DEC-101 - human capacity and meaningful review

Document: aos-dec-101-human-capacity-and-meaningful-review-2026-10-29 · Source revision or record: DEC-101, 29 October 2026

AOS Specifications v1.0 · Edition dated 3 November 2026

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

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

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

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

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

29 October 2026 · Mark approved substantive question 3 in this chat (“yes”). Author: Codex. Approved direction; detailed amended wording retains ordinary separate review/readiness gates.

Approved rule

Every workflow that depends on human judgement must demonstrate sufficient empowered human capacity and meaningful review before operational reliance, with proportionate reassessment during use. Capacity includes realistic demand, response arrangements, cover and owned unresolved duties. Meaningful review requires observable evidence that people can understand the material, question an AI recommendation, introduce other evidence and exercise their own judgement.

The organisation approves workflow-specific assessment criteria, competent assessors and review triggers. Representative exercises include absences, demand surges and materially flawed AI recommendations. Speed, agreement with AI, signatures and acceptance clicks are insufficient individually to establish good or bad judgement; assessment concerns observable process and evidence, not claimed access to a person’s internal thought. If required capacity or review conditions cease to hold, the affected workflow enters its approved degraded or human fallback arrangements. Service duties remain owned; workload pressure cannot discard mandatory referrals or silently widen automation permissions. Separately permitted urgent/service action retains its existing authority; this decision grants no emergency power, universal staffing ratio, deadline, pass rate or individual surveillance permission.

Controlled allocation

DEC-101 → AOS-30 v0.6 REQ-048 / planned VER-031; AOS-40 v0.9 REQ-032 / planned VER-030 and annex v0.3 variants VER-030-V01/V02; Operational Profiles v0.2. Scope includes both before-reliance evidence and proportionate continuing reassessment, with owned degraded/fallback action and unchanged automation bounds. Existing requirement/case/variant IDs and counts retained. Criteria, actual capacity, competent assessment and observed results remain required; no case executed. Prior DEC-099/100 and original source statuses/manifest retained.

AOS-00/Map v0.51, Source Matrix v0.24. Changes implement the approved operational-reliance principle, not staffing appointments, a universal metric or proof of actual judgement. S-04-09 remain undecided.

Provenance and validation

Originals, candidates, exact diffs, hashes and scoped checks are retained locally in AOS/deliverability-review-2026-10-29/decision-101. Verify requirement IDs/counts, only REQ-048/032 amended, existing case/variant identities, newly added relative links and saved contents. Cases remain planned/unexecuted; documentary checks are not independent assurance or a running-system test.