unresolved, never an inferred broad grant. Outputs preserve status, limitations, reason and applicable current-control evidence.

Time values preserve source precision and clock context. Monetary/quantity limits use approved units and ranges, not bare numbers. Identity formats, comparison/operator vocabularies, permissible ranges, freshness and response intervals are unresolved commissioning/schema settings in ISS-003/004/005.

Acknowledgement of record admission, notification delivery, control application and human responsibility are different events. Same request identity/content permits deduplicated handling under the contract; materially different content under the same identity is a conflict. Deduplication does not allow reuse of an expired or invalidated grant.

Ordering uses explicit revision/effective scope, not receipt order alone. Notifications may be late/out of order; consumers re-establish current state. Retry does not extend validity or widen permission. Restriction propagation has an approved enforceable boundary and evidence; no global instantaneous revocation guarantee.

Request retries, notification reconciliation and failure response follow approved profiles. AOS-01 unavailability returns unavailable/unresolved rather than allow. Required evidence unavailable blocks dependent effect unless a separately approved fallback supplies valid controls. CON-004 cannot resolve unknown execution by assuming failure.

6.3 Reciprocal common-definition adoption, 6 October 2026

AOS-01 adopts Kernel Exchange Register v0.1 (aos-kernel-exchange-register-v0-1.md) §§3-6 at revision 0.1, Core Record Contracts v0.2 and Shared Contracts v0.2 as its single proposed logical definitions. Each local CON retains its identifier and purpose; the register §6 names every produced/consumed family and reciprocal kernel end. No alternative local fields override them. Producers name exact revisions/profiles; receivers validate matching meaning, authorised access and compatibility. Proposed AOS-03-IF-001/REC-D and AOS-04-IF-001/REC-X are catalogue allocations, not schema approval. Required acknowledgement stages and rejection/partial/unresolved responses follow KX-21; actual effect remains REC-X.

DEC-062-066 are approved detailed directions. Organisation role appointments, vocabulary/threshold/unit profiles, executable wire schemas, current-control/propagation and recovery mechanisms, and non-kernel endpoint adoption remain explicit dependencies. Earlier §6 descriptions of pending schema work are resolved only at this common logical level; commissioning and build evidence remain open.

6.4 Action-3 reciprocal coordination adoption

AOS-01 adopts Kernel Control Coordination v0.1 (aos-kernel-control-coordination-v0-1.md) §§2-10, Kernel Exchange Register v0.2 and Core/Shared v0.3 as the single proposed logical checkpoint/activation/change/account/reservation/withholding/resume definitions. Original CON IDs remain stable; Register §10 and Control Coordination §9 extend their common family views. Existing §6.3/§19.2 versions identify action-2 history; current declared definition revisions use Register v0.2 §4/§10, never an inferred version conversion.

AOS-01 supplies current authority/restrictions and powers; AOS-03 supplies identity/use/basis/consent; AOS-04 supplies exact task/effect/grouping/demand; AOS-05 gates actual effects and maintains authoritative account/reservation/applied state; AOS-02 supplies common dependency/assurance/account evidence. KX-24 ACC and KX-25 RSV are produced authoritatively by AOS-05 and consumed by AOS-01/02/03/04/05 only within permitted scope; KX-26 WHD is a continuing-duty view from service/execution workflow with AOS-05 blocker evidence, not an automatic notification exemption. Exact dependent CON allocation is the annex §9 table.

Every relevant change tracks receiving application or a reasoned no-material-dependency/owned unresolved result. Withholding creates an accountable separately authorised notification, human responsibility acknowledgement/cover/escalation, traceable coalescing and appropriate resident workflow update through resident-agreed channels. If delivery fails, the duty remains owned. Acknowledged handoff is not service completion. Independent reporting route/current recovered-state proof remain action 4; no claim of delivery capacity here.

6.5 Action-4 protected reporting and recovery adoption

AOS-01 adopts Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1 (aos-kernel-protected-reporting-and-recovery-v0-1.md) §§2-8 as the single proposed logical specification under approved DEC-073-078. Current baseline: AOS-00/Map v0.18; AOS-01-05 v0.6; Core/Shared v0.4; Exchange Register v0.3; Control Coordination v0.2. Existing CON/IF identifiers remain; AOS-01-CON-001/002/003/004 consume/produce the annex §5 views. KX-19 protected finding, KX-20 recovery and KX-26 continuing duty use their newly declared revisions in Register v0.3. Older action-2/3 declarations remain historical and require explicit reviewed compatibility, never automatic conversion.

The common envelope, REC-E/A/D/X/Q and CHECK/ACT/CHG/ACC/RSV/WHD remain distinct. Protected reporting adds separately approved route/permission/recipient/custody and human responsibility evidence; recovery adds authoritative currentness/completeness, isolation/reconciliation and scoped empowered release. Custody, technical receipt, system availability and accepted responsibility are different results. Operational role appointments, deadlines, accepted source mechanisms and actual fallbacks remain commissioning dependencies with no invented default.

Annex §7 records dated primary standards references and per-rule provenance. STD-05 control principles are design sources; ISO references are verified edition/scope alignments pending licensed clause verification. AOS approval is not ISO conformance or certification. AOS-specific no-revival, uncertainty retention, agreed resident channels and acknowledged continuing duty are expressly distinguished from standard-derived principles.

6.6 Research powers and change evidence

Existing CON-001/002/003/004 carry research authority, candidate-change/activation, human decision and handoff meanings; no new IF is allocated. All participants reference AOS-02 v0.7 §6.6 supporting views and AOS-04-CON-009 common behaviour/profile contract. Component owners define substantive research remits; AOS-01 validates applicable powers rather than interpreting every external development. Accepted/rejected/deferred/unresolved research dispositions preserve exact finding and decision revisions. Acceptance for drafting, amendment approval, release approval, actual application and outcome closure remain separate; normal instrument/compatibility/revocation rules apply. Live compliance concerns route to empowered reviewers; source verification is not adoption or authority.

6.7 AOS-30 decision-record participation - 7 October 2026

Under DEC-103 and current AOS-30 §§5/6.2/10.3, decision validity/effective time, record authentication/evidence, minutes approval and permission to execute are distinct. Reliance uses sufficient attributable evidence assessed under the actual organisation’s legal form, instruments and approved evidence policy; a valid decision may precede minutes approval. A Chair-authenticated record or extract may be evidence through an authorised route, but no signature, draft or extract alone creates decision authority or resolves conflicting evidence. No universal second approval of exact decision wording is imposed where applicable arrangements do not require it. Minute-taker drafting and Company Secretary stewardship remain distinct; non-board decisions use their applicable empowered route. Current authority/data-use/conditions and observed effects remain separate. Missing or disputed sufficient evidence blocks affected automated reliance for accountable resolution, not a declaration of legal invalidity.

CON-003 consumes this exact approval meaning; CON-002 activation remains separately evidenced. No executable schema change is made; the existing logical KX-06 v0.3 meaning is explicitly adopted. Existing REQ/VER identifiers and proposed/planned statuses are preserved.

7. Authority and decision boundaries

Board-authorised Mode 1 parameters govern routine operation. Organisations define their consequential-action boundary, but cannot automate Mode 2 adjudication or waive founding constraints. Some consequential execution may be explicitly delegated; a consequential classification is not identical to a permanent Mode 2 designation.

Telos amendment is approved only by the board acting as a body and cannot be delegated. Schedule amendment, including grants/expansion within that instrument, requires executive proposal, AI/Governance/Ethics Committee review and board sign-off. This specification records that chosen architecture; future commissioning must establish valid organisational instruments and bodies rather than assume their existence.

An operational schedule may authorise immediate temporary suspension. That reduction is not permission expansion. Reinstatement follows its approved schedule route. Under DEC-043, permanent withdrawal of an individual grant requires explicit operational-schedule withdrawal powers; changing the schedule itself, including a class of authority, retains the formal amendment sequence. Withdrawal cannot be undone by technical restart or administrator action. Any future restoration requires an explicitly approved governance route; no new restoration power is inferred.

Under DEC-042, agent-to-agent delegation requires explicit permission in the originating instrument and separate establishment of the recipient’s authority within the originating scope/restrictions, with lineage retained. A task assignment transfers no permission. This does not introduce a federated identity system or authorise cross-organisation delegation.

Under DEC-044, applicable explicit prohibitions prevent execution. Unresolved instrument conflict withholds the affected action and is referred to an authorised human; neither model nor administrator may invent precedence. Detailed schema, approved precedence encoding and operational withdrawal procedures remain open, while these general directions are settled.

AI analysis may surface conflicts and recommend options. It cannot grant itself powers, adjudicate incommensurable values, approve a constitutional amendment, treat revealed preferences as authority or regard developer policy as the organisation's delegation instrument.

Welfare/consent tension requires explicit board-level determination and valid AOS-03 processing rules; neither welfare priority nor a consent override is invented here. Resident-agreed communication channels are a separate prerequisite from authority, and do not by themselves supply a processing basis.

Human powers are also bounded. A purported authorised instruction that conflicts with non-waivable core conditions cannot enable the prohibited effect. Questions of institutional authority/legality are referred to the appropriate humans and professional owners, not resolved by model inference.

8. Reasoning principles applied

8.1 FP v4 applicability

Table row 1
FP: 1 Telos, conferred purpose, function
Component application / limitation: §§1/7, REQ-016-020; software cannot confer purpose

Table row 2
FP: 2 Mode 2 permanently human
Component application / limitation: REQ-013/037; human judgement quality cannot be proved by signature

Table row 3
FP: 3 Architectural integrity
Component application / limitation: REQ-006/028/032; separate control from AI interpretation

Table row 4
FP: 4 Radical transparency
Component application / limitation: REQ-029/033; disclosure remains governed

Table row 5
FP: 5 Structural imperfection
Component application / limitation: §§5/11/13; outages, conflict and partial activation explicitly handled

Table row 6
FP: 6 Epistemic humility
Component application / limitation: REQ-007/010; no uncertain grant

Table row 7
FP: 7 No-exit obligation
Component application / limitation: REQ-038 with AOS-11/03; resident silence supplies no permission; lived experience assessment belongs elsewhere

Table row 8
FP: 8 Constitutional mediator
Component application / limitation: REQ-016-019/034; board-body powers protected; institutional conduct needs human assessment

Table row 9
FP: 9 Compliance as consequence
Component application / limitation: Principle-first derivation; verified legal mapping remains AOS-03/21/40 work

Table row 10
FP: 10 Complexity and emergence
Component application / limitation: §15 contrasting/interaction cases; AOS-25/40 monitor aggregate drift

8.2 RP v6 applicability by controlled domain and locator

Table row 1
RP locator: Domain 1: “Every governance process must close…”; “Every human accountability layer…”; “The ‘AI said so’ test…”
Application and coverage: REQ-009/026 and AOS-13/30 handoff/outcome dependencies; delivery alone insufficient

Table row 2
RP locator: Domain 1 option-set principle; domain 4 real-state/options/feedback/revealed-preference principles

Application and coverage: AOS-22/30 own option preparation and debrief; AOS-01 consumes approved records without treating inference/preferences as grants; REQ-020/034

Table row 3
RP locator: Domain 2, all four commitments
Application and coverage: REQ-013/014/035/037; parameters governed, deliberation unobserved, permanent boundary actively defended

Table row 4
RP locator: Domain 3 1+5 placement, risk intrinsic and cross-layer handoff
Application and coverage: §3; REQ-026-028; no extra intelligence or GI enforcement monopoly

Table row 5
RP locator: Domain 3 Golden Thread
Application and coverage: Building-safety delegation accountability context; information quality/verified obligations owned by AOS-10/03/40, not established by AOS-01

Table row 6
RP locator: Domain 5 blind spots/perimeter/emergent effects
Application and coverage: §11/15/17; authority-coverage gaps explicit; monitoring primarily AOS-14/25/40

Table row 7
RP locator: Domain 6 ethics/purpose/equity/no-exit/compliance
Application and coverage: §§1/7/9/15; require governed purpose/authority rather than optimisation-created power; ethical outcomes need institutional review

Table row 8
RP locator: Domain 6 welfare-consent hierarchy
Application and coverage: §7, ISS-011; board determination and AOS-03 validation required; no default override

Table row 9
RP locator: Domain 6 telos/function and accumulating precedent
Application and coverage: REQ-016-020; learned interpretation not constitutional approval; AOS-25/30 independent review retained

Table row 10
RP locator: Domain 6 developer frameworks
Application and coverage: §13/16; provider capability/policy cannot confer delegation; assessment/monitoring owned with AOS-04/25/30

Table row 11
RP locator: Domain 7 all three transparency commitments
Application and coverage: REQ-009/029/033; reconstructable evidence, explicit uncertainty, no private chain-of-thought

Table row 12
RP locator: Domain 8 all seven delegation commitments
Application and coverage: REQ-001/003-012/018-028/038; explicit contextual permission, human authorisation, governed change, purpose/audit and protected audience

Table row 13
RP locator: Domain 9 all four purpose/sensing commitments
Application and coverage: REQ-012/038; AOS-03 data-use controls cannot be bypassed by authority; no behavioural-inference exception invented

This is an applicability assessment, not a claim that AOS-01 fully implements every source obligation. Component/source traceability must link complementary responsibilities in AOS-02-05/10-14/20-25/30/40; unresolved allocation is retained in ISS-012.

8.3 GT applicability

Table row 1
GT tests: M1.1/7/8/10/11/13
AOS-01 evidence contribution / other owner: Purpose-bound instruments; current delegations; accountable actions; interaction boundaries; review history

Table row 2
GT tests: M1.2/3/5/6/9/14
AOS-01 evidence contribution / other owner: Supplies authority/accountability context; sensing, risk, performance, legal assurance, value-for-money and Golden Thread evidence owned elsewhere

Table row 3
GT tests: M1.4/12
AOS-01 evidence contribution / other owner: Board capability/self-assessment are institutional review matters; AOS-01 does not certify them

Table row 4
GT tests: M2.1/3/4/8/9/10/12/13/14/15
AOS-01 evidence contribution / other owner: Supports values/reservation/brake/explanation/change evidence and provider governance dependencies; substantive judgements remain human

Table row 5
GT tests: M2.2/5/6/7/11
AOS-01 evidence contribution / other owner: Coherence under pressure, independence, legitimacy, no-exit and collective judgement require human/longitudinal assessment; no automated pass claim

All 29 tests are accounted for at applicability level. No GT test is reported passed; there is no route to AI observation of deliberation to obtain Mode 2 assessment evidence.

9. Data, privacy and disclosure

Component purposes: establish current authority, validate/activate governed changes, maintain restrictions, explain outcomes and supply review/audit evidence. Data comprises instruments, identities/roles via AOS-03, action/context references, approval/effective history, limits and conditions, determinations, restriction events and referral evidence.

Keep source facts, interpretations, proposed instruments, approved decisions and actual effects distinct. Use governed references/projections rather than copying sensitive case files into all authority records. Access is by approved purpose/role; retention, deletion, disclosure and correction are AOS-02/03 profile responsibilities with ISS-010/011 prerequisites.

Role appointment changes can invalidate authority; preserve the decision-maker's powers at decision time rather than infer them from current job title. Historical evidence is not unlimited retention permission. AOS-01 does not derive behavioural/health/performance inferences merely because case information is accessible.

Resident communication requires the applicable agreed channel(s); when agreement/channel availability is unresolved, AOS-11/13 use the approved human route and do not silently substitute an unagreed channel. Exact agreement fields and selection/combination rules remain in the shared profile adoption work.

10. Behaviour and workflows

10.1 Determine authority

Exact request → authenticate identity/principal via AOS-03 → obtain current organisation instruments → evaluate explicit permission/prohibitions/reservations/conditions → obtain data-use dependency → record allow/deny/unresolved with evidence → executor rechecks at defined checkpoint → capture actual effect → return outcome to AOS-02/13/30/25.

A changed payload, recipient, policy, role or material fact reassesses dependent permission. Unrelated permitted actions continue. Referral uses separate explicit authority. An allow result cannot eliminate other execution prerequisites.

10.2 Change and activate

Proposal → exact revision and cross-component impact → applicable human sequence → approved human record → validate compatibility/current configuration → activate under approved conditions → evidence control application → monitor/review outcome.

Changing the proposal materially requires the applicable reviews/sign-off for the changed version, not a mixture of approvals for different proposals. If activation succeeds on only some paths, show those paths and restrict dependent capability rather than report complete activation.

10.3 Restrict and restore

Restriction trigger → validate suspender/withdrawer powers → record scope/effective boundary → controls apply restriction → notify/reconcile affected pending work → authorised review and recorded disposition → approved reinstatement or new grant if justified.

No restart, expiry of an incident timer or operator convenience restores permission. Already irreversible effects remain historical; authorised follow-up assesses impact. Required audience escalation cannot be silently disabled through ordinary configuration.

10.6 Combined control coordination

For effects, activation, material changes, concurrent reservations, withholding and resumption, apply the common protocol in Control Coordination v0.1 §§3-8. Denial or missing current controls/accounting withholds dependent work; actual application and responsibility are separately evidenced. Timeouts/cancellations do not establish no prior effect or release uncertain capacity. Numeric/profile/role selections remain commissioning dependencies.

10.7 Protected reporting and controlled recovery

Apply Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1 §§3-4: withhold dependent effects, attempt only permitted reporting, retain original tracking owner until accepted handoff and preserve unresolved failure duties. Restore in isolation; prove required authoritative current state and complete material changes, apply current dispositions and reconcile effects/reservations. Only scoped accepted release can restore operation, followed by fresh current CHECK and capacity admission; no automatic queue replay. Unaffected release requires evidence of no material dependency, not mere absence of a known incident.

10.8 External research, disposition and amendment

Approved component research profile and exact baseline → permitted external retrieval through AOS-14 → source/provenance/date/applicability evidence → component assessment of relevance and affected requirements/functions/contracts → finding or bounded no-material-finding/coverage-gap result → authorised recipient and

accountable handoff → recorded human disposition → controlled change candidate if accepted → required approval, verification, compatible activation and outcome follow-up. Urgent operational/legal/safety implications use their separately authorised response route while specification change remains pending; a research finding supplies no emergency power. One retrieved source may feed several permitted component assessments; each preserves its own implications, review duties and disposition.

11. Failure, escalation and recovery

Table row 1
Condition: Missing/expired/conflicting instrument
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Unresolved/deny as applicable; withhold dependent effect; authorised referral

Table row 2
Condition: Identity or data-use control unavailable
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: No allow-to-execute implication; AOS-03/04/05 supply withholding evidence

Table row 3
Condition: Restriction notification late/out of order
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Resolve current governing state at checkpoint; scope/version/effect boundary evidenced

Table row 4
Condition: Approval source inconsistent or wrong body
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Reject eligibility; retain proposal and diagnostic; no generated approval

Table row 5
Condition: Human reviewer unavailable
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Pending unresolved decision; AOS-13/30 approved deadlines/cover/referral; no automated substitute

Table row 6
Condition: Protected finding suppressed
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Record violation and authorised incident route; independent enforcement tests; no claim of invulnerability

Table row 7
Condition: Partial activation or control outage
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Dependent path remains inactive/unavailable; authorised fallback; no silent bypass

Table row 8
Condition: Execution outcome unknown
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: AOS-04/13/14 reconcile before consequential repeat; new current determination alone cannot prove no prior effect

Table row 9
Condition: Backup/rollback restores old policy
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Re-establish current restrictions; rollback cannot resurrect withdrawn powers

Table row 10
Condition: Urgent welfare/safety concern
Required design behaviour / dependent owner: Separately delegated internal route; defined human duty; no inferred data-use override or emergency grant

Local containment preserves independently permitted activity. Exact fallback capacity, deadlines and control availability must be commissioned; this draft does not promise continuous service.

12. Evidence, provenance and audit

Reconstruct: trigger and exact request → accessible source/context → actor/principal/accountable role → applicable authority/versions → applied rule/result/limitations → human decision where required → checkpoint → execution/outcome → intervention → disposition.

Record contemporaneous inputs, rule versions, outputs and approved human rationale. Do not demand private model chain-of-thought or reconstruct history from generated explanations. AOS-02 owns stored common evidence; AOS-01 semantic obligations are REQ-008/009/025/029/033/034. External/affected audiences receive permitted explanations/projections, not unrestricted underlying material.

Include proposal approvals and rejections, version sequence, restrictions, failed changes, partial activation and configuration-access attempts. Audit access and evidence lifecycle are independently governed. Retention/deletion conflicts require a resolved profile, not an assumption that audit wins.

13. Security and operational requirements

Authority enforcement must not depend solely on a requesting model following instructions. AOS-04/05 implement the defined independent control boundary and attempted-bypass protection; this specification determines what they enforce. The threat model covers malicious requester, misconfigured administrator, stale replica, action substitution, compromised approval input, role confusion, cross-instance leakage and restored old state.

Separate authority approval and technical configuration powers according to approved organisation role constraints; exact segregation and control mechanisms remain ISS-001/004/009. No unsourced universal dual-key requirement or named product is introduced.

Decision response, restriction propagation, clock tolerance, availability, evidence durability and recovery targets require operating conditions, accountable owners and approved values. Absent values block affected readiness. Accessibility applies to human approvals/explanations/handoffs; commissioning must establish formats and human capacity with AOS-30/05.

AI may assist interpretation or conflict detection under AOS-20-25 evaluation controls. It cannot be the only mechanism that verifies issuer powers or issues permission. Unknown policy wording/ambiguous conditions require human resolution; a model confidence score is not authorisation.

14. Invariants

INV identifiers have prefix AOS-01; each is explanatory restatement of the listed proposed REQ obligations, not an additional hidden requirement.

Table row 1
INV: INV-001
Statement: No explicit current applicable permission, no dependent agent effect
REQ / VER: 005/007/011; 002/004/006

Table row 2
INV: INV-002
Statement: Mode 2 adjudication is never delegated to software
REQ / VER: 013/037; 008/018

Table row 3
INV: INV-003
Statement: Technical access cannot amend constitutional authority
REQ / VER: 016-020; 009-011

Table row 4
INV: INV-004
Statement: Suspension survives restart until valid restoration
REQ / VER: 022/023; 006/012

Table row 5
INV: INV-005
Statement: Action permission does not supply data-use permission
REQ / VER: 012/038; 007

Table row 6
INV: INV-006
Statement: Protected finding obligations cannot be removed by ordinary configuration
REQ / VER: 027/028; 013

Table row 7
INV: INV-007
Statement: Approval and activation are distinct
REQ / VER: 031/032; 014

Table row 8
INV: INV-008
Statement: No unknown-effect repetition authorised as though the first action failed
REQ / VER: 036; 017

Table row 9
INV: INV-009
Statement: Research-profile approval and proposal acceptance do not confer amendment authority
REQ / VER: 064-066/068; 041/042/044

15. Conformance and acceptance

15.1 Conformance criteria

CR identifiers have prefix AOS-01. All are proposed; satisfying software cases alone does not establish sound institutional governance.

Table row 1
CR: CR-001
Claim that requires evidence: Contextual explicit delegation and current controls implemented
REQs / evidence: 001-012/025/038-044; VER-001-007/019/020

Table row 2
CR: CR-002
Claim that requires evidence: Human/constitutional boundaries protected
REQs / evidence: 013-020/034/035/037; VER-008-011/018

Table row 3
CR: CR-003
Claim that requires evidence: Restriction and protected referral function under failures
REQs / evidence: 021-028/036; VER-012/013/017

Table row 4
CR: CR-004
Claim that requires evidence: Explanation, records and activation are controlled
REQs / evidence: 029-033; VER-014-016

Table row 5
CR: CR-005
Claim that requires evidence: Component logic withstands contrasting process scenarios
REQs / evidence: Whole relevant allocation; VER-017-020 plus matrix below

Explicit conformance navigation - 29 October 2026

This index completes the documentary navigation from every retained kernel requirement to its proposed conformance criterion and its existing planned case(s). It neither adds a requirement nor claims that a case was executed or that its coverage is adequate. CR-EXCHANGE, CR-COORDINATION, CR-CONTINUITY and CR-RESEARCH below are derived grouping labels local to this component, not new system obligations. Original numbered CR claims remain applicable with their stated scope and limitations. Exact requirement text in §4.3 and case definitions in §15 remain authoritative.

Table row 1
Derived criterion: CR-EXCHANGE
Existing obligation family / derivation: Common definition/revision, compatibility, assurance and staged evidence adoption; existing §19.2 allocation.

Table row 2
Derived criterion: CR-COORDINATION
Existing obligation family / derivation: Current checkpoint, compatible activation, change propagation, cumulative accounting and owned withholding/resumption; existing §19.3 allocation.

Table row 3
Derived criterion: CR-CONTINUITY
Existing obligation family / derivation: Protected reporting, accepted human duty and current-state recovery/release; existing §19.4 allocation.

Table row 4
Derived criterion: CR-RESEARCH
Existing obligation family / derivation: Controlled research, evidence/coverage, human review and separate amendment authority; existing research requirements and their allocation.

CR-CONFIGURATION: proposed classification/configuration adequacy claim derived from REQ-070; no additional obligation beyond that requirement.

CR-BOOTSTRAP: the checking service’s own minimum metadata permission is independently established, bounded and current under DEC-100; evidence is assessed through REQ-069 and its planned case.

Table row 1
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-001
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-001
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 2
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-002

Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-001
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 3
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-003
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-002
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 4
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-004
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-002
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 5
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-005
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-002
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 6
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-006
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-003
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 7
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-007
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-004
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 8
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-008
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-005
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 9
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-009
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-001, AOS-01-VER-005
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 10
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-010
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-005, AOS-01-VER-006

Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 11
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-011
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-006
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 12
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-012
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-007
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 13
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-013
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-008
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 14
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-014
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-008
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 15
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-015
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-008, AOS-01-VER-014
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 16
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-016
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-009
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 17
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-017
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-009
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 18
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-018
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-010
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 19
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-019
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-010
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 20
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-020
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-011
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 21
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-021
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-012
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 22
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-022
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-006, AOS-01-VER-012
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 23
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-023
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-012
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 24
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-024
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-012
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 25
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-025
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-006, AOS-01-VER-013
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 26
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-026
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-004, AOS-01-VER-013
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 27

Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-027
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-013
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 28
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-028
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-013
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 29
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-029
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-004
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-015
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 30
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-030
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-004
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-015
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 31
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-031
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-004
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-014
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 32
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-032
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-004
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-014
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 33
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-033
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-004
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-016
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 34
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-034
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-001, AOS-01-VER-009
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 35
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-035
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002

Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-009
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 36
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-036
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-003
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-017
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 37
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-037
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-002
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-018
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 38
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-038
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-007, AOS-01-VER-017
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 39
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-039
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-019
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 40
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-040
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-019
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 41
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-041
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-019
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 42
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-042
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-019
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 43
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-043
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-020
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked

case(s).

Table row 44
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-044
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-001
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-020
Derivation / applicability: Explicit allocation to the existing numbered claim in §15.1; assess the unchanged requirement through its linked case(s).

Table row 45
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-045
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-EXCHANGE
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-021, AOS-01-VER-025
Derivation / applicability: Existing common exchange and assurance/evidence obligation.

Table row 46
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-046
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-EXCHANGE
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-021
Derivation / applicability: Existing common exchange and assurance/evidence obligation.

Table row 47
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-047
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-EXCHANGE
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-022, AOS-01-VER-026
Derivation / applicability: Existing common exchange and assurance/evidence obligation.

Table row 48
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-048
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-EXCHANGE
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-024
Derivation / applicability: Existing common exchange and assurance/evidence obligation.

Table row 49
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-049
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-EXCHANGE
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-023
Derivation / applicability: Existing common exchange and assurance/evidence obligation.

Table row 50
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-050
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-027, AOS-01-VER-028
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 51
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-051
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-028
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 52
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-052
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-029, AOS-01-VER-030
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 53

Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-053
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-031, AOS-01-VER-032
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 54
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-054
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-031
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 55
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-055
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-032
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 56
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-056
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-033, AOS-01-VER-034
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 57
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-057
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-COORDINATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-030, AOS-01-VER-034
Derivation / applicability: Existing coordinated current-control/effect/duty obligation.

Table row 58
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-058
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-035
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 59
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-059
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-036
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 60
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-060
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-037
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 61
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-061
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-038
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 62
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-062
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-039
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 63
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-063
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONTINUITY
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-040
Derivation / applicability: Existing protected-reporting, handoff or recovery obligation.

Table row 64
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-064
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-RESEARCH
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-041
Derivation / applicability: Existing research obligation; assessment remains distinct from amendment/activation.

Table row 65
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-065
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-RESEARCH
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-041, AOS-01-VER-042
Derivation / applicability: Existing research obligation; assessment remains distinct from amendment/activation.

Table row 66
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-066
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-RESEARCH
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-042
Derivation / applicability: Existing research obligation; assessment remains distinct from amendment/activation.

Table row 67
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-067
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-RESEARCH
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-043
Derivation / applicability: Existing research obligation; assessment remains distinct from amendment/activation.

Table row 68
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-068
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-RESEARCH
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-044
Derivation / applicability: Existing research obligation; assessment remains distinct from amendment/activation.

Table row 69
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-069
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-BOOTSTRAP
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-045
Derivation / applicability: DEC-100 approved direction; independently verifiable advance permission for the checking service itself.

Table row 70
Requirement: AOS-01-REQ-070
Proposed criterion (AOS-01 prefix): CR-CONFIGURATION
Existing planned case(s): AOS-01-VER-046
Derivation / applicability: DEC-102 approved direction; accountable evidence that classification/settings preserve governing constraints.

15.2 Planned verification register

All cases use prefix AOS-01-VER- and are planned, not executed. Shared preconditions: fixed document/contract/profile manifest; synthetic identities/instruments; approved fixture values; isolated test environment; no live external effects. Missing prerequisites yield not assessed. Inspect every relevant authority path/record, not an undisclosed sample.

Each row defines input/steps and expected result/evidence. Method is inspection plus test/demonstration where executable. Assessor: appointed AOS-40 authority/security reviewer for controls, organisation governance reviewer for institutional powers, privacy reviewer for data-use boundary; appointments unresolved. Human judgement quality requires a separately defined review rubric and longitudinal assessment.

Table row 1
VER: 001
REQs: 001/002/009/034
Procedure / representative inputs: Submit authentic-looking approval by wrong role/body, another instance, then valid exact record
Expected result and retained evidence: Invalid powers/scope not admitted as authority; validated decision and historical role powers linked

Table row 2
VER: 002
REQs: 003-005
Procedure / representative inputs: Same action across allowed/prohibited/missing-permission domains and conditions
Expected result and retained evidence: Explicit scope respected; no inferred grant; instrument and request revisions recorded

Table row 3
VER: 003
REQs: 006
Procedure / representative inputs: Submit purported human-approved waiver of foundational prohibition
Expected result and retained evidence: Prohibited grant rejected; reason/core source recorded; no activation

Table row 4
VER: 004
REQs: 007/026
Procedure / representative inputs: Remove/conflict authority evidence; include independently permitted referral
Expected result and retained evidence: Dependent action withheld; authorised internal referral possible; absence of route remains unresolved

Table row 5
VER: 005
REQs: 008-010
Procedure / representative inputs: Mutate target/payload/role/material evidence after allow; include unrelated work
Expected result and retained evidence: Original allow cannot cover changed action; affected work reassessed; independently permitted work preserved

Table row 6
VER: 006
REQs: 010/011/022/025
Procedure / representative inputs: Apply suspension before checkpoint, late notification, in-flight irreversible action and restart
Expected result and retained evidence: Enforceable prevention evidenced; race limitations/effects recorded; no promise of instant reversal; stale/restarted grant rejected

Table row 7
VER: 007
REQs: 012/038
Procedure / representative inputs: Authority allow with denied data use or missing resident channel agreement; then separately valid prerequisites
Expected result and retained evidence: No dependent execution from authority alone; exact permitted audience/channel controls recorded

Table row 8
VER: 008
REQs: 013-015
Procedure / representative inputs: Routine parameter, unapproved consequential class and incommensurable-values request
Expected result and retained evidence: Board-authorised Mode 1 only; unapproved capability inactive; Mode 2 referred to empowered

humans

Table row 9
VER: 009
REQs: 016/017/034/035
Procedure / representative inputs: Individual approves telos change; board approves exact change; attempt live boardroom input
Expected result and retained evidence: Individual/delegated approval rejected; board-body record eligibility preserved; live capture rejected

Table row 10
VER: 010
REQs: 018/019
Procedure / representative inputs: Omit/reorder executive/Committee/board stage; mismatch revisions; attempt agent expansion by admin
Expected result and retained evidence: Amendment remains ineligible until exact required sequence; formal equivalent approval required

Table row 11
VER: 011
REQs: 020
Procedure / representative inputs: Use repeated precedents/model learning as grant or constitutional amendment
Expected result and retained evidence: No activation without required human approval; analytical evidence remains distinct

Table row 12
VER: 012
REQs: 021-024
Procedure / representative inputs: Unauthorised/authorised suspension, absent withdrawal instrument, restart, improper reinstatement
Expected result and retained evidence: Scope-bound restriction and individual withdrawal only under explicit operational powers; schedule amendment follows its formal route; missing powers unresolved; no administrator/restart restoration; approved route required

Table row 13
VER: 013
REQs: 025-028
Procedure / representative inputs: Disable protected audience/route via ordinary admin; fail referral delivery; notifications out of order
Expected result and retained evidence: Attempt rejected/detected under threat model; required audience and unresolved handoff evidenced; current state reconciled

Table row 14
VER: 014
REQs: 015/031/032
Procedure / representative inputs: Approved schedule with missing active dependencies; partial control deployment
Expected result and retained evidence: Approved-not-active distinct; only validated capability enabled; incomplete paths visible/inactive

Table row 15
VER: 015
REQs: 029/030
Procedure / representative inputs: Explain denial; attempt excessive disclosure and unreviewed exception
Expected result and retained evidence: Permitted meaning/basis/referral; reviewed exception evidence where applicable; permission unchanged

Table row 16
VER: 016
REQs: 033
Procedure / representative inputs: Correct instrument; exercise governed retention/delete/access profiles
Expected result and retained evidence: Earlier effective history and amendment evidence preserved to policy; no unauthorised disclosure or perpetual retention assumption

Table row 17
VER: 017

REQs: 036/038
Procedure / representative inputs: Unknown external effect/repeat; internal escalation versus external commitment/contact
Expected result and retained evidence: Reconciliation gates repeat; external-specific human authorisation/data use/agreement checked; no internal-routing permission laundering

Table row 18
VER: 018
REQs: 037/013
Procedure / representative inputs: Review Mode 2 defence mechanism and cross-process matrix with governance reviewer
Expected result and retained evidence: Board determination evidence/cycle specified; permanent boundary retained; process limitations and residual gaps recorded

Table row 19
VER: 019
REQs: 039-042
Procedure / representative inputs: Assign task without delegation permission; propose broader downstream scope; then valid bounded recipient delegation
Expected result and retained evidence: Task gives no grant; absent/broader powers withheld; recipient authority separately validated; originating/receiving trail retained

Table row 20
VER: 020
REQs: 043/044/007/026
Procedure / representative inputs: Permission plus applicable prohibition; conflicting instruments with/without approved precedence; model/admin suggests convenient winner
Expected result and retained evidence: Prohibition blocks allow; unresolved conflict withholds action and refers through authorised route; no invented hierarchy; approved unambiguous precedence evaluated without overriding applicable prohibition

Table row 21
VER: 021
REQs: 045/046
Procedure / representative inputs: Definition/version compatibility; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-01: supported, unsupported and accepted translated records; original and translation retained, restricted meaning preserved, declared loss suitable for use. Planned, not executed.

Table row 22
VER: 022
REQs: 047
Procedure / representative inputs: Assurance status and exact fact binding; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-02: multiple incomplete/disputed/purpose-bounded assessments; preserve all chains and disagreements; no admission-to-truth or new-revision validation shortcut. Planned, not executed.

Table row 23
VER: 023
REQs: 049
Procedure / representative inputs: Original evaluation and later effects; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-03: permit/deny before effect, later checkpoint/withheld/effect links; original decision reconstructable, absent evidence never proof of enforcement. Planned, not executed.

Table row 24
VER: 024
REQs: 048
Procedure / representative inputs: Acknowledgement stages; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-04: delivery without application/responsibility; no false completion; pure information requires no invented human acknowledgement. Planned, not executed.

Table row 25
VER: 025
REQs: 045
Procedure / representative inputs: Reciprocal CON walkthrough; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-05: inspect every component CON against the same producer/consumer definitions, field/status/units/ack manifest; retain mismatches and non-kernel dependencies. Planned, not executed.

Table row 26
VER: 026
REQs: 047
Procedure / representative inputs: Restricted assurance projection; inspect/test exact approved synthetic fixture and definition revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: KXV-06: permitted projection preserves required assurance substance; unavailable material evidence leaves reliance unresolved; no privacy bypass. Planned, not executed.

Table row 27
VER: 027
REQs: 050
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-01: Exact checkpoint and restriction race; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Substitute arguments/current evidence and restrict before/after last enforceable point; affected pre-boundary effect blocked, irreversible crossing and uncertainty/follow-up evidenced. Planned, not executed.

Table row 28
VER: 028
REQs: 050/051
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-02: Partial compatible activation; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Wrong/old/missing required applied member and restriction during rollout; affected path withheld, compatible unaffected scope evidenced, no approval-to-activation shortcut. Planned, not executed.

Table row 29
VER: 029
REQs: 052
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-03: Change receipt versus application; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Duplicate/conflicting/out-of-order notices and missing consumer; actual applied/no-material-dependency basis or owned unresolved cover/escalation; old permission not revived. Planned, not executed.

Table row 30
VER: 030
REQs: 052/057
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-04: Selective impact and restart; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Correct pending input and significant completed consequence; reassess affected work, preserve history and owner review, no replay on restart. Planned, not executed.

Table row 31
VER: 031
REQs: 053/054
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-05: Concurrent overlapping capacity; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Parallel workers request same remaining allowance across multiple scopes and provider switch; no partial grant, double spend or account reset evasion; exact authoritative evidence. Planned, not executed.

Table row 32
VER: 032
REQs: 053/055
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-06: Partial/unknown reservation; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Expire/cancel/failover after possible effect and cross period boundary; confirmed quantity consumed, uncertain remainder held, release only evidenced unused quantity. Planned, not executed.

Table row 33
VER: 033
REQs: 056
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-07: Withheld duty notification; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Accounting/control unavailable, missing acknowledgement, failed route and coalesced repeats; dependent work blocked, separate permitted notification and accountable delivery exception/cover; every operation traceable. Planned, not executed.

Table row 34
VER: 034
REQs: 056/057
Procedure / representative inputs: KCV-08: Resident update and controlled resume; inspect/test exact authorised synthetic fixture and versions
Expected result and retained evidence: Service affected with acknowledgement but unresolved task, unagreed channel and sensitive content, then premature resume; only permitted agreed-channel update, contact duty visible, no replay without current reconciled evidence/approval. Planned, not executed.

Table row 35
VER: 035
REQs: 058
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-01 / DEC-104: approved finding-class profile; primary controls/reporting failure plus implicated or suppressing normal recipient/release controller; false alternative sharing technical dependency or implicated sole gatekeeper; valid authorised independent alternative.
Expected result and retained evidence: The component supplies its assigned authority/record/use/task/runtime evidence for both technical and organisational independence. No implicated sole release gate; no assumed independence from an alternate address alone. Use only pre-authorised verified minimal-content routes; inadequate arrangements remain owned, block protected-reporting assurance/affected dependent reliance and preserve tracking/service duties. Inspect actual alternate attempt, custody/control, recipient and acceptance evidence; no external-disclosure default. Planned, not executed.

Table row 36
VER: 036
REQs: 059
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-02: Reporting permission and recipient invalid; authorised synthetic fixture, exact profile and source revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: Expired/wrong-scope advance permission, unverified recipient or excessive content; refuse unauthorised payload, retain minimal permitted fallback if valid, otherwise owned unresolved duty; no emergency grant. Planned, not executed.

Table row 37
VER: 037
REQs: 060
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-03: No human accepts and fallback also fails; authorised synthetic fixture, exact profile and source revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: Receipt without responsibility acceptance, absent cover, escalation failure and repeated linked reports; original tracking owner persists, all affected work traceable, approved human fallback/owned exception and resident-channel duty remain visible. Planned, not executed.

Table row 38
VER: 038
REQs: 061
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-04: Protected backup is stale or incomplete; authorised synthetic fixture, exact profile and source revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: Valid integrity check but omitted withdrawal/consent/deletion/change or uncertain source coverage; dependent release blocked until scope-specific currentness and completeness are established from authoritative evidence. Planned, not executed.

Table row 39
VER: 039

REQs: 062
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-05: Restore contains old permission and uncertain effects; authorised synthetic fixture, exact profile and source revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: Isolated old snapshot with deleted/restricted payload, completed/partial/unknown effects, uncertain reservation and incompatible config; no normal effects, apply dispositions and reconcile exposure, no repeated known effect or hidden retained payload. Planned, not executed.

Table row 40
VER: 040
REQs: 063
Procedure / representative inputs: KPV-06: Premature selective release under compound failure; authorised synthetic fixture, exact profile and source revisions
Expected result and retained evidence: Combine compromise, incomplete current-state evidence, outstanding handoff and provider failover; reject unsupported automatic/human release, accept only evidenced approved unaffected scope, preserve unresolved duties and require fresh CHECK/reservation for continuation. Planned, not executed.

Table row 41
VER: 041
REQs: 064/065
Procedure / representative inputs: Missing component remit; operator expands retrieval/delegation or suppresses required reporting through profile edit
Expected result and retained evidence: Unsupported delegation/configuration rejected; exact powers/profile and protected duty preserved. Planned, not executed.

Table row 42
VER: 042
REQs: 065/066
Procedure / representative inputs: Primary source announces a change; reviewer accepts candidate for drafting; agent attempts authority/specification amendment
Expected result and retained evidence: Publication and acceptance remain evidence/disposition only; unapproved amendment and reporting suppression prevented. Planned, not executed.

Table row 43
VER: 043
REQs: 067
Procedure / representative inputs: Urgent regulatory/safety implication with uncertain applicability and delayed specification work
Expected result and retained evidence: Separately permitted empowered review/handoff proceeds with uncertainty/owner/cover; no emergency power or false closure. Planned, not executed.

Table row 44
VER: 044
REQs: 068
Procedure / representative inputs: Approval for one finding/proposal revision supplied for a changed revision, followed by valid exact-version approval
Expected result and retained evidence: Mismatch withheld; valid applicable human sequence, verification/compatible activation and application evidence required. Planned, not executed.

15.3 Contrasting process tests - requirements first, scenarios second

Scenarios test the general specification. They are not sources of universal powers or numerical limits. Any discovered gap becomes an issue/change proposal with source-based rationale and explicit scope.

Table row 1
Scenario: Overdue repair

Tests of AOS-01: Scoped internal escalation/contact, disputed evidence invalidation, accountable human decision and current checks
Process-specific configuration / limitation: DEC-031-041 demonstration rules; promises/completion/agreed channels in Operational Profiles; not universal repair policy

Table row 2
Scenario: Procurement commitment
Tests of AOS-01: Explicit financial/target limits, external commitment authorisation, aggregate/context change, unknown-effect repetition
Process-specific configuration / limitation: Actual approval powers, currency/budget/aggregation/reconciliation rules unresolved; no automatic spending right inferred

Table row 3
Scenario: People development / employment
Tests of AOS-01: Coaching permission separate from employment judgement; purpose change and sensitive processing
Process-specific configuration / limitation: Organisation people/HR rules and AOS-03/12 instruments; example reserves employment decisions as architecture boundary, not a new hiring procedure

Table row 4
Scenario: Telos or schedule amendment
Tests of AOS-01: Board-body reservation, formal sequence, exact versions, suspension and reinstatement
Process-specific configuration / limitation: Valid organisation bodies/appointments/operational schedule required

Table row 5
Scenario: External data disclosure
Tests of AOS-01: Principal/recipient/purpose/scope binding; independent data use; revocation/change before effect
Process-specific configuration / limitation: Approved sharing/trust/retention/location rules; no assumed federation system

Table row 6
Scenario: Cross-domain welfare/safety signal
Tests of AOS-01: Separately permitted routing, protected audience, consent tension and no-response escalation
Process-specific configuration / limitation: Required classes/thresholds/roles and board determination unresolved; no emergency override fabricated

Procurement aggregation and cumulative small actions require a defined review/control profile: a series of individually permitted actions may change material context or reveal a purpose/authority problem. AOS-25/40 assess aggregate behaviour; numerical budgets or an automatic aggregate denial rule are not invented here.

DEC-100 planned bootstrap/access case

Table row 1
VER: 045
REQ coverage: 069/007
Preconditions / procedure: Startup with a valid advance metadata-read instrument, then missing, expired, withdrawn, wrong-instance or excessive permission. Try to derive the checker’s permission from the pending business request or the other check’s favourable result; request underlying operational records. Interrupt permission/currentness lookup and restore stale metadata.
Expected result / retained evidence: Minimum scoped metadata reads are permitted only on independently verified advance authority/use evidence; no self-authorisation, circular favourable grant or wider operational access. Unverified/currentness failures withhold affected reliance and retain accountable referral; separately authorised fallback has no enlarged powers. Startup/recovery must re-establish valid current permission before reliance. Retain instrument/profile, checked identity/metadata scope, ordered access attempts, prevention/currentness/referral observations and competent assessor findings. Planned, not executed.

DEC-102 planned configuration-adequacy case

Table row 1

VER: 046
REQ coverage: 015/070
Preconditions / procedure: Present approved but inadequate classifications/settings: repeated small commitments evade a cumulative bound; low financial cost conceals resource impact; “routine” relabels rights/service/protected-data consequences; a setting transfers reserved judgement, suppresses mandatory reporting or purports to grant prohibited use. Present missing evidence, a material change without reassessment and a justified conformant routine delegation.
Expected result / retained evidence: Authorisation alone cannot qualify an inadequate configuration. Actual effects/cumulative scope, distinct financial/resource impacts and governing constraints are assessed by a competent accountable reviewer. Affected reliance remains withheld with owned resolution until adequate evidence exists; material change requires reassessment. Properly delegated routine action may proceed under applicable controls without inventing a universal individual-approval rule. Retain profile, powers, chosen values/rationale, fixture/effect evidence, assessor/disposition and scope/limitations. Planned, not executed.

16. Dependencies

Table row 1
Stage: Drafting
Dependencies: FP/RP/GT, AOS-00/Map/QS/template, shared/core contracts and decisions; no implementation choices needed

Table row 2
Stage: Component baseline
Dependencies: Fixed shared schemas/semantics, approved wording, source allocation, scope/role/precedence/expiry profiles and resolved material conflicts

Table row 3
Stage: Build
Dependencies: AOS-02/03/04/05/13/14/30 contracts; threat model; fixtures; operating targets; authorised bounded release; separate readiness assessment

Table row 4
Stage: Activation
Dependencies: Actual approved organisation instruments, identities/appointments, compatible controls, approved consequential classification, deployed restriction/recording routes, operational human cover

Table row 5
Stage: Operation
Dependencies: Current policies/delegations/roles, evidence availability, ongoing review/learning/incident processes and AOS-25/40 assurance

AOS-21 supplies authoritative corpus and precedent under its governance controls. GI charter AOS-20 supplies authorised obligations, not independent power to bypass shared controls. AOS-30 receives/records human decisions without observing board deliberation.

17. Issues

ISS identifiers have prefix AOS-01. All are open unless indicated. General subdelegation, withdrawal and conflict directions are resolved under DEC-042-044; welfare and cumulative-limit directions under DEC-051/056 are also settled. Their detailed dependencies remain open; each is a dependency/design question, not a requirement or inferred approval. Component custodian coordinates; listed specialist owners supply evidence. Confidence is high that each prerequisite is material, unresolved on actual implementation/organisation detail.

Table row 1
ISS: 001

Type / question and source: Dependency: valid bodies/roles, custodian, appointments and segregation; RP1/8
Affected items / owner: FUN-001/007/008; organisation governance/AOS-30
Evidence required / gate: Powers, appointment and succession records; activation

Table row 2
ISS: 002
Type / question and source: Design gap: instrument schema, permission/prohibition scope and approved precedence/subdelegation encoding; DEC-042/044 settle general direction, RP8/QS-12
Affected items / owner: CON-001/002, REQ-001-007/019/032; AOS-01/02
Evidence required / gate: Exact approved schema/rules; component baseline/build

Table row 3
ISS: 003
Type / question and source: Design gap: material context, units/operators, evidence sufficiency and currentness; REC-A/P02/P03
Affected items / owner: FUN-003/004; AOS-01/02/03
Evidence required / gate: Action-specific typed rules and dependency mapping; build

Table row 4
ISS: 004
Type / question and source: Design gap: enforceable checkpoint, race/clock/propagation limits and bypass mechanism; DEC-028
Affected items / owner: FUN-004/006; AOS-04/05
Evidence required / gate: Threat model, approved profiles and test evidence; build/activation

Table row 5
ISS: 005
Type / question and source: Dependency: Mode 1 parameters, consequential classification and Mode 2 review cycle; RP2/REQ-049
Affected items / owner: FUN-002; organisation board/AOS-25/30
Evidence required / gate: Approved parameters/designations and review protocol; activation

Table row 6
ISS: 006
Type / question and source: Dependency: approval/amendment record schema and institutional sequence; DEC-024/025
Affected items / owner: FUN-005/006; AOS-01/02/30
Evidence required / gate: Exact-version proposal/review/sign-off and effective rules; build/activation

Table row 7
ISS: 007
Type / question and source: Question: restriction scope, operational withdrawal procedure, notification/reinstatement and expiry; DEC-043 settles individual withdrawal versus schedule amendment
Affected items / owner: FUN-007/008; organisation governance/AOS-04/05
Evidence required / gate: Approved routes, authority, delivery/ordering and restoration conditions; build/activation

Table row 8
ISS: 008
Type / question and source: Dependency: referral recipients, acknowledgement, windows and cover; RP1/DEC-033/034
Affected items / owner: FUN-009; AOS-13/30
Evidence required / gate: Approved routes and operating capacity; activation

Table row 9
ISS: 009
Type / question and source: Design gap: protected classes/audiences and suppression-resistant controls; RP8 protected-finding principle
Affected items / owner: REQ-027/028; AOS-20/25/05/30
Evidence required / gate: Charter obligations, protected change route and threat-model tests; build/activation

Table row 10
ISS: 010
Type / question and source: Dependency: explanation exceptions, disclosure/access/retention rules; DEC-027/QS-13
Affected items / owner: FUN-010/REQ-033; AOS-03/02/30

Evidence required / gate: Approved rules, exception reviewer and evidence lifecycle; activation

Table row 11
ISS: 011
Type / question and source: Dependency: DEC-051 settles the bounded human welfare-protocol direction; actual board-approved acute-risk hierarchy/instruments, external/sensitive processing basis and professional legal mapping remain open; RP6/9
Affected items / owner: REQ-012/038; organisation board/AOS-03/14
Evidence required / gate: Valid documented instruments/professional assessment; dependent capability activation

Table row 12
ISS: 012
Type / question and source: Dependency: shared IF/schema adoption and complete source traceability
Affected items / owner: §§6/8/19; AOS-02/40 and component owners
Evidence required / gate: Producer/consumer agreement, exact allocations and remaining findings; component baseline

Table row 13
ISS: 013
Type / question and source: Design gap: DEC-056 settles cumulative-effect bounds; exact authority/context grouping, measures, periods, review/brake powers and cross-agent enforcement remain open; FP10/GT M1.13
Affected items / owner: §15; AOS-01/03/04/05/02/25/40
Evidence required / gate: Aggregate scenarios, materiality/evaluation profile; relevant build/activation

Table row 14
ISS: 014
Type / question and source: Review: sufficiency of authority model across contrasting contexts
Affected items / owner: §15; Mark/project reviewer
Evidence required / gate: Scenario review, findings and source-grounded revisions; component baseline

AOS-01-ISS-015 - research powers/profile commissioning (open dependency): appoint component research/review roles, approve remit/sources/jurisdiction/cadence/cover and exact supporting-view adoption; AOS-01/04/02/13/14/30 owners. Evidence: approved profile/powers, controlled human disposition and amendment fixtures; gate: dependent build/activation.

18. Implementation guidance - non-normative

Possible patterns include typed policy evaluation, versioned instrument stores, separate approval/activation workflow and independently controlled execution gates. Cryptographically bound evidence may support integrity, but cannot prove substantive human powers or quality of judgement.

No policy engine, token format, federation protocol, vendor or topology is mandated. An implementation may consolidate services while preserving auditable responsibility and approval boundaries. Distributed enforcement needs evidence of its actual failure/propagation limits; a central service is not automatically adequate either.

19. Traceability and change

REQ rows link source/parent decision → function/contract → planned VER. CAP/INV/CR tables give complementary reverse links. Source applicability in §8 identifies dependencies rather than silently claiming full coverage.

The shared dossiers' REC-R06-10/15/16/19/20 supply authority/context/explanation/current-control/repeat/restart derivations; this component allocates the relevant AOS-01 obligations. It does not duplicate their entire schemas or adopt unrelated repair rules as common law.

Before baseline approval, extend the controlled Source Traceability Matrix with exact AOS-01 REQ/VER links and residual cross-component allocations. This initial component draft does not close source findings by implication.

Mark confirmed on 5 October that specifications are drafted from governing principles and architecture and then tested against processes. A process finding may expose a gap; a general amendment requires explicit source-based justification and a recorded scope/decision. Preserve demonstration-specific directions separately.

Record changes with affected IDs, reason, source/decision, approver, contract compatibility, timing and dependent component review. Research agents observe/analyse/challenge/propose; they cannot approve amendments. No architectural direction is superseded by this initial draft.

19.1 Common decision-baseline reconciliation, 6 October 2026

Author review against AOS-00 v0.15 (DEC-001-061) and Specification Map v0.15. Earlier dated source/approval references identify historical derivation, not a competing current baseline. Decisions DEC-001-044 remain applicable as scoped in §§2-8: logical ownership, human reserved powers, common contracts, separate organisation instances, controlled locations, technology neutrality and bounded repair profiles. Repair-specific choices do not become universal rules. DEC-018 remains deferred; independent review remains unassigned. No new decision, permission, numerical setting or requirement approval is inferred.

The table records later-decision applicability and existing document anchors. It is a decision/status reconciliation, not the completed source-to-field-to-producer/consumer traceability required by KR-09.

Table row 1
Decision set: DEC-045-048
Applicable direction / responsibility boundary: AOS-02 owns source identity, assurance and governed lifecycle; HACT remains a verified-scope reference, not an authority instrument.
Existing component anchors: §§3/6/9; REQ-008/033; CON-001/002; VER-005/016
Remaining work / status: Source/schema adoption remains ISS-003/010/012 and KR-01/08.

Table row 2
Decision set: DEC-049-053
Applicable direction / responsibility boundary: Independent data-use permission, private assistance, bounded human welfare protocol and reviewable disclosure apply to authority referrals.
Existing component anchors: REQ-012/029/030/038; CON-004; VER-007/015/017; ISS-010/011
Remaining work / status: General welfare direction approved; actual board instruments, lawful basis and professional assessment remain open.

Table row 3
Decision set: DEC-054-057
Applicable direction / responsibility boundary: Dynamic delegation cannot expand authority; cumulative controls and configuration changes require the applicable approved powers.
Existing component anchors: REQ-019/039-041; CON-001/002; VER-010/019; ISS-013
Remaining work / status: Aggregate enforcement remains KR-06; exact profiles/approval powers unresolved.

Table row 4
Decision set: DEC-058-061
Applicable direction / responsibility boundary: Technical isolation is distinct from constitutional restriction; recovery/failover cannot reinstate withdrawn authority.
Existing component anchors: REQ-021-025/031/032/036; CON-002/004; VER-006/012/014/017
Remaining work / status: Privileged powers, selective continuity and recovery evidence remain shared commissioning dependencies; KR-02/04/05.

Stable REQ/VER/CON/IF identifiers, requirement wording and planned-case status are preserved. The five current component revisions are v0.3; their historical v0.1/v0.2 records remain intact. KR-09 decision/status/interface-label work is complete; full reciprocal source/REQ/contract/field/VER allocation remains open with the shared-contract work. Author checks are document checks, not executed verification or independent readiness evidence.

19.2 Action-2 source/field/consumer/verification allocation

New REQ-045-049 originate in v0.4, 6 October 2026; status proposed, owner inherited from document control, logical scope only. VER-021-026 are planned cases. Earlier records retain their origins; AOS-03 REQ-040 is clarified under DEC-064, not retired. Totals at this historical adoption step: 49 proposed REQs and 26 planned VERs.

Table row 1
Source / decision: DEC-002/065; QS-12/21; GT M1.13
Register obligation / common field: KXR-01/02/07/08; definition_revision/profile_manifest; KX-10 field_map/losses
Component REQ → planned VER: REQ-045/046 → VER-021/025
Reciprocal adoption: Every local CON ↔ declared producer/consumer ends in register §6

Table row 2
Source / decision: FP4/6; RP7 audit/uncertainty; DEC-046/062/063
Register obligation / common field: KXR-03/04; REC-E assurance_refs/status, complete REC-Q and use suitability
Component REQ → planned VER: REQ-047 → VER-022/026
Reciprocal adoption: Evidence producer/AOS-02 ↔ this consumer under independently permitted use

Table row 3
Source / decision: RP7 auditability; DEC-064
Register obligation / common field: KXR-05; original REC-A/D evaluation, REC-X exact-result/checkpoint/effect links
Component REQ → planned VER: REQ-049 → VER-023
Reciprocal adoption: AOS-01/03 evaluator ↔ AOS-04 execution/AOS-05 runtime ↔ AOS-02 custody

Table row 4
Source / decision: RP1 accountability; GT M1.13; DEC-066
Register obligation / common field: KXR-06; KX-21 stage/result/evidence
Component REQ → planned VER: REQ-048 → VER-024
Reciprocal adoption: Actual receiver/applier/empowered human ↔ sender/tracker; no assumed non-kernel adoption

Shared fields and reciprocal logical definitions are now adopted at kernel document level. Old local source-matrix/schema issue descriptions remain residual commissioning/full-suite tasks, not a reason to duplicate definitions. Full-suite source allocation and non-kernel adoption remain open; no implemented conformance or independent readiness evidence.

19.3 Action-3 exact obligation/field/consumer/verification allocation

REQ-050-057 originate in v0.5, 6 October; proposed logical scope, custodian/approver inherited, no implementation approval. VER-027-034 are planned. Totals at this historical adoption step: 57 proposed REQs/34 planned VERs. Original record wording and IDs remain unchanged.

Table row 1
Source / approved decision: DEC-067; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-01; CHECK.request/current sources/version/outcome; 01/03 controls → 04/05 effect gate, 02 custody
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-050 → VER-027/028

Table row 2
Source / approved decision: DEC-068; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-02; ACT.required members/applied vector/restriction fence; 01/03/04/05 application → coordinator/02
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-051 → VER-028

Table row 3

Source / approved decision: DEC-069; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-03; CHG.consumer application/impact owner; semantic source/02 → all material consumers
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-052 → VER-029/030

Table row 4
Source / approved decision: DEC-070; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-04; ACC.linked scope/period/units; 04 semantics → 05 accounting, 01/03 constraints, 02 custody
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-053 → VER-031/032

Table row 5
Source / approved decision: DEC-071; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-05; RSV.complete demand/admission vector; 04 request → 05 authoritative admission → exact executor
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-054 → VER-031

Table row 6
Source / approved decision: DEC-071; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-06; RSV.confirmed/residual/release evidence; observed effects → 05 account and 02/04 evidence
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-055 → VER-032

Table row 7
Source / approved decision: DEC-071; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-07; WHD.owner/ack/cover/resident duty; service/05 blockers → permitted operational recipient, 13/30/resident workflow
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-056 → VER-033/034

Table row 8
Source / approved decision: DEC-072; FP4/5/6/7/10; RP1/7 audit/8 contextual authority/9 purpose; GT M1.13
Common obligation / field / reciprocal ends: KCR-08; BRK.resume evidence/current check; authorised owner/controls/account → 04/05 executor
Proposed REQ → planned VER: REQ-057 → VER-030/034

Record types and source locators are the annex §§9-10, using unchanged FP/RP/GT versions. Non-kernel adoption and wire/profile/role implementation remain explicit gaps. This source/field/case allocation does not supply executed or independent assurance.

19.4 Action-4 sources and reciprocal verification

REQ-058-063 link DEC-073-078/KPR-01-06 to planned VER-035-040/KPV-01-06 one-to-one; all cases include cross-component failure/acceptance evidence. Source references and derivation boundaries are Protected Reporting and Recovery §7; exact fields, ownership and CON reciprocity are §§2/5. Current authoritative source mechanisms, human capacity, numerical profiles and commissioned independence need explicit owners/evidence before release. These cases have not been executed.

19.5 External-research traceability

DEC-086 → CAP-006/FUN-011 → existing CON-001-004 and AOS-04-CON-009/AOS-02 §6.6 → REQ-064-068 → VER-041-044. Origin v0.7, 6 October 2026; proposed logical wording, project approver Mark, organisational powers/profile appointments open. Prior source/status/history remain intact; other components' adoption is tracked separately.

20. Build and handover

No build scope is authorised through this draft. A future bounded release needs its exact component/contract/profile manifest, resolved relevant ISS items, approved synthetic fixtures, accepted requirements/cases, platform/control implementation choices and separate readiness assessment. Live activation additionally needs valid organisational instruments and operational cover.

Builder discretion covers implementation technology behind fixed semantics. Stop on missing powers, scope/classification, material context rules, unresolved source conflict, unavailable approved data use, missing checkpoint/restriction/evidence route, unapproved contract versions, ambiguous prior effect, absent human fallback or any proposed widening of delegation.

Author/AI checks do not satisfy the separate-reviewer G3 walkthrough. Independent project review is deferred; organisational independent GI interpretation/precedent reviews remain required under DEC-010-012.

21. Review and control

Table row 1
Quality area: QS-01-03 identity/structure/history
Author assessment / finding: All 21 template sections and summary supplied; stable local/component IDs; no previous AOS-01 found in current reference architecture/V0.1 inventories

Table row 2
Quality area: QS-04-10 requirement records
Author assessment / finding: 63 proposed obligations; source/category/shared metadata, owners/blockers and planned verification; actual schemas/values unresolved

Table row 3
Quality area: QS-11-14 architecture/interfaces/lifecycle/failure
Author assessment / finding: Responsibilities/trust boundaries, existing IF-001, three complementary CONs, states, normal/change/restriction paths and failures; interoperable schemas and commissioning detail remain gaps

Table row 4
Quality area: QS-15-20 operating qualities/authority/principles
Author assessment / finding: Human boundaries, controls, uncertainty, disclosure, audit and learning protection explicit; no measured runtime or institutional adequacy evidence

Table row 5
Quality area: QS-21-23 traceability/verification
Author assessment / finding: 40 planned cases and contrasting process matrix; source-matrix writeback/cross-component adoption pending; no executed test or GT pass

Table row 6
Quality area: QS-24-28 review/readiness/handover
Author assessment / finding: Author check only; independent review deferred; no readiness/build/activation claim

Author verification checks identifier uniqueness, internal REQ/VER links and table structure. No tailoring is claimed; annexes carry referenced detail. Specification-quality conclusion: structured component draft with explicit blockers. Design-adequacy conclusion: principle-derived authority model requiring scenario review, technical assurance and organisational validation.

Next: action-4 logical protected reporting/recovery adopted with standards provenance. Read existing GI/human-handoff material before further drafting; non-kernel adoption, commissioning and independent/executed evidence remain open.

v0.7 research amendment author checks: stable original requirement/verification rows and approval histories preserved; new REQ/VER sequences and references checked; common profile/view/powers ownership reconciled against AOS-00/Map v0.21 and template v0.4. New cases remain planned; no actual research, runtime, independent review or readiness evidence claimed.

Component summary

Purpose: establish explicit current authority without substituting software function for human purpose or judgement.
Owns: instruments, contextual permission, protected change/restriction and authority evidence.
Receives: exact action requests, approved human records, current instruments, identity/data-use and execution evidence.
Produces: allow/deny/unresolved results, activation/restriction eligibility, explanation and protected referral constraints.
Reserved human authority: Mode 2, board-body telos amendment and the applicable approval/change powers.
Conformant when: approved requirements and institutional/control dependencies are evidenced across relevant scenarios.
Open: organisation powers/settings, exact schemas and implementation of approved precedence/withdrawal/checkpoint rules, protected delivery, source allocation and independent readiness review. General directions under DEC-042-044 are settled.

Decision disposition, 5 October: Mark approved all three recommendations (“Agree all three”). AOS-00 v0.11 DEC-042-044 and Map v0.8 record them. This approves direction, not exact requirement wording or the whole document. Remaining work comprises detailed record/schema/control design, source traceability, organisational commissioning and assurance. No additional question is currently submitted to Mark; new material choices discovered during that work require explicit referral.

Action-2 current disposition, 6 October: v0.4 uses AOS-00/Map v0.16 and approved DEC-062-066. §6.3/§19.2 record common logical adoption and traceability. Current totals 49 proposed REQs/26 planned VERs; earlier counts/versions in approval histories remain historical. No requirement-wording, executed-case or readiness promotion.

Action-3 current disposition, 6 October: DEC-067-072 approved, including revised recommendation 5 notification/acknowledged duty and appropriate resident update. AOS-01 v0.5 adopts Register v0.2, Core/Shared v0.3 and Control Coordination v0.1 against AOS-00/Map v0.17. Current totals 57/34 proposed REQs/planned VERs; no executed assurance or readiness promotion. KR-02/03/06 logically reconciled; actual commissioned implementation remains open.

Action-4 current disposition, 6 October: all six directions approved; DEC-073-078 and standards-reference instruction recorded. AOS-01 v0.6; 63 proposed REQs/40 planned VERs. KR-04/05 logically reconciled through the common annex and reciprocal adoption. No executed recovery/report delivery, clause-level ISO conformity, independent assurance or readiness promotion.

External-research current disposition, 6 October: AOS-01 v0.7; 68 proposed REQs/44 planned VERs against AOS-00/Map v0.21/template v0.4. Approved direction DEC-086; no actual activation, executed assurance or readiness promotion.

Historical opening status notices - retained provenance

These are dated drafting snapshots, including their then-current versions, totals, completion statements and next tasks. They do not define today's baseline or work queue. The present document retains its proposed/planned status; approved directions retain their recorded scope. Use the current inventory, adopted README and live to-do list for orientation; authoritative requirement and decision text remains in its named sections.

Historical status notice - AOS-30 alignment - 7 October 2026: functional drafting and consistency alignment complete under Mark’s instruction. AOS-00/Map v0.25, DEC-001-089; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3 and AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.9/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.8; source matrix v0.9 and template v0.4 unchanged; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1 unchanged. Earlier dated baseline/adoption/next-step entries are history. CR30-01-03 are closed at the functional-document level; implementation/commissioning evidence remains separate. No new DEC/REQ/VER/IF identifier or operating power is introduced.