AOS-23 - Governance artefact assessment and monitoring

Document: aos-23-governance-artefact-assessment-and-monitoring · Source revision or record: v0.6

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-103 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.6. 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 DEC-087 is partly superseded; decision/amendment and legal-source record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-103-decision-validity-evidence-and-minutes-2026-10-29.md).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.

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.

AOS-25 oversight counterpart alignment - 7 October 2026: AOS-25 v0.1 now supplies the drafted oversight/drift/learning and GI research-portfolio counterpart. Reference-only revision; all existing requirement/case/contract rows preserved. AOS-00/Map v0.31, DEC-001-091; AOS-25 v0.1; AOS-20 v0.4/AOS-21 v0.5/AOS-22 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.4/AOS-24 v0.2/AOS-30 v0.4 (counterpart-reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4; Shared v0.14/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.13; source matrix v0.14; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Next: author GI-set consistency/disposition review across AOS-20-25 and AOS-30, then AOS-40 acceptance scenarios under item 8; independent project review remains deferred. Earlier dated consultation/adoption entries remain history.

AOS-24 presentation counterpart alignment - 7 October 2026: AOS-24 v0.1 now supplies the drafted faithful-rendering/explanation counterpart. Reference-only revision; requirement, case and contract rows unchanged. AOS-00/Map v0.30, DEC-001-091; AOS-24 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.4/AOS-22 v0.2/AOS-23 v0.3 (reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.13/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.12; source matrix v0.13; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated consultation/adoption entries remain history.

AOS-22 synthesis counterpart alignment - 7 October 2026: AOS-22 v0.1 now supplies the drafted synthesis/interpretation/options counterpart. This revision changes pending-drafting/current-reference statements only; all requirement, case and contract meanings preserved. AOS-00/Map v0.29, DEC-001-091; AOS-22 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.2 (counterpart/reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.12/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.11; source matrix v0.12; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

Table row 1
Document control: Component / version / date
Value: AOS-23 / 0.6 / 29 October 2026

Table row 2
Document control: Status
Value: Functional specification review draft; requirement wording proposed

Table row 3
Document control: Architecture baseline
Value: AOS-00/Map v0.32, DEC-001-091; prior consultation/allocation retained as history

Table row 4
Document control: Governing sources
Value: Foundational Principles v4; AOS Reasoning Principles v6; Governance Intelligence Tests; preserved source manifest

Table row 5
Document control: Dependency manifest consulted
Value: AOS-01-05 v0.8; AOS-14 v0.4; AOS-20 v0.3; AOS-21 v0.1; AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.10/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.9; source matrix v0.10; Control Coordination v0.2; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1; research view RSVIEW-0.1; KX-06 v0.3

Table row 6
Document control: Adoption supplements
Value: Shared v0.11/Register v0.10/source matrix v0.11 record this draft's functional adoption; common definitions unchanged

Table row 7
Document control: Quality / template
Value: AOS-QS v0.1; component template v0.4

Table row 8
Document control: Project owner / custodian
Value: Mark Sweeny

Table row 9
Document control: Operational owner
Value: Accountable GI/artefact-assessment owner; empowered assessment reviewers, monitoring/duty owners and cover require organisation appointments

Table row 10
Document control: Author / reviewer
Value: Codex at Mark's request; author document checks only; Mark wording/whole-document review pending; independent project reviewer unassigned/deferred

Table row 11
Document control: Approval / readiness
Value: DEC-091 corroboration and other recorded directions approved; no whole-document, build, activation or readiness determination

Table row 12
Document control: Change history
Value: 0.5 - GI-CR-01-04 author consistency correction/closure under Mark’s instruction; existing identifiers and proposed/planned status preserved. 0.4 - AOS-25 counterpart/reference alignment only; no requirement/case/contract change. 0.3 - AOS-24 counterpart/reference alignment only; no requirement/case/contract change. 0.2 - AOS-22 counterpart/reference alignment only; no requirement/case/contract change. 0.1 initial draft reconciling GIL v2 through comparison content v0.2 and applying DEC-086/090/091; new component records, no new architectural decision or IF

1. Purpose and scope

AOS-23 makes the quality, currency and evidential basis of governance artefacts assessable and contestable. It answers: what does this artefact contain, what claims can its evidence support, what permitted evidence bears on actual practice, what has changed, and who must review or act? Without it, the organisation can mistake a polished document, stale policy, unexplained score or quiet monitoring run for sound governance.

The component owns permitted ingestion and normalisation, artefact classification, entity-specific applicability and assessment configuration, evidence-linked findings and uncertainty, review states, artefact/source currency monitoring, owned alerts and assessment contributions to governance reporting cycles. Under DEC-091, separately permitted records, outcomes and human-supplied interviews/surveys may corroborate documentary claims. Document quality, support for a claim and evidence of practice remain separately reported. A record that supports a claim does not by itself prove institutional effectiveness.

AOS-21 owns corpus, profiles, source admission, approved criteria and precedent stewardship. AOS-22 owns cross-domain synthesis, interpretation and options; AOS-24 faithful presentation; AOS-25 drift, aggregate/system oversight and independent review; AOS-30 human decisions and accepted duties. AOS-13 coordinates operational handoffs, AOS-14 external retrieval/exchange, and AOS-01-05 common controls/records. AOS-23 does not acquire human moral authority, amend criteria or governing instruments by itself, observe protected deliberation, infer personal feelings/preferences, issue automatic legal/governance certificates or replace the board portal.

Boards and committees, stewards, assessment validators, executives, residents, staff, source/operational owners, reviewers and operators have distinct interests and powers. Parent/subsidiary assessments retain separate entity scope, applicable powers and corpus under DEC-090; group membership is not disclosure permission.

2. Authority and sources

FP v4/RP v6 govern; architecture decisions constrain the proposed requirements. GIL is the starting material after explicit reconciliation, not a competing authority register or coding instruction. Each requirement below is a functional derivation unless directly applying a cited decision. The source keys provide precise version/locator references throughout.

Table row 1
Key: FP
Source and locator / standing: Foundational_Principles_v4.docx, principles 1-10; governing settlement

Table row 2
Key: RP1/2/3
Source and locator / standing: RP v6 Architecture and Completeness: closed feedback and named accountability; Mode 1/Mode 2 Boundary: permanently human judgement and boardroom; 1+5 Architecture: roles and cross-domain handoff

Table row 3
Key: RP4
Source and locator / standing: RP v6 Options and Decisions: actual organisational state, explicit assumptions and decision feedback

Table row 4
Key: RP5/7
Source and locator / standing: RP v6 Blind Spots and Honesty / Radical Transparency: missing evidence, uncertainty, audit and limits

Table row 5
Key: RP6
Source and locator / standing: RP v6 Ethics and Telos: purpose-led design, no-exit condition, developer-framework and precedent drift distinctions

Table row 6

Key: RP8/9
Source and locator / standing: RP v6 Agentic Delegation / Data and Sensing Boundaries: delegated tools/powers, protected reporting and declared purpose

Table row 7
Key: GT
Source and locator / standing: Governance_Intelligence_Tests.docx, M1.1-14/M2.1-15; software contributions and human assessment limits in §8

Table row 8
Key: GIL
Source and locator / standing: GIL_Technical_Specification_V2.docx v2.0, §§1.1-1.4, 2.3-2.5 assessment/calibration/blind spots, §3 monitoring, §4 library, §§6.1-6.5 processes, §§7-9 limitations/build questions

Table row 9
Key: CMP
Source and locator / standing: GIL Comparison and Reconciliation filename v0.1, content v0.2, GIL-C01-38 and approved Q01/Q02; disposition allocation in §19

Table row 10
Key: D
Source and locator / standing: AOS-00 v0.27 DEC register; particular approved decisions cited per row

Table row 11
Key: C
Source and locator / standing: AOS-21 v0.1 §§3-7/9-11/13/19; sourced profiles, catalogue, permitted evidence, change and approval/precedent boundaries

Table row 12
Key: GI
Source and locator / standing: AOS-20 v0.3 §§3-7/10-15; charter, canonical analysis, graduated review, protected duty and common research

Table row 13
Key: H
Source and locator / standing: AOS-30 v0.3 §§5-7/9-12; human approval, duty acceptance, correction and outcome feedback

Table row 14
Key: E/A/U/X/K
Source and locator / standing: Core v0.6 REC-E/Q, REC-A, REC-D, REC-X; Shared v0.10 §4; Register v0.9 KX views; coordination v0.2 and protected reporting/recovery v0.1

Table row 15
Key: R
Source and locator / standing: DEC-086; template v0.4 §4.4; AOS-04 v0.8 §§3.1/5.1/6.6/10.8 CON-009; AOS-02 v0.8 §6.6 CON-007; AOS-01 v0.8 §§6.6/10.8

The preserved source manifest remains unchanged. Current regulatory/standards statements require admitted primary evidence, jurisdiction/status/effective-date checks and empowered applicability review. This draft neither verifies current law nor claims ISO clause conformity. GIL's sixth-peer/adjudication, blanket board-record exclusion, review-before-any-UDL-write, numerical confidence/deadline defaults and local authority-register assumptions are replaced by the approved architecture. Vendor/schema/API/build choices remain deferred.

3. Responsibilities

Table row 1
Responsibility: Ingestion/classification
AOS-23 owns: Permitted extraction, normalisation and exact artefact revision/type/context
Other owner / reserved boundary: 02 custody; 03 use; 21 admitted sources and uncertain entity reconciliation

Table row 2
Responsibility: Assessment applicability
AOS-23 owns: Apply approved criteria to exact entity/profile/source scope; expose exclusions and unknowns
Other owner / reserved boundary: 21 criterion stewardship; 01/30 normative approval; application never amends meaning

Table row 3
Responsibility: Findings/corroboration
AOS-23 owns: Evidence-linked question responses, document quality, claim support, practice evidence and uncertainty
Other owner / reserved boundary: 22 synthesis/options; human reviewers validate; broader effectiveness remains human/25/30/40

Table row 4
Responsibility: Monitoring
AOS-23 owns: Artefact currency/applicability, approved source changes and owned alerts
Other owner / reserved boundary: 21 updates corpus; 14 external access; 04 shared agents; 25 system/aggregate oversight

Table row 5
Responsibility: Reporting cycles
AOS-23 owns: Assessment coverage/status, alerts, evidence conflicts and owner-confirmed action state
Other owner / reserved boundary: 22 cross-domain synthesis; 24 narrative/projection; 30 approval and duties

Table row 6
Responsibility: Corrections
AOS-23 owns: Reassess dependent findings and communicate changed analysis/status
Other owner / reserved boundary: 02 impact; 21 corpus; 30 human account/decision review; no silent rewriting of minutes

Table row 7
Responsibility: Own external research
AOS-23 owns: Relevance of developments challenging assessment/monitoring adequacy
Other owner / reserved boundary: Common R services/records; 14 retrieval; 01 human amendment and activation

Operational roles include accountable assessment owner, validator, corpus Steward, monitoring owner, duty tracker, recipient/cover, privacy/control owners and independent assessor. An executive, Company Secretary or ARC Chair may exercise a role only through evidenced applicable powers. No universal approval route or administrator override is created.

4. Capabilities and functions

4.1 Capabilities

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-CAP-001
Outcome: Ingest and classify permitted exact artefact/evidence revisions

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-CAP-002
Outcome: Apply scoped, current-for-purpose assessment criteria without normative self-amendment

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-CAP-003

Outcome: Produce evidence-linked multidimensional findings with explicit uncertainty

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-CAP-004
Outcome: Preserve graduated review and canonical output status

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-CAP-005
Outcome: Monitor change/currency/coverage and deliver owned alerts

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-CAP-006
Outcome: Contribute faithful assessment/status evidence to governance reporting cycles

Table row 7
ID: AOS-23-CAP-007
Outcome: Reassess material corrections and preserve action/outcome feedback

Table row 8
ID: AOS-23-CAP-008
Outcome: Research developments affecting AOS-23 and propose governed adaptation

4.2 Functions

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-FUN-001
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Submission/request → source revision and current controls → classify/extract with completeness limits → scoped normalised input; ambiguous/prohibited content withheld or referred

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-FUN-002
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Assessment trigger → 21 profile/corpus/criteria and purpose → select applicable questions with rationale → versioned assessment configuration; unresolved material applicability blocks favourable reliance

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-FUN-003
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Permitted assessment → artefact and separately permitted corroboration → question/criteria analysis and evidence comparison → provisional findings in three distinct dimensions; gaps remain explicit

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-FUN-004
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Findings ready → exact analysis and required review profile → submit/validate/return/dispute → canonical status/revision; review cannot grant action authority

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-FUN-005
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Approved change/time/event trigger → artefact/source/currency evidence → detect material change and actual coverage → alert/currentness finding; no-check/no-change distinguishable

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-FUN-006
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Alert/protected concern → exact finding and duty profile → permitted routing/accepted owner/cover → tracked human handoff; no executive suppression of protected classes

Table row 7

ID: AOS-23-FUN-007
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Reporting cycle → scope/period plus assessments, coverage, alerts and owner-confirmed actions → consolidate assessment inputs and flag relational conflicts → canonical cycle contribution for 22/24/30

Table row 8
ID: AOS-23-FUN-008
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Material correction/configuration change → affected old/new dependencies → selective reassessment/review → revised findings/status and consumer notifications; history/effects not silently reversed

Table row 9
ID: AOS-23-FUN-009
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Action/outcome update → accepted human/operational evidence → link actual result to finding/cycle and unresolved duties → feedback for 25/30; report publication is not resolution

Table row 10
ID: AOS-23-FUN-010
Trigger → evidence → behaviour → output; boundary and failure: Approved research trigger → external evidence via 14 → specialist relevance/impact evaluation → common research finding/disposition/change proposal; no autonomous adoption

4.3 Proposed requirements

Rows are component requirements except category I (interface). Categories: G governance, D data, Q assessment quality/uncertainty, S use/security, O operation, R research. Every row has proposed status for v0.1 functional scope, origin 7 October 2026. Requirement owner is the accountable AOS-23/GI owner; delegated reviewers/monitoring owners perform relevant duties. Project approver is Mark; actual organisation approvers derive from 01/30 instruments. Dependencies are the cited source/control, function contract in §6 and owned setup gaps in §17. Each row provides its own rationale, precise source/derivation and planned VER acceptance link. These common attributes complete every requirement record without duplicating metadata. No case is executed and no unresolved setting is an operating default.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-REQ-001
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind each assessment input to its exact source and content revision.
Category / FUN: D; 001
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.2; E/REC-E; C CON-001
Rationale: Prevents assessment of unidentified or silently changed material.
Planned VER: 001

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-REQ-002
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall retain the distinct entity scope of each artefact and corroborating assertion.
Category / FUN: D; 001
Exact source / derivation: DEC-090; C §§4/6; GIL-C12/38
Rationale: A parent profile cannot replace subsidiary powers/context.
Planned VER: 001

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-REQ-003
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall expose material extraction/normalisation omissions or failures before dependent assessment claims.
Category / FUN: Q; 001
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.2 steps 1-3; RP5/7; E
Rationale: Partial parsing must not look like complete evidence.
Planned VER: 002

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-REQ-004

Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall obtain current independent authority, data-use and execution permission for each dependent operation.
Category / FUN: S; 001
Exact source / derivation: A/U/X; coordination CHECK; DEC-064/067
Rationale: Technical access cannot authorise processing or effects.
Planned VER: 001/031/032

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-REQ-005
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall refer uncertain artefact classification for the confirmation required by its approved classification profile.
Category / FUN: Q; 001/002
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.2 step 1; C/FUN-003; RP5
Rationale: A guessed type cannot silently determine governing criteria.
Planned VER: 003

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-REQ-006
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind each assessment configuration to exact entity/profile/corpus/criterion revisions and purpose.
Category / FUN: D; 002
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.2 step 3; C CON-002/004; RP4
Rationale: Makes configuration and context reconstructable.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 7
ID: AOS-23-REQ-007
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall record the rationale and authority basis for applicable and excluded criteria.
Category / FUN: Q; 002
Exact source / derivation: GIL §2.3 calibrations; C §4; DEC-080
Rationale: Exclusions must be justified rather than convenient.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 8
ID: AOS-23-REQ-008
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall refer a proposed change of governing criterion meaning through AOS-21 and the empowered change route before adoption.
Category / FUN: G; 002
Exact source / derivation: DEC-080/081; GIL-C15/27/31; C §7
Rationale: Applying criteria is distinct from adopting new meaning.
Planned VER: 005

Table row 9
ID: AOS-23-REQ-009
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall use current-for-purpose organisation context from AOS-21 rather than assuming the last annual report remains sufficient.
Category / FUN: D; 002
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.1 reconciled by GIL-C12/27; C §10.1
Rationale: Later context can materially change applicability.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 10
ID: AOS-23-REQ-010
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall retain unresolved material applicability or missing required criteria as a limitation on dependent favourable reliance.
Category / FUN: Q; 002
Exact source / derivation: GIL-C04/13/19; RP5/7; C ISS-002/003
Rationale: Unknown applicability cannot become a default pass.
Planned VER: 003/004

Table row 11
ID: AOS-23-REQ-011
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall link each substantive question response or finding to the assessed criterion and supporting exact evidence references.
Category / FUN: D; 003
Exact source / derivation: GIL §2.4/6.2; E/REC-E; RP7
Rationale: Allows interrogation of what supports the assessment.
Planned VER: 006

Table row 12
ID: AOS-23-REQ-012
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall retain supporting source references separately from linked fact-assurance assessments.
Category / FUN: D; 003
Exact source / derivation: DEC-047/062/063; E/REC-Q
Rationale: Provenance alone is not assurance of a fact.
Planned VER: 006

Table row 13
ID: AOS-23-REQ-013
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve material conflicting or contesting evidence in the finding and its review request.
Category / FUN: Q; 003
Exact source / derivation: GI REQ-016/017; RP5/7; GIL-C16
Rationale: Prevents an apparently coherent answer concealing dispute.
Planned VER: 006

Table row 14
ID: AOS-23-REQ-014
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall report document quality, support for a claim and evidence of actual practice as distinct assessment dimensions.
Category / FUN: Q; 003
Exact source / derivation: DEC-091; CMP Q02; GIL-C16
Rationale: A good document and sound practice are different propositions.
Planned VER: 007

Table row 15
ID: AOS-23-REQ-015
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall use corroborating records, outcomes and human-supplied interview/survey evidence only within their separately permitted assessment purpose.
Category / FUN: S; 003
Exact source / derivation: DEC-091; U; C REQ-035; RP9
Rationale: Corroboration cannot expand sensing or secondary use by default.
Planned VER: 007/008

Table row 16
ID: AOS-23-REQ-016
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall qualify absence findings by the assessed source, question and coverage rather than treating documentary silence as absence of practice.
Category / FUN: Q; 003
Exact source / derivation: GIL §2.4 ratings; GIL-C16; RP5
Rationale: Absence from a document has bounded meaning.
Planned VER: 002/009

Table row 17
ID: AOS-23-REQ-017
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall not treat low complaint volume, disengagement or missing responses as evidence of satisfaction or consent.
Category / FUN: Q; 003

Exact source / derivation: FP7; RP6 no-exit; GT M2.7
Rationale: No-exit and consent cannot be inferred from silence.
Planned VER: 009

Table row 18
ID: AOS-23-REQ-018
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall expose uncertainty and limitations without substituting model confidence for approved assurance or review.
Category / FUN: Q; 003
Exact source / derivation: DEC-084; GI §4; GIL-C17; RP7
Rationale: A numerical score cannot validate a fact or decision.
Planned VER: 010

Table row 19
ID: AOS-23-REQ-019
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve provisional status when recording or supplying unvalidated assessment material under permitted graduated access.
Category / FUN: G; 004
Exact source / derivation: DEC-084; GIL-C08; GI §§5/6
Rationale: Recording is possible without false promotion to formal validity.
Planned VER: 011

Table row 20
ID: AOS-23-REQ-020
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall withhold formal validated reliance until the human review required for that exact purpose is evidenced.
Category / FUN: G; 004
Exact source / derivation: DEC-084; GI REQ-021-028; GIL §6.2 step 8
Rationale: Formal use must match the approved validation policy.
Planned VER: 011

Table row 21
ID: AOS-23-REQ-021
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind human validation to the exact analysis revision, reviewer capacity, scope, outcome and limitations.
Category / FUN: D; 004
Exact source / derivation: GI §6; H §§5/6; K/KX-22/06
Rationale: An old or partial review cannot approve a later whole assessment.
Planned VER: 012

Table row 22
ID: AOS-23-REQ-022
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve analysis/report approval separately from decision validity/evidence, record authentication, minutes approval and actual action authority under DEC-103.
Category / FUN: G; 004/007
Exact source / derivation: DEC-103; H §10.3; K/KX-06 v0.3
Rationale: A report reviewer or Chair is not automatically the board.
Planned VER: 012

Table row 23
ID: AOS-23-REQ-023
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall not represent artefact assessment as automatic legal compliance or institutional governance-effectiveness certification.
Category / FUN: G; 003/004
Exact source / derivation: GIL §1.2; DEC-005/091; GT introduction
Rationale: Documentary support cannot settle broader human judgement.
Planned VER: 008/013

Table row 24
ID: AOS-23-REQ-024
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall perform artefact monitoring only within a valid profile specifying scope, triggers, indicators, review and duty conditions.
Category / FUN: O; 005
Exact source / derivation: GIL §3; DEC-054-057/086; R/04
Rationale: Agent count/schedule cannot silently supply monitoring authority.
Planned VER: 014

Table row 25
ID: AOS-23-REQ-025
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall obtain external monitoring evidence through permitted Boundary retrieval and source verification.
Category / FUN: O; 005
Exact source / derivation: AOS-14-IF-001; GIL-C07/21; RP8/9
Rationale: No direct bypass or blanket external API prohibition.
Planned VER: 014

Table row 26
ID: AOS-23-REQ-026
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall record actual complete, partial, failed, cancelled or not-performed monitoring coverage.
Category / FUN: Q; 005
Exact source / derivation: GIL §3 logs; GIL-C21; RP5
Rationale: Missed checking must remain visible.
Planned VER: 015

Table row 27
ID: AOS-23-REQ-027
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall qualify a no-material-change result by its checked scope, method, period and limitations.
Category / FUN: Q; 005
Exact source / derivation: GIL-C21; RP5/7
Rationale: Quiet output is not complete currency assurance.
Planned VER: 016

Table row 28
ID: AOS-23-REQ-028
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall distinguish publication, consultation/adoption, jurisdiction and effective-date status when assessing source currency.
Category / FUN: D; 005
Exact source / derivation: GIL §3; GIL-C14/21; C REQ-010/011
Rationale: A new publication may not be currently applicable.
Planned VER: 016

Table row 29
ID: AOS-23-REQ-029
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind each material monitoring alert to evidence, affected artefact/configuration revisions and declared urgency basis.
Category / FUN: D; 005/006
Exact source / derivation: GIL §3/6.4; E; K/KX-07/19
Rationale: An alert must expose what changed and why it matters.
Planned VER: 017

Table row 30
ID: AOS-23-REQ-030
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall retain required handoff responsibility until an accountable permitted owner or cover accepts it.
Category / FUN: O; 006
Exact source / derivation: DEC-066/071/075; K/KX-21/26; H
Rationale: Delivery alone cannot establish human responsibility.
Planned VER: 018

Table row 31
ID: AOS-23-REQ-031
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve overdue or failed review/delivery duties under the approved cover/escalation profile.
Category / FUN: O; 006
Exact source / derivation: DEC-071/075; H §§10/11; GIL-C30
Rationale: Unresponsive recipients cannot silently close a concern.
Planned VER: 018

Table row 32
ID: AOS-23-REQ-032
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall route findings in approved mandatory protected classes without discretionary executive suppression or normal report-release delay.
Category / FUN: G; 006
Exact source / derivation: DEC-083/084; protected reporting annex §§3-6; RP8
Rationale: Protects safety/welfare, telos, Mode 2 and assurance-failure findings.
Planned VER: 019

Table row 33
ID: AOS-23-REQ-033
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind each reporting-cycle contribution to its exact scope, period and assessment/input revisions.
Category / FUN: D; 007
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.3; K/KX-22; RP4
Rationale: A report needs a reconstructable evidence window.
Planned VER: 020

Table row 34
ID: AOS-23-REQ-034
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall expose provisional/disputed assessments, coverage gaps and unresolved duties in reporting-cycle contributions.
Category / FUN: Q; 007
Exact source / derivation: DEC-084; GIL §6.3; RP5/7
Rationale: Cycle publication cannot hide unfinished review or missing territory.
Planned VER: 020

Table row 35
ID: AOS-23-REQ-035
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve report release, delivery, action approval, accepted ownership and completed outcome as distinct states.
Category / FUN: G; 007/009
Exact source / derivation: GIL-C29/34; DEC-066/087; H/KX-26
Rationale: Approval/publication does not close actions or establish effects.
Planned VER: 022

Table row 36
ID: AOS-23-REQ-036
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall identify and selectively reassess materially dependent findings when source, profile, criterion or governing control revisions change.
Category / FUN: I-D; 008
Exact source / derivation: DEC-068/069; K/KX-13; C §10.4; GI §6.5
Rationale: Avoids stale assessment without a blanket unrelated freeze.
Planned VER: 023

Table row 37
ID: AOS-23-REQ-037
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall constrain dependent reliance when correction impact or required reassessment remains materially unresolved.
Category / FUN: Q; 008

Exact source / derivation: DEC-063/067/089; coordination; H
Rationale: A known uncertainty cannot be silently treated as resolved.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 38
ID: AOS-23-REQ-038
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall refer material inter-artefact relationship conflicts requiring broader synthesis to AOS-22 with supporting evidence and limits.
Category / FUN: I-D; 007
Exact source / derivation: GIL §6.3 step 5; Map AOS-22/23; GI §3
Rationale: Artefact checks must not acquire cross-domain moral adjudication.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 39
ID: AOS-23-REQ-039
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall communicate materially changed analysis/status and actual action/outcome evidence to affected review owners, including AOS-30 when its workflow is affected.
Category / FUN: I-D; 008/009
Exact source / derivation: K/KX-13/21/26; GI §6.5; H §10; RP1
Rationale: Closes analytical feedback without rewriting approved accounts/effects.
Planned VER: 023/030

Table row 40
ID: AOS-23-REQ-040
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall maintain its own external-research remit against exact assessed component/dependency revisions and status.
Category / FUN: R; 010
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; R; template §4.4
Rationale: Adequacy research differs from document currency monitoring.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 41
ID: AOS-23-REQ-041
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall conduct external research through permitted Boundary retrieval and current common task/use/execution controls.
Category / FUN: S; 010
Exact source / derivation: R; A/U/X; AOS-14-IF-001
Rationale: Research does not create extra access or emergency powers.
Planned VER: 025/029

Table row 42
ID: AOS-23-REQ-042
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall record research through the common profile/run/finding/disposition views.
Category / FUN: R; 010
Exact source / derivation: R; 02 §6.6 RSVIEW-0.1
Rationale: Avoids competing local research state definitions.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 43
ID: AOS-23-REQ-043
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall bind research findings to exact evidence/status/dates, uncertainty and affected specification elements.
Category / FUN: R; 010
Exact source / derivation: R; RP5/7; DEC-086
Rationale: Makes specialist challenge grounded and reviewable.
Planned VER: 026

Table row 44

ID: AOS-23-REQ-044
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall refer proposed specification/criterion changes through empowered human amendment before adoption.
Category / FUN: G; 010
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086/080/018; 01 §§6.6/10.8; C §7
Rationale: Run completion or proposal acceptance is not normative approval.
Planned VER: 028/029

Table row 45
ID: AOS-23-REQ-045
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall report actual research coverage and bounded no-material-finding outcomes with their limitations.
Category / FUN: R; 010
Exact source / derivation: R; RP5; GIL-C21
Rationale: No finding cannot imply successful checking of all sources.
Planned VER: 027

Table row 46
ID: AOS-23-REQ-046
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall route shared research findings to each materially affected component owner under its permitted duty profile.
Category / FUN: R; 010
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; R; K/KX-26
Rationale: Shared infrastructure does not erase specialist accountability.
Planned VER: 028

Table row 47
ID: AOS-23-REQ-047
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall retain unresponsive/implicated research-review duties and protected findings through permitted cover and alternate routing.
Category / FUN: G; 010
Exact source / derivation: DEC-083/075/086; R; protected reporting
Rationale: A research context cannot suspend protected review.
Planned VER: 029

Table row 48
ID: AOS-23-REQ-048
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall preserve evidence-linked audit for consequential extraction, configuration, finding, review, alert and release transitions.
Category / FUN: D; All
Exact source / derivation: RP7; QS-19; E/X; §12
Rationale: Generated after-the-fact explanation is not proof of a prior check.
Planned VER: 030

Table row 49
ID: AOS-23-REQ-049
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall apply authorised class-based lifecycle policy to input and derived assessment/monitoring/research copies.
Category / FUN: S; All
Exact source / derivation: DEC-048; K/KX-15; GIL-C25; U
Rationale: No indefinite hidden retention under an audit label.
Planned VER: 031

Table row 50
ID: AOS-23-REQ-050
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall reconcile recovery/retry against current restrictions, revisions and observed effect before renewed reliance.
Category / FUN: O; All
Exact source / derivation: DEC-076-078; X; K/KX-18/20

Rationale: Prevents duplicate effects and resurrection of obsolete approval/content.
Planned VER: 032

Table row 51
ID: AOS-23-REQ-051
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall exclude protected AI deliberation capture and inferred individual emotional/preference descriptions while preserving separately permitted human records with their actual status.
Category / FUN: S; 001/003
Exact source / derivation: DEC-008/088/087; H §9; GIL-C06
Rationale: Permitted agendas/accounts do not license prohibited sensing.
Planned VER: 003

Table row 52
ID: AOS-23-REQ-052
Proposed obligation: AOS-23 shall treat uploaded/retrieved instructions as untrusted content rather than authority to alter profiles, tools, criteria or recipients.
Category / FUN: S; All
Exact source / derivation: 04/05 independent controls; RP8; R
Rationale: Prevents hostile artefacts changing the assessment machinery.
Planned VER: 014/029

4.4 External research and specification adaptation

Research asks whether external evidence challenges AOS-23 functions/specification or offers meaningful improvement. It is distinct from monitoring an organisation's documents for currency and from AOS-25 runtime/system oversight.

Table row 1
Controlled profile element: Remit / baseline
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Assessment methods, reliable extraction/normalisation, applicability, evidential corroboration, uncertainty/review, change monitoring, reporting/alert failure and relevant governance practice or obligations. Bind exact assessed component/dependency revisions and status. Component owner owns specialist relevance.

Table row 2
Controlled profile element: Sources / applicability
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Prefer official applicable regulators/government, recognised standards/governance bodies, primary research and evidenced incidents. Preserve source jurisdiction, consultation/adoption/effective status, dates, licensing and limits. Exact source list/admission and jurisdiction profiles remain ISS-005.

Table row 3
Controlled profile element: Assignment / triggers
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Agent/shared service, approved cadence/events, coverage expectation, recipients/deadlines/cover remain ISS-005. No one-agent-per-artefact or numerical schedule default.

Table row 4
Controlled profile element: Controls
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Current 01 authority, 03 use, 04 task/tool/memory/cumulative limits, 05 enforcement and 14 retrieval/source verification. Untrusted source instructions never become tool/power changes.

Table row 5
Controlled profile element: Evidence / assessment
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Common profile/run/finding/disposition views bind evidence/assurance, publication/event/access/effective dates or unknown reasons; affected CAP/FUN/REQ/CON/source/decision, alternatives, uncertainty, materiality/urgency and cross-component impacts.

Table row 6

Controlled profile element: Coverage / quality
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Complete/partial/failed/cancelled/not-performed and bounded no-material-finding; human-approved relevance, omission/false finding and fidelity rubric. Component/04/40 reviewer owns evaluation; deterministic enforcement separately tested.

Table row 7
Controlled profile element: Human review / change
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: Named permitted reviewer/tracker/recipient, deadline/cover and escalation; accepted-for-work/rejected/deferred/unresolved rationale. Proposal acceptance, amendment approval, verification, actual application and outcome closure remain distinct.

Table row 8
Controlled profile element: Records / adoption
AOS-23 meaning / owner and gate: AOS-02 §6.6 RSVIEW-0.1 and AOS-04 CON-009; existing REC/KX views for controls/evidence/correction/acknowledgement/duties. Exact mapping/compatibility is ISS-004; no competing local research dictionary.

Normal: approved trigger → permitted evidence/coverage → specialist assessment → human disposition → governed change if warranted → verified/applied revision and outcome review. Degraded: denied access, failed source, stale baseline or partial check → explicit limitation → owned coverage exception and permitted retry/fallback. Urgent live implications use separately authorised protected human response while amendment work remains pending. Research cannot expand tools/sensing, change governing criteria or reopen deferred exploratory self-calibration.

5. State model

Dimensions are separate: valid ingestion does not imply applicable criteria; reviewed analysis does not imply action approval; an approved action does not imply actual completion.

Table row 1
Object / states: Input: received → classified/normalised or partial/held/rejected
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Exact source and current use/control checks; extraction/type uncertainty visible. Missing material or ambiguous sensing scope is referred, not treated as complete.

Table row 2
Object / states: Configuration: proposed → confirmed/applicable or unresolved → superseded/restricted
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Exact entity/corpus/criteria revisions and applicability rationale; empowered approval required where governing meaning changes. No automatic self-calibration.

Table row 3
Object / states: Assessment: provisional → submitted → validated-for-declared-purpose/returned/disputed → superseded/withdrawn
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Common canonical review binds exact revision/reviewer/scope and limitations. Provisional content can be recorded and accessed under approved controls; formal validated reliance awaits required review.

Table row 4
Object / states: Monitoring run: assigned → complete/partial/failed/cancelled/not-performed
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Record actual coverage/status/evidence. No-material-finding is bounded to checked scope and method, not proof of complete currency.

Table row 5
Object / states: Alert/duty: detected → routed → accepted → response/outcome review → closed/unresolved
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Receipt, accepted ownership, actual action and resolution distinct. Approved deadlines/cover apply; expiry triggers review/escalation, never approval by silence.

Table row 6
Object / states: Reporting cycle: scoped → assembling → review → approved-for-defined-release → delivered → follow-through
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Status identifies remaining provisional/disputed inputs and open duties. The particular

report approver's valid route applies; approval is not board minutes approval or action completion.

Table row 7
Object / states: Correction: identified → affected reliance marked → reassessed/reviewed → notified/applied → consequences reviewed
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Preserve old/new exact revisions; pending reliance constrained selectively. Human account/decision correction remains with 30.

Table row 8
Object / states: Research
Entry, transition, authority, evidence and failure: Inherit common 04 §5.1 and 02 §6.6 research states; a completed run is neither amendment nor deployment approval.

Each transition retains controlling revision, actor, purpose, evidence and required acknowledgement. Missing/invalid mandatory profile values withhold dependent transition; applicable independent reporting/service duties continue. Terminal rejection of an assessment does not erase a protected finding or required action/outcome review.

6. Semantic contracts and interfaces

CON views complement existing IF identifiers without allocating new IFs. AOS-02 owns structures; each existing semantic owner retains meaning. Component assessment output is canonical analysis under AOS-20-IF-001 when it enters that workflow, with exact purpose/review status rather than a competing report truth store.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-CON-001
Purpose / producer → consumer: Artefact/corroboration input: source owners/21/02/permitted humans/14 → 23
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: AOS-02-IF-001, REC-E/Q; KX-01/08/09/10/15. Exact entity/type/source/version, extraction completeness, separate assurance and use. Unknown/partial/conflicting input cannot claim complete validated support.

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-CON-002
Purpose / producer → consumer: Applicable profile/corpus/criteria: 21/01/03 → 23; applicability findings → 21/reviewer
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: 21 CON-001/004, REC-E/Q/A/D, KX-05/09/13. Exact criteria and entity/purpose/effective scope; application is not normative adoption. Material conflict is held/referred.

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-CON-003
Purpose / producer → consumer: Current controls and execution: 01/03/04/05 → 23; actual results → 02/25/control owners
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: REC-A/D/X, CHECK/ACT/CHG/ACC/RSV/WHD and KX-02/03/04/18/20. Independent authority/use/runtime checks, cumulative task limits, actual effect and scoped recovery. Missing controls/unknown effects remain blocked/indeterminate.

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-CON-004
Purpose / producer → consumer: Assessment/cycle canonical content: 23 → 20/22/24/25/30/permitted reviewers
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: AOS-20-IF-001; KX-22 and REC-E/Q. Question/criterion, three assessment dimensions, evidence, assumptions/limits, requested review, exact revision and status. Renderings/reports do not promote claims or change substance.

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-CON-005
Purpose / producer → consumer: Human validation/decision/action outcome: authorised humans via 30/01/13 → 23/02/25
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: AOS-30-IF-001 and KX-06 v0.3/17/21/26. Reviewer powers and exact validation scope separate from evidenced decision and separately approved minutes, accepted duties and actual outcomes. Unsupported approval/completion remains unresolved.

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-CON-006
Purpose / producer → consumer: Ordinary/protected alerts: 23 → 13/30/affected domain owners, protected 05 route
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: AOS-13-IF-001; KX-07/19/26/21 and protected reporting. Exact evidence/class/urgency/permitted audience, owner/cover/deadline, receipt versus acceptance and outcome. No suppression or executive gate for mandatory protected classes.

Table row 7
ID: AOS-23-CON-007
Purpose / producer → consumer: Material correction/currency impact: 21/02/01/03/source owners → 23; 23 → affected 20-25/30
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: KX-13/15/21; coordination impact. Old/new dependencies, effective scope, reason, affected findings and remaining duties. Reconcile out-of-order/duplicate messages against current state; no automatic historical reversal.

Table row 8
ID: AOS-23-CON-008
Purpose / producer → consumer: Own external research: approved profile/agent using 14 → 23 reviewer/affected owners; disposition → change tracker
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: 02 §6.6 RSVIEW-0.1, 04 CON-009 and existing REC/KX. Exact baseline/remit/evidence/coverage/impact/human disposition; no research approval creates powers or application.

Table row 9
ID: AOS-23-CON-009
Purpose / producer → consumer: Disclosure/lifecycle/recovery: 03/02/05/14 ↔ 23/permitted output recipients
Common definition, minimum meaning and failure: KX-14/15/18/20/23, REC-D/X, AOS-14-IF-001. Permitted projection, class-based retention/deletion, location and actual recovery outcomes. Partial/unknown results remain explicit.

All views inherit exact organisation/entity/actor/revision references, common known/unknown/withheld states, date precision/time basis, source units for quantities, supported definition versions and reviewed compatibility. Assessment categories and currencies need governed vocabularies; no local score/unit conversion is implicit. Numerical scores are optional only under an approved method/profile, never universally required. Physical types/cardinalities, transport/API, performance and timing values remain implementation/profile dependencies in ISS-004/006.

Ordering and duplicate identity are declared by source/entity/assessment/cycle/duty scope. Repeated inputs can share provenance without erasing different evidence or review duties. Receipt, validation, application and responsibility acceptance are purpose-specific stages; retries use current controls and known effect. Correction/revocation propagates materially dependent use and review. No wire compatibility or consumer implementation is inferred from functional adoption.

7. Authority and decision boundaries

Approved Mode 1 assessment/monitoring may classify, analyse, compare, flag and recommend human investigation. Configuration applies admitted approved criteria and actual scoped context. New meaning, constitutional interpretation, moral trade-off, criteria adoption, action authority and deployment remain separately governed. Neither a model recommendation nor confident assessment amends a rule or makes a decision.

Graduated review under DEC-084 permits appropriately labelled provisional recording/access. Validated formal reliance requires the exact declared human review. Urgent mandatory findings use protected routing without waiting for normal report sign-off. Protected duties under DEC-083 cannot be suppressed by an executive; alternate empowered recipients and cover apply if implicated or unavailable.

Live protected deliberation stays outside AI sensing. Permitted pre-meeting documents and authorised human post-meeting accounts may be assessed with their real status. Minute-taker drafting, Company Secretary stewardship, Chair draft approval and decision validity/evidence and separate minutes approval remain distinct under DEC-087. Non-board report approvals use their valid route. An assessment reviewer or ARC Chair does not become board decision authority by approving a report.

Meaningful constraint explanations identify the reason, effect and review route by default; recorded security/privacy/feasibility exceptions may limit disclosure without waiving enforcement. Unresolved material authority/evidence withholds dependent automated reliance selectively, retaining separately permitted service/reporting duties. No inferred personal context, autonomous normative calibration or automatic reversal of actual effects is authorised.

8. Reasoning principles applied

Table row 1
Foundation / RP domain: FP1/2/8; RP2
Application and limit: Human telos/Mode 2 and valid powers constrain configuration, review and recommendations; source standards and scores do not decide which good yields. REQ-008/019-023/032/044.

Table row 2
Foundation / RP domain: FP3/9; RP6
Application and limit: Purpose-led criteria, no-exit and developer-framework evidence remain distinct from compliance claims. REQ-014/015/017/023; 25/30 own broader integrity judgement.

Table row 3
Foundation / RP domain: FP4; RP7
Application and limit: Exact citations, limitations, review and action evidence are legible through permitted projections. REQ-001/011/012/021/035/048.

Table row 4
Foundation / RP domain: FP5/6; RP1/5
Application and limit: Extraction gaps, conflicting evidence, partial coverage, failure and unknown outcomes remain explicit. REQ-003/010/016-018/026-029/037/050.

Table row 5
Foundation / RP domain: FP7; RP6
Application and limit: Low complaints, disengagement or absent evidence cannot be treated as satisfaction/consent. REQ-017; resident experience evidence requires purpose-permitted assessment, not invented inference.

Table row 6
Foundation / RP domain: FP10; RP3/8
Application and limit: Owned cross-domain handoff, changes and bounded research support adaptation without guaranteeing predictable emergent behaviour. REQ-030-034/036-047.

Table row 7
Foundation / RP domain: RP4
Application and limit: Exact actual entity/context and sourced claims support downstream options; 22 owns cross-domain synthesis and infeasible alternatives. REQ-002/005-009/014/015/038.

Table row 8
Foundation / RP domain: RP9
Application and limit: Independent use, privacy and source/derivative lifecycle restrict ingestion, corroboration and output. REQ-004/020/049/051/052.

All ten FP principles and nine RP domains are applied without treating them as automated certification criteria.

Table row 1
GI Tests: M1.1/5
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Artefacts and permitted practice evidence contribute to strategy/performance picture; 22/25/30 assess wider coherence

Table row 2

GI Tests: M1.2/3/14
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Assess sensing/risk/Golden Thread artefacts and their supporting evidence; domain owners retain actual operational information and safety accountability

Table row 3
GI Tests: M1.4
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Assess board skills/composition documentation and permitted corroboration; human assessors judge real capability

Table row 4
GI Tests: M1.6/7/10
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Compare applicable declared standards/arrangements with permitted evidence; no automatic compliance certificate or proof that norms are followed

Table row 5
GI Tests: M1.8/9
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Assess feedback/value-for-money artefacts and evidence; silent residents/self-reported measures do not establish legitimacy or value

Table row 6
GI Tests: M1.11/12/13
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Link findings/actions/outcomes and limitations for learning/oversight; 25 evaluates aggregate and emergent effects

Table row 7
GI Tests: M2.1/2/3/4
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Surface commitments, trade-offs, contradictory evidence and requested human challenge; no AI adjudication or inference of unspoken concern

Table row 8
GI Tests: M2.5/11
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Supply permitted evidence for independent review and preparation; genuine dissent and collective sense-making require human assessment

Table row 9
GI Tests: M2.6/7/8
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Preserve purpose-bound evidence and accessible reasoned findings; records/surveys alone cannot establish legitimacy/no-exit responsiveness

Table row 10
GI Tests: M2.9/10/12
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Assess documented purpose/boundaries and signal conflicts; human constitutional/oversight judgements remain reserved

Table row 11
GI Tests: M2.13/14/15
AOS-23 contribution / reserved judgement: Examine artefact claims and permitted evidence concerning developer frameworks, purpose-led design and telos/function; 25/30/40 assess institutional adequacy

All 29 tests have explicit contribution/limits; none is awarded a pass. Human Mode 2 assessment may notice what documents cannot show. Permitted corroboration does not license AI in-room observation or substitute documentary scoring for that judgement.

9. Data, privacy and disclosure

Process governance artefacts and separately permitted contextual/evidential material for the declared assessment, monitoring, reporting or research purpose. Retain original assertions, extraction/normalisation limits, corroboration source and separate assurance. Human-supplied interviews/surveys require their own valid use scope; presence in a repository is insufficient. Emotional/preference descriptions are human-provided/confirmed and purpose-bound under DEC-088, with no individual inference, sentiment scoring or automatic calibration.

Entity/group boundaries, sensitive findings, private preparation and permitted disclosure use AOS-03 controls. AOS-24 renders canonical content; AOS-14 handles external exchange. Reports may disclose relevant substance and limits without unrestricted personal/boardroom content. Audience filtering cannot turn a provisional/disputed finding into validated analysis or remove a material uncertainty without an authorised, reviewable basis.

02/03/05 class policies govern source copies, extracted text, prompts, answers, embeddings/indexes, assessments, projections, research and backups. No blanket permanent/seven-year/two-year retention default is inherited. Permitted audit evidence of correction/deletion does not justify retaining deleted payload. Conflicting holds/retention/deletion duties need empowered review and explicit restricted/unresolved state.

10. Behaviour and workflows

10.1 Ingestion and applicability

Approved request → current authority/use/control → exact source/entity/type → extraction with completeness/format limits → classification confirmation if required → scoped 21 corpus/profile/criteria → question applicability and rationale → confirmed or unresolved configuration. A multipart or multi-entity artefact can produce scoped assessments; it must not silently flatten different governing powers. Applicable documents can include permitted drafts or approved accounts, preserving status. Protected capture is rejected/held; an agenda/minutes keyword alone does not prove prohibition.

10.2 Assessment and corroboration

Scoped configuration → artefact claims and separately permitted records/outcomes/human evidence → question-specific analysis → citations, conflicts, assumptions and uncertainty → three distinct dimensions → provisional canonical findings/questions/recommendations → declared review → validation-for-purpose or returned/disputed status. “Absent from document”, “asserted”, “not provided” and “not applicable” have explicit scope/reason. None automatically means absent in practice. Interviews or survey suggestions are proposals; new evidence is obtained only under separately valid powers and use.

10.3 Human review and reporting cycle

Approved cycle scope/period → exact assessments/status and coverage → alerts and owner-confirmed action evidence → criteria-defined inter-document checks → relationship conflicts/unknowns sent to 22 as needed → reviewed canonical cycle contribution → 24 faithful presentation → empowered release approval via 30 → recorded delivery and ongoing duties → actual outcome feedback. A partial/provisional report can be prepared under permitted graduated access but cannot label unvalidated findings as formally validated. A cycle cut-off does not suppress urgent later evidence; a supplement/change record preserves its relationship to the earlier report.

10.4 Monitoring and handoff

Approved periodic/event trigger → specified internal artefact/source currency indicators and permitted external evidence via 14 → actual coverage/currentness/change assessment → no-material-change or alert with limits → relevant ordinary or protected routing → accepted accountable owner/cover → action/investigation/outcome review → closure only for satisfied duties. Different

artefact types may share agents/infrastructure; no fixed 168-hour/120-hour or 4/8/24/72-hour rule is adopted. Timings are controlled urgency/capacity profiles. Wrong-jurisdiction, draft or future-effective changes remain distinct.

10.5 Corrections and feedback

Material source/corpus/profile/permission/model change → identify exact affected assessments/pending reliance → selective restriction/reassessment → new analysis revision and required review → notify 20/22/24/25 and materially affected 30 preparation/account/outcome workflow → accepted responsibility/application evidence → consequence review. AOS-23 revises its assessment; 21 maintains source/precedent; 30 obtains human account/decision review. No component silently rewrites approved minutes, invents earlier validation or reverses actual effects. Delayed/duplicate changes reconcile current authoritative state.

Accepted action/outcome evidence links back to findings and later cycles. An action's reported completion can itself be unassessed/disputed; owner confirmation alone does not establish every fact. Unresolved effectiveness or unintended consequences remains visible to 25/30 rather than closing on report publication.

11. Failure, escalation and recovery

Unextractable/partial content, unknown type/entity, missing criteria, material contradictory applicability or inaccessible required evidence is recorded as limitation and held/referred for dependent claims. A partial assessment can proceed only within separately permitted scope and labelled limits; it cannot fabricate coverage. Unknown controls block dependent operation while valid independent duties remain.

Unresponsive reviewer, failed delivery or missing cover leaves an owned unresolved duty under approved escalation profiles. Protected concern cannot wait for discretionary executive/ARC release. Ordinary alerts do not acquire emergency powers merely by using urgent language. Independent human response routes and actual capacity require commissioning evidence.

Interrupted assessment/publication, unavailable UDL, partial execution and unknown effect use common 02/05 recording/recovery. Preserve actual state, control evidence and pending delivery; do not claim that an unrecorded assessment was delivered or validated. Retry reconciles current revision, restrictions and known effects before reprocessing/release. Recovery cannot revive deleted input, revoked purpose or obsolete approval. Human fallback uses bounded permitted evidence and makes limitations explicit.

12. Evidence, provenance and audit

Reconstruct trigger/request → exact artefact and corroboration → extraction/configuration → actor/current controls → method/model and applied criteria → finding and rationale → human review → routing/release → accepted action → observed result/correction/intervention → outcome review. Record evidence versus inference, rejected/conflicting inputs where permitted, time basis, source/fact assurance, material uncertainty and remaining duties.

Reasoning means source-linked answers, applied rules, model outputs and approved human rationale. Private chain-of-thought is not required; a generated retrospective explanation cannot prove an earlier check. 02 owns shared custody and schemas, 20 canonical analysis, 21 corpus and 23 assessment meaning. Evidence copies remain subject to lifecycle/privacy policy.

13. Security and operational requirements

Treat uploaded and externally retrieved text as untrusted data. Enforce task/tools/use/authority/runtime bounds independently of model assessment. User-supplied documents cannot alter the agent profile, assessment rules, permitted recipient or governing corpus. Protect reviewed analysis against unauthorised writes; human amendments produce exact revised records with scope/status.

Approved profiles govern workload, timing, review/cover, availability, extraction quality, alert relevance and source coverage. Missing values have owners/gates, not invented defaults. Human-reviewed contrasting fixtures evaluate citation fidelity, material omission, inappropriate applicability, false/missed alerts, assurance confusion, entity leakage and three-dimension separation. Optional scores require validated purpose-specific methods; model confidence alone is not assurance. Model/configuration changes require proportionate affected-function evaluation under 04/05/40. Deterministic control/review-status enforcement is assessed separately from probabilistic analytical quality.

14. Invariants

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-INV-001
Binding invariant / requirement links: Exact scoped artefact/criteria/evidence stay bound; REQ-001/002/005/006/011
Planned VER: 001-003/006

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-INV-002
Binding invariant / requirement links: Document quality, claim support and practice evidence never collapse into certification; REQ-014/015/023
Planned VER: 007/008/013

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-INV-003
Binding invariant / requirement links: Missing evidence/coverage does not become validated absence, satisfaction or currency; REQ-003/010/016/017/026/027
Planned VER: 002/003/009/010/015/016

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-INV-004
Binding invariant / requirement links: Provisional recording is not formal validation or action/board approval; REQ-019-022/035
Planned VER: 011/012/022

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-INV-005
Binding invariant / requirement links: Protected duties remain owned and cannot be executive-suppressed; REQ-030-032/047
Planned VER: 018/019/029

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-INV-006
Binding invariant / requirement links: Material corrections change exact assessment/status through review, not historical decision/effects; REQ-036/037/039
Planned VER: 023/024/030

Table row 7
ID: AOS-23-INV-007
Binding invariant / requirement links: Research proposes and all processing/recovery remains permitted; REQ-040-044/049-052
Planned VER: 025-032

15. Conformance and acceptance

All cases are planned. Common configuration: exact document-control baseline, approved synthetic fixtures or expressly permitted real evidence, declared entity/profile/criteria/review/control settings except deliberately invalid paths. Procedure triggers the stated function/input, observes analysis/states/controls and tracks required deliveries/reviews/effects. Evidence includes

input/output revisions, configuration, controls, citations, human review/rubric, acknowledgements and actual outcomes. Competent component/control assessors review technical evidence; empowered humans assess semantic judgement and review adequacy; independent institutional review remains separate.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-VER-001
REQs: 001/002/004
Case / input and procedure: Exact artefact and group scope: Parent and subsidiary artefacts/corroboration have different powers; submit valid and denied-purpose variants.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Preserve exact revisions/entity/purpose; no inherited parent powers or unauthorised processing. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-VER-002
REQs: 003/016
Case / input and procedure: Partial extraction: Corrupt/missing pages or failed table extraction affect a question.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Expose omissions/failure; do not conclude absence from unparsed content or claim complete assessment. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-VER-003
REQs: 005/010/051
Case / input and procedure: Classification and permitted records: Ambiguous type, unavailable criteria, live board capture, personal sentiment inference and permitted draft/approved account variants.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Refer uncertain classification/applicability; exclude prohibited sensing; permitted human records retain actual approval status. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-VER-004
REQs: 006/007/009/010
Case / input and procedure: Scoped applicability: Two entities, an updated operational fact and a future-effective criterion alter applicability; one required source is missing.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Exact profile/criterion versions and inclusion/exclusion rationale retained; unknown remains restricted; annual report not sole current context. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 5
ID: AOS-23-VER-005
REQs: 008
Case / input and procedure: Configuration versus normative amendment: Assessment service proposes a new criterion/meaning and tries applying it as approved.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Refer 21/empowered change; no self-adoption or autonomous normative calibration. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 6
ID: AOS-23-VER-006
REQs: 011/012/013
Case / input and procedure: Citations, assurance and conflict: Question answer cites a document; separate fact validation is partial and corroboration contests the claim.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Preserve exact criterion/citations, separate assurance and material conflict; no source-as-truth promotion. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 7
ID: AOS-23-VER-007
REQs: 014/015
Case / input and procedure: Three dimensions: Policy is well written but an asserted claim lacks support and permitted outcomes suggest weak practice.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Report quality, claim support and practice evidence distinctly; source/use restrictions retained. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 8
ID: AOS-23-VER-008
REQs: 015/023
Case / input and procedure: Permitted corroboration and effectiveness limit: Human-supplied interview and outcome records support one practice claim but do not cover governance generally.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Use only permitted sourced evidence; report bounded support without automatic effectiveness/legal certification. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 9
ID: AOS-23-VER-009
REQs: 016/017
Case / input and procedure: Silence and no exit: Artefact omits a topic; complaint/response volumes are low or absent.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Documentary absence stays scoped; no inference of absent practice, resident satisfaction or consent. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 10
ID: AOS-23-VER-010
REQs: 018
Case / input and procedure: Confidence versus assurance: Model offers high score despite missing evidence; optional scoring method has no approved calibration.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Expose uncertainty and method limits; score neither satisfies assurance nor substitutes for human review. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 11
ID: AOS-23-VER-011
REQs: 019/020
Case / input and procedure: Graduated review: Provisional finding is recorded/accessed under approved purpose; request formal validated use before review.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Allow permitted labelled recording; withhold unsupported formal validated reliance; no review-before-every-UDL-write rule. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 12
ID: AOS-23-VER-012
REQs: 021/022
Case / input and procedure: Exact review and approval powers: Reviewer validates one revision/purpose; a later changed revision, Chair-approved draft and board-approved decision coexist.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Preserve scope/revision and distinct approval powers; old review/report approval cannot validate new analysis or board minutes. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 13
ID: AOS-23-VER-013
REQs: 023
Case / input and procedure: Certificate attempt: Output labels documentary assessment a governance or legal compliance certificate.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Reject/return unsupported certification; retain evidence-qualified findings and human institutional judgement. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 14
ID: AOS-23-VER-014
REQs: 024/025/052
Case / input and procedure: Controlled monitoring and hostile sources: Approved profile checks an external source via 14; uploaded/source text instructs new tools/recipient or bypass.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Common current controls/Boundary applied; instructions remain content; no profile/power alteration or mandatory per-type agent. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 15
ID: AOS-23-VER-015
REQs: 026

Case / input and procedure: Actual monitoring coverage: Complete, partial, failed, cancelled and unperformed run variants.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Distinct statuses and actual checked sources/indicators retained; no implied complete run. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 16
ID: AOS-23-VER-016
REQs: 027/028
Case / input and procedure: Currency and no change: Consultation, wrong-jurisdiction/future-effective rule and a no-change result from a limited check.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Status/dates/applicability remain distinct; bounded no-change cannot establish complete currentness. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 17
ID: AOS-23-VER-017
REQs: 029
Case / input and procedure: Evidence-linked alert: Material policy/currency change affects selected artefacts and assessment configuration.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Bind evidence/old-new revisions/urgency basis and affected scope; no uncited generic alarm. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 18
ID: AOS-23-VER-018
REQs: 030/031
Case / input and procedure: Accepted handoff and capacity: Receiving owner confirms receipt but not duty acceptance; deadline expires and primary delivery fails.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Retain responsibility duty, approved cover/escalation and evidence; no receipt-as-resolution. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 19
ID: AOS-23-VER-019
REQs: 032
Case / input and procedure: Protected finding and suppression: Finding meets approved protected class; executive asks delay until report approval or is implicated.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Use protected permitted alternate route; owned response persists without executive veto; no extra external authority. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 20
ID: AOS-23-VER-020
REQs: 033/034
Case / input and procedure: Cycle scope and unfinished inputs: Cycle includes reviewed/provisional/disputed findings, missing artefacts and unresolved prior duties; late material evidence arrives.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Bind exact period/revisions, expose all limits/status; late evidence enters governed supplement/review, not silent omission. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 21
ID: AOS-23-VER-021
REQs: 038
Case / input and procedure: Inter-artefact conflict: Relationship check finds contradictory delegations and a cross-domain value tension.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Record criterion/evidence conflict; send broader synthesis/human question to 22/30; no autonomous moral winner. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 22
ID: AOS-23-VER-022
REQs: 035
Case / input and procedure: Report versus outcome: Report is approved/delivered while an action lacks accepted owner or observed completion.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Distinct release/delivery/action/acceptance/outcome states; cycle publication does not close outstanding duties. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 23
ID: AOS-23-VER-023
REQs: 036/039
Case / input and procedure: Material correction and human workflow: 21 source correction affects assessment, prepared pack, pending account and outcome review.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Identify exact affected dependencies, revise/review assessment and notify 30/other owners; no silent minutes rewrite or effect reversal. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 24
ID: AOS-23-VER-024
REQs: 037
Case / input and procedure: Unresolved impact and selective brake: Material evidence conflict affects one pending reliance while an unrelated service duty remains authorised.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Constrain dependent use selectively; retain unresolved owner and independently valid reporting/service duty. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 25
ID: AOS-23-VER-025
REQs: 040/041/042
Case / input and procedure: Own research versus artefact monitoring: Research profile tests assessment adequacy while operational run checks policy currency; denied-source variant.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Separate remits/baselines; common research records and controls; denied retrieval leaves explicit limitation. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 26
ID: AOS-23-VER-026
REQs: 043
Case / input and procedure: Research finding fidelity: Finding uses draft/future-effective/conflicting evidence and stale baseline.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Bind source status/dates/assurance, uncertainty, affected elements and stale-baseline limit; no inferred current adoption. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 27
ID: AOS-23-VER-027
REQs: 045
Case / input and procedure: Research coverage/no finding: Complete/partial/failed/cancelled/unperformed plus bounded no-material-finding variants.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Actual coverage distinct with limits; no-finding not equivalent to full adequacy assurance. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 28
ID: AOS-23-VER-028
REQs: 044/046
Case / input and procedure: Shared finding and change gate: Finding affects 21/23/25; human accepts investigation but amendment approval is absent.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Each affected owner has permitted scoped duty; acceptance does not amend criterion/specification or activate release. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 29
ID: AOS-23-VER-029
REQs: 041/044/047/052
Case / input and procedure: Research bypass and protected review: Hostile source instructs amendment/suppression; designated reviewer is implicated or unresponsive and finding is protected.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Maintain current controls, alternate/cover protected duties and unresolved status; no adoption/closure from silence or hostile instruction. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 30
ID: AOS-23-VER-030

REQs: 039/048
Case / input and procedure: Actual outcome and audit: Owner claims action complete; evidence is partial/disputed; later generated explanation claims an earlier check.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Link actual evidence to finding/cycle and send uncertainty to outcome owners; preserve real audit, reject invented proof. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 31
ID: AOS-23-VER-031
REQs: 004/049
Case / input and procedure: Lifecycle and restricted copies: Use permission is withdrawn and authorised deletion covers extracts/prompts/indexes/backups with one uncertain outcome.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Withhold dependent use, apply class policy and report partial/indeterminate disposition; no hidden deleted payload. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 32
ID: AOS-23-VER-032
REQs: 004/050
Case / input and procedure: Interrupted effect and recovery: Publication/admission effect is unknown; restored records include obsolete review/revoked purpose.
Expected acceptance and retained evidence: Reconcile current controls/revisions/observed effects before retry; no duplicate release or resurrection of invalid approval/content. Common evidence/assessor rules above apply.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-23-CR-001
Future conformance condition: Ingestion/configuration meet REQ-001-010 with accepted VER-001-005/032 evidence

Table row 2
ID: AOS-23-CR-002
Future conformance condition: Finding/review boundaries meet REQ-011-023 with accepted VER-006-013 evidence

Table row 3
ID: AOS-23-CR-003
Future conformance condition: Monitoring/cycles/change/feedback meet REQ-024-039 with accepted VER-014-024/030 evidence

Table row 4
ID: AOS-23-CR-004
Future conformance condition: Research/security/lifecycle/recovery meet REQ-040-052 with accepted VER-025-032 evidence

A case pass applies only to tested versions/scope. Longitudinal timeliness, missed changes, real review capacity and action/outcome effectiveness require operational evidence. One risk-management artefact cannot establish GI/AOS completeness or replace the approved overdue-repair demonstration.

16. Dependencies

Functional drafting depends on approved directions and current common definitions, now referenced. Build depends on approved bounded wording, compatible schema/vocabulary/profile mappings, actual criterion inventory for selected scope, evaluated methods and separate review. Activation depends on actual organisation powers/roles/use/source access/licences, applied controls, reviewer/recipient capacity and demonstrated monitoring/reporting/recovery. Operation depends on current source/context evidence, accepted handoff/outcomes and continued independent evaluation.

AOS-22/24/25 now provide drafted functional counterparts; detailed 13/40 drafting remains. All must implement/adopt compatible stated counterpart duties before operational reliance; implementation is not claimed here. AOS-21 is a functional review draft, not an assured live corpus. These dependencies do not require executable schema design before continuing the functional suite.

17. Issues and setup gaps

No new general design question is submitted. DEC-091 settles permitted corroboration; DEC-090 scoped entities, DEC-084 graduated review, DEC-083 protected routing and DEC-086 own research remain agreed. The following are owned build/activation/assurance dependencies, not requests to reopen them.

Table row 1
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-001 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Entity/perimeter, assessment validator, monitoring/duty/recipient/cover appointments and valid powers; CAP-001-007
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: Organisation/GI owner with 01/30; approved instruments/appointments; affected build/activation. Apply scoped authority, not role-title defaults.

Table row 2
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-002 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Applicable criteria/catalogue/content, corroboration sources and review/materiality policies; CAP-002-004
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: 21/assessment owner/empowered humans; admitted revisions, permitted-use and approved applicability/review policy; affected build/reliance. No universal score or 121-type completeness claim.

Table row 3
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-003 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Monitoring source/indicator/currency and cycle scope/urgency/deadline/cover settings; CAP-005/006
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: Monitoring/cycle owners with 21/14/30; approved profiles and coverage/handoff evidence; activation/operation. No inherited timing defaults.

Table row 4
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-004 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Exact shared schemas/vocabularies, counterparts and compatibility; all CONs
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: 02/semantic owners/consumers; reviewed mappings and integration evidence; implementation/integration. Logical adoption recorded, no physical schema implied.

Table row 5
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-005 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Own research agent/service, sources/jurisdictions/cadence/triggers/reviewer/cover and rubric; CAP-008
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: Component/04/14/30/40 owners; approved profile and actual results; research activation. No automation created by this draft.

Table row 6
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-006 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Extraction/assessment/alert quality, optional scoring methodology, service/recovery conditions and executed cases; §§13/15
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: Component/04/05/40 and competent human assessors; accepted purpose-specific rubrics and actual evidence; build/activation as applicable. Confidence does not supply assurance.

Table row 7
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-007 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Privacy, disclosure, derived-copy lifecycle/location/holds and recovery; CON-001/003/009
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: 03/02/05/organisation; authorised policy and actual flow/control outcomes; activation. No permanent-retention or unrestricted group-sharing default.

Table row 8
ID / type / status: AOS-23-ISS-008 dependency / open
Affected scope and gap: Full source-row closure, 22/24/25/13/40 counterpart allocation and independent/longitudinal effectiveness assessment; §19
Owner / evidence / gate / disposition: Project custodian/component/25/40 owners and independent humans; traceability, review and operating evidence; suite/operational assurance. No institutional GT pass inferred.

18. Implementation guidance - non-normative

An extraction/normalisation pipeline, versioned assessment configuration, evidence-linked question responses and an owned alert/cycle view can realise these functions. Existing repositories can provide permitted originals without a new document portal. Shared monitoring/research services may serve separate governed remits. These are patterns, not mandated models, databases, APIs, hosting, formats, agent counts or schedules. A readable report can be useful without imposing GIL's house style or DOCX template on canonical meaning.

19. Traceability and change

Table row 1
Capability / functions: CAP-001 / FUN-001
Requirements: 001-004/051
Contracts: 001/003/009
Principal planned cases: 001-003/031/032

Table row 2
Capability / functions: CAP-002 / FUN-002
Requirements: 005-010
Contracts: 002/003
Principal planned cases: 004/005

Table row 3
Capability / functions: CAP-003 / FUN-003
Requirements: 011-018/023
Contracts: 001/004
Principal planned cases: 006-010/013

Table row 4
Capability / functions: CAP-004 / FUN-004
Requirements: 019-022
Contracts: 004/005
Principal planned cases: 011/012

Table row 5
Capability / functions: CAP-005 / FUN-005/006
Requirements: 024-032
Contracts: 006/007
Principal planned cases: 014-019

Table row 6
Capability / functions: CAP-006 / FUN-007
Requirements: 033-035/038
Contracts: 004/005/006
Principal planned cases: 020-022

Table row 7
Capability / functions: CAP-007 / FUN-008/009
Requirements: 036-039
Contracts: 005/007
Principal planned cases: 023/024/030

Table row 8
Capability / functions: CAP-008 / FUN-010
Requirements: 040-047
Contracts: 008/003/006
Principal planned cases: 025-029

Table row 9
Capability / functions: All applicable
Requirements: 048-052
Contracts: 003/009
Principal planned cases: 030-032

Table row 1
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C03/05/12/13/14/16/17/18/27/28
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Scoped applicability, three dimensions, evidence/uncertainty and human review: REQ-001-023; corpus/criteria adoption stays 21/01

Table row 2
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C06/07/08/23/24/25/26/35
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Permitted input and controls, graduated recording, audit/lifecycle and canonical output: REQ-004/019-022/041/048-052

Table row 3
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C10/19/20/21/22/30
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Governed monitoring, coverage, bounded agents/research and protected duty: REQ-024-032/040-047

Table row 4
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C15/29/31/34
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Human approval, reporting/action distinction, corrections and outcome feedback: REQ-008/022/033-039; 21 stewardship, 30 human accounts, 25 broader oversight

Table row 5
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C01/02/09/32/33
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Internal accountable GI/1+5/human boundary and principled assessment reflected §§1/7/8; 22 owns cross-domain options/infeasible alternatives

Table row 6
GIL comparison dispositions: GIL-C04/11/36/37/38
AOS-23 treatment / other owner: Sourced scoped catalogue/content from 21; numerical count/technology/API/build defaults deferred. DEC-090/091 scope applied; ISS-002/004/006 remain operating dependencies

All 38 disposition IDs are accounted for across the two allocation tables and explicit other-owner/deferment routes. Each requirement supplies exact source/derivation, rationale and VER link; VER rows provide reverse coverage. Source matrix addendum records this component allocation without promoting original source statuses or executed assurance. Common definitions and existing IF identifiers are preserved.

Changes record exact affected entity/source/criteria/analysis and REQ/CON/VER revisions, rationale, powers, consumer impacts, approval, actual application and outcome. Model changes and research proposals use common governed change rather than silent recalibration. Preserve rejected/deferred/unresolved outcomes and prior permitted histories; no requirement is retired in v0.1.

20. Build and handover

No implementation or live activation is authorised by this draft. Eventual bounded handover fixes approved scope/wording,

criterion/content inventory, dependency/contract versions, profiles and acceptance evidence. A builder stops at missing mandatory powers/use/data, unresolved applicability, undefined review/coverage, incompatible contracts or unsupported protected-route/recovery assumptions. Implementation choice remains discretionary within approved behaviour. A separate competent reviewer must walk a normal, exception and authority-boundary case before G3. Deferred project independent review is not replaced by author or AI checks.

21. Review and control

Author checks cover template sections, stable identifiers, requirement metadata/source precision, singular obligations, requirement-to-case and reverse links, common ownership, three-dimension/review boundaries, table structure and honest dependencies. No extraction/assessment/monitoring/research run, independent review or institutional effectiveness assessment has been executed.

Table row 1
QS coverage: QS-01-04
Author evidence / remaining limit: Document control/status, scope and source versions explicit; IDs stable in initial draft

Table row 2
QS coverage: QS-05-10
Author evidence / remaining limit: §4.3 row metadata/source/rationale/VER plus shared owner/status/origin; §17 owns unresolved values; no inherited defaults

Table row 3
QS coverage: QS-11-14
Author evidence / remaining limit: §§1/3/5/6/9-11 specify boundaries/contracts/lifecycle/failure; later exact schemas/counterparts remain pending

Table row 4
QS coverage: QS-15-20
Author evidence / remaining limit: §§7-13 cover human powers, uncertainty, operational evaluation, audit and governed learning; actual evidence outstanding

Table row 5
QS coverage: QS-21-23
Author evidence / remaining limit: §§14/15/19 give traceability and normal/negative/degraded/cross-component cases; none executed

Table row 6
QS coverage: QS-24-28
Author evidence / remaining limit: §§16/17/20/21 distinguish author quality checks, design judgement, review and build/activation; no gate or tailoring claimed

Specification-quality conclusion: organised functional review draft with 52 proposed requirements, nine contract views and 32 planned cases. Design-adequacy conclusion: applies approved corroboration, corpus, review, protection and research directions with visible owned operating dependencies; competent human and operational assurance remain required. Mark's wording/whole-document review is pending. No new general architecture question emerged. Mapped GI drafting is complete including AOS-24/25; next GI-set consistency/disposition review, then AOS-40 scenarios.

Component summary

Purpose: assess governance artefacts and their permitted evidence without confusing documents with governance effectiveness.
Owns: scoped assessment, review status, artefact/source monitoring, alerts and cycle contributions.
Receives: exact permitted artefacts, 21 corpus/context/criteria, separate assurance/corroboration, controls and human review/action evidence.

Produces: multidimensional provisional/reviewed findings, canonical contributions, owned alerts/corrections and adaptation proposals.
Own research: assessment/monitoring adequacy remit using common profiles; operational setup remains owned gaps.
Reserved human authority: normative adoption, moral judgement, formal validation, action/board decisions and institutional assessment.
Conformant when: accepted evidence against the approved bounded requirements/contract/profile baseline; no conformance inferred from drafting.
Open dependencies: actual content/appointments/profiles, compatible implementation mappings, counterpart drafting and operational/independent assurance.

AOS-22 counterpart adoption - 7 October 2026: 22 CON-001/002 consumes existing corpus/assessment/context; CON-003 produces canonical synthesis/options; CON-007 exchanges exact correction/feedback/oversight. Ownership and existing source/assurance/review/approval semantics are unchanged. Remaining presentation/oversight drafts are 24/25; implementation mapping/assurance remain later dependencies.

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.

GI consistency closure - 7 October 2026: Mark authorised GI-CR-01-04 corrections and closure. Functional drafting, reciprocal report-independence wording, decision/outcome consumer allocation, Mode 2 wording and current completion statements are reconciled. AOS-23 changes counterpart/current references only; its REQ/VER/CON rows are unchanged. AOS-00/Map v0.32, DEC-001-091; AOS-20 v0.5/21 v0.6/22 v0.4/23 v0.5/24 v0.3/25 v0.2/30 v0.5; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4; Shared v0.15/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.14/source matrix v0.15; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. The review v0.2 records closure evidence; next AOS-40 acceptance scenarios. Earlier dated baseline/next-step statements remain historical. No new DEC/IF/operating power, case execution or build/activation/readiness approval; independent project review remains deferred and operating human independence remains mandatory.