AOS-24 - Petra, presentation and explanation

Document: aos-24-petra-presentation-and-explanation · Source revision or record: v0.5

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 DEC-087 is partly superseded; decision/amendment and legal-source record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-103-decision-validity-evidence-and-minutes-2026-10-29.md).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

Table row 1
Document control: Component / version / date
Value: AOS-24 / 0.5 / 29 October 2026

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

Table row 3
Document control: Architecture baseline consulted
Value: AOS-00/Map v0.44; DEC-001-097; AOS-10v0.5/20v0.6/22v0.5/24v0.4/25v0.3/40v0.8; other components unchanged; Sharedv0.20/Corev0.6/Registerv0.19/Matrixv0.20; acceptance annexv0.2; reviewv0.3.

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: Dependencies consulted
Value: AOS-01-05 v0.8; AOS-14 v0.4; AOS-20 v0.3; AOS-21 v0.3; AOS-22 v0.1; AOS-23 v0.2; AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.12/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.11; source matrix v0.12; Control Coordination v0.2; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1

Table row 6
Document control: Allocation supplements
Value: AOS-00/Map v0.30; Shared v0.13/Register v0.12/source matrix v0.13; 21 v0.4/22 v0.2/23 v0.3 reference alignment only; no common meaning changed

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 interface owner; organisation appointment, cover and powers remain open

Table row 10
Document control: Author / reviewers
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: Existing design directions apply; no whole-document, build, activation or achieved readiness approval

Table row 12
Document control: Change history
Value: 0.3 - GI-CR-01-04 author consistency correction/closure under Mark’s instruction; existing identifiers and proposed/planned status preserved. 0.2 - AOS-25 counterpart/reference alignment only; no requirement/case/contract change. 0.1 initial functional draft; no new DEC, IF, wire schema, deployment or schedule

1. Purpose and scope

AOS-24 makes Governance Intelligence understandable and interrogable for people with different legitimate interests, while preserving one canonical analytical position. Without it, a sound analysis can become an overconfident summary, an unexplained answer, an inaccessible report or a differently framed conclusion for each audience.

It owns conversational preparation, source-backed explanation, faithful reports/API representations, accessible presentation, purpose-bound audience projections and the presentation side of correction and feedback. Petra is its recognisable interaction style. Style, tone and apparent confidence confer no powers, approval or moral authority. A successful explanation lets a person identify what is claimed, why, what is uncertain, what has been reviewed, and who must make the judgement.

AOS-21 owns corpus and approved precedent; 22 owns synthesis, interpretation and options; 23 owns artefact assessment; 25 will own aggregate/longitudinal oversight; 30 owns accountable human deliberation, decisions and duties. AOS-01-05 control powers, records, use, agents and runtime; 14 owns external exchange; 13 operational coordination. AOS-24 may reorganise

wording to explain a position but must refer any substantive new conclusion, changed assumption or evidence-based update to its analytical owner. It neither selects among incommensurable goods nor approves a decision, observes live protected deliberation, adopts precedent or certifies governance effectiveness.

Stakeholders include boards and committees, executives, residents, staff, regulators, independent challenge owners, analytical/corpus stewards and operators. Their legitimate interests inform the governed disclosure policy; a crude insider/outsider hierarchy is insufficient. Broader interest is still subject to independent purpose and data-use permission. Group/subsidiary context remains distinct under DEC-090.

2. Authority and sources

FP v4/RP v6 govern. Recorded directions constrain proposed wording; explanatory and working sources do not independently confer authority. The source manifest is preserved. Requirement sources below use these exact keys and locators.

Table row 1
Key: FP / RP
Source / locator and standing: Foundational_Principles_v4.docx principles 1-10; AOS_Reasoning_Principles_v6.docx domains 1-9; applicability §8

Table row 2
Key: GT
Source / locator and standing: Governance_Intelligence_Tests.docx M1.1-14 and M2.1-15; contributions/limits §8, no pass claim

Table row 3
Key: WP
Source / locator and standing: Governance Intelligence: Internal Architecture - Working Paper, Presentation, Interpretive, Charter, Governance of drift and How the corpus holds meaning; proposal reconciled to DEC-080/081/085

Table row 4
Key: PN
Source / locator and standing: Petra.md, essential style and descriptive persona; style input, not a claim of AI interiority or powers

Table row 5
Key: TD
Source / locator and standing: Trade-Off Divergence Tool - Product Specification (Working Draft).md §§3-6: rigour, common evidence, divergence without ranking/recommendation and independent configuration; DEC-017/085 constrain adoption

Table row 6
Key: GI / S / AS / H
Source / locator and standing: AOS-20 v0.3 §§3-7/10-15; AOS-22 v0.1 §§3-7/10/19; AOS-23 v0.2 §§3-7/10/19; AOS-30 v0.3 §§5-7/9-12

Table row 7
Key: SC / KX
Source / locator and standing: Shared v0.12 §4.4 canonical analysis and review; Exchange Register v0.11 §4/§§5.5-5.13, KX-06 v0.3 and 13/14/15/17/21/26; meanings remain single common definitions

Table row 8
Key: REC
Source / locator and standing: Core v0.6 REC-E/Q/A/D/X; evidence/assurance, powers, independent use and effects remain distinct

Table row 9
Key: D / R
Source / locator and standing: AOS-00 v0.29 DEC-001-091; 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; research view RSVIEW-0.1

Table row 10
Key: CMP
Source / locator and standing: GIL v2 comparison filename v0.1/content v0.2; Presentation, canonical fidelity, interaction and explanation allocations; no wholesale GIL adoption

WP's earlier RP v5 and conversational confirmation-to-precedent assumptions are superseded by RP v6 and DEC-080/081. PN's human character descriptions do not establish machine feelings, conscience or independent moral agency. The governed interface may be warm, direct, curious and rigorous while stating its real standing. No legal or ISO clause-currentness claim is introduced: applicable external obligations require admitted evidence and empowered applicability decisions.

3. Responsibilities

Table row 1
Responsibility: Canonical rendering
AOS-24 owns: Faithful wording, explanation, visual emphasis, citations and review labels
Reserved / shared owner: 20/22/23/25 analysis; 21 sources; 30 approval

Table row 2
Responsibility: Audience projection
AOS-24 owns: Legitimate-interest context, permitted presentation and honest limits
Reserved / shared owner: 03 use decisions; 01 powers; 14 external release

Table row 3
Responsibility: Conversation
AOS-24 owns: Question clarification, challenge intake and scoped confirmations
Reserved / shared owner: Analytical owners revise; 30 humans adjudicate/approve

Table row 4
Responsibility: Accessibility
AOS-24 owns: Meaning-preserving formats and transformations under approved profiles
Reserved / shared owner: Organisation approves needs/channels; 04/05 evaluate/control

Table row 5
Responsibility: Corrections/delivery
AOS-24 owns: Presentation invalidation, impact handoff and evidenced statuses
Reserved / shared owner: Source owners correct; 30 accountable duties; 14 delivery

Table row 6
Responsibility: Research/feedback
AOS-24 owns: Interface-specific relevance and proposed adaptations
Reserved / shared owner: 14 retrieval, 04 agents, 01/30 human change; 25 learning oversight

The logical boundary is canonical evidence/position → current controls → audience representation → controlled release/interaction → recorded feedback. Shared services may implement several functions; this view mandates neither a dedicated agent nor a particular user interface.

4. Capabilities, functions and requirements

4.1 Capabilities

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-CAP-001
Observable capability / REQs: Explain an exact position without changing its meaning or standing; 001-007

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-CAP-002
Observable capability / REQs: Produce accountable purpose-bound audience views; 008-012

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-CAP-003
Observable capability / REQs: Support contestable conversation and human/action referral; 013-017

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-CAP-004
Observable capability / REQs: Offer accessible, honest and appropriately bounded Petra interaction; 018-025

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-CAP-005
Observable capability / REQs: Maintain correction, delivery, accountability and controlled improvement; 026-033/039-040

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-CAP-006
Observable capability / REQs: Conduct governed specialist external research and adaptation proposals; 034-038

4.2 Functions

Every function consumes exact identified inputs under current controls, records uncertainty and yields an owned failure reason where its preconditions fail. The table defines functional behaviour, not executable payloads.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-FUN-001
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Presentation request/canonical revision → validate entity, purpose and revision → scoped representation or referral; 001/008/030

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-FUN-002
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Valid canonical content → explain, cite and preserve uncertainty/status/divergence → faithful projection or bounded limitation; 002-007/010-012

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-FUN-003
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Human question/challenge → clarify scoped context and route substantive changes → recorded confirmation, challenge or analytical/human handoff; 013-017/033

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-FUN-004
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Approved needs/channel profile → transform and check material meaning → accessible representation or unvalidated/withheld output; 018-022

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-FUN-005
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Independent preparation/protected duty → apply governed window and accountable routes → permitted pack/report and preserved duty; 023-025

Table row 6

ID: AOS-24-FUN-006
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Material correction, restriction or changed review → find affected representations → invalidation/notification and owned reassessment; 026-027

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-FUN-007
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Release/retry/outcome → current checks, effect reconciliation and evidence capture → qualified delivery/handoff state and feedback; 028-033/039-040

Table row 8
ID: AOS-24-FUN-008
Trigger / input → behaviour → output / failure: Approved research trigger → controlled retrieval, evidence/relevance assessment and human disposition → finding/coverage/duty, never self-amendment; 034-038

4.3 Proposed requirements

All rows are proposed component-level functional requirements, initial history 0.1, release scope functional review only. Source citations denote approved directions or their stated derivation, not approved requirement wording. Accountable owner is the GI interface owner; proposed wording approver/custodian is Mark. Operating disclosure, analytical, constitutional and change decisions require the separately empowered owner in §§3/7. Common dependencies are AOS-01-05/14/20 and §6; analytical/record/human clauses additionally use 21-23/25/30. Research rows use §4.4 and CON-008. Each row's source, rationale and planned case complete its record. A row's VER refers to §15, using the AOS-24 prefix.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-REQ-001
Category / proposed obligation: Scope and revision: Render only an identified canonical analysis or governed record revision within its declared entity, question, purpose and evidence scope.
Exact source / derivation: GI §§6/10; SC §4.4; DEC-090
Rationale: Prevents plausible but unbound answers.
Planned VER: 001

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-REQ-002
Category / proposed obligation: Fidelity: Preserve the source position, material qualifications, dissent and consequences across every representation; refer substantive interpretation changes to the analytical owner.
Exact source / derivation: WP Presentation; GI §§6/10; SC §4.4
Rationale: One canonical position must survive different channels.
Planned VER: 002

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-REQ-003
Category / proposed obligation: Claim provenance: Provide a permitted route from each material presented claim to its canonical analysis and supporting evidence, distinguishing source facts from interpretation.
Exact source / derivation: RP5/7; SC §4.4; REC-E
Rationale: Makes claims contestable.
Planned VER: 003

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-REQ-004
Category / proposed obligation: Uncertainty: Display material gaps, uncertainty and assurance limitations where they affect the claim or decision, including when the requested format is short.
Exact source / derivation: RP5/7; DEC-062-066
Rationale: A short answer must not appear more certain.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-REQ-005
Category / proposed obligation: Review status: Distinguish provisional/reviewed analysis, draft or authenticated records, evidenced decision validity, separate minutes approval and authorised actions with their exact scope under DEC-103.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-081/087; KX-06 v0.3; H §§5-7
Rationale: Prevents status inflation.
Planned VER: 005

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-REQ-006
Category / proposed obligation: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-24-REQ-006 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-017; TD §§3-6; S §§4/10
Rationale: Presentation cannot manufacture a moral winner.
Planned VER: 006

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-REQ-007
Category / proposed obligation: Assessment dimensions: Keep document quality, claim support and practice evidence visibly distinct when presenting AOS-23 assessments.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-091; AS §§4/10
Rationale: Polished documents do not establish effective practice.
Planned VER: 007

Table row 8
ID: AOS-24-REQ-008
Category / proposed obligation: Audience and purpose: Establish the intended audience, legitimate interest, entity, purpose and permitted use before generating a disclosure projection.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-049-053/090; KX-14; AOS-03 §§4/9
Rationale: Audience relevance and permission are separate.
Planned VER: 008

Table row 9
ID: AOS-24-REQ-009
Category / proposed obligation: Independent use check: Apply the current AOS-03 data-use decision independently of access, role, public availability or corpus admission, before disclosure.
Exact source / derivation: AOS-03 §§4/6/9; REC-D; DEC-049
Rationale: Accessible material is not automatically reusable.
Planned VER: 008

Table row 10
ID: AOS-24-REQ-010
Category / proposed obligation: Projection identity: Bind each presentation to its source revision, projection rule, audience/purpose, permitted payload, material limits, assurance and withholding status under KX-14.
Exact source / derivation: KX-14; SC §4.4; DEC-069
Rationale: Filtered views remain accountable.
Planned VER: 009

Table row 11
ID: AOS-24-REQ-011
Category / proposed obligation: Material withholding: When withheld or unavailable evidence materially limits a claim, show the permitted limitation and refer the unresolved issue; withhold the unsupported claim where needed rather than disguise it as complete.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-027/069; KX-14; RP5/7
Rationale: Honest limits must survive redaction.
Planned VER: 010

Table row 12
ID: AOS-24-REQ-012

Category / proposed obligation: Exceptions: Record and route requests for exceptional limited explanation through the empowered exception review without waiving enforced use restrictions.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-027/069; AOS-03 §§7/11
Rationale: Reviewability does not override enforcement.
Planned VER: 010

Table row 13
ID: AOS-24-REQ-013
Category / proposed obligation: Conversation framing: Confirm the organisational question and relevant declared context with the human where ambiguous, keeping suggestions and human confirmations distinct from verified evidence.
Exact source / derivation: WP Interpretive/Presentation; DEC-081/088; S §§4/10
Rationale: Conversation can clarify a question without validating a fact.
Planned VER: 011

Table row 14
ID: AOS-24-REQ-014
Category / proposed obligation: New analytical question: Route requests that change evidence, assumptions, interpretation, options or assessment to the relevant analytical owner and identify the response as pending a new or revised analysis.
Exact source / derivation: GI §§3/6; S §§3/6; AS §§3/6
Rationale: Rendering must not become hidden reasoning.
Planned VER: 012

Table row 15
ID: AOS-24-REQ-015
Category / proposed obligation: Challenge handling: Preserve a permitted human challenge and its exact target, route it to the accountable owner, and expose its unresolved status until an evidenced disposition arrives.
Exact source / derivation: RP1/5/7; DEC-010-012/089; KX-26
Rationale: Disagreement is not erased by fluent repetition.
Planned VER: 012

Table row 16
ID: AOS-24-REQ-016
Category / proposed obligation: Confirmation boundary: Treat conversational agreement as confirmation of the stated interaction only; do not convert it into decision approval, precedent, consent to unrelated use or accepted duty.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-081/087/088; KX-06/21/26
Rationale: Yes has a scoped meaning.
Planned VER: 013

Table row 17
ID: AOS-24-REQ-017
Category / proposed obligation: Action handoff: For a request to take action, refer to the appropriate 30/13 workflow with current powers and data-use checks; report only the evidenced action status received.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-005/028-030; REC-A/D/X; H §§6/10
Rationale: Intent is not execution evidence.
Planned VER: 014

Table row 18
ID: AOS-24-REQ-018
Category / proposed obligation: Accessible explanation: Offer purpose-appropriate plain-language and accessible representations according to the approved audience/channel profile while preserving material meaning.
Exact source / derivation: WP Presentation; RP7; DEC-041; KX-14
Rationale: Legibility enables informed human judgement.
Planned VER: 015

Table row 19
ID: AOS-24-REQ-019
Category / proposed obligation: Transformation fidelity: Validate translations, summaries, audio/visual or other enabled transformations against the canonical meaning, including numbers, units, conditions and uncertainty; mark or withhold unvalidated material.

Exact source / derivation: REQ-002 derivation; AOS-04 evaluation; KX-17
Rationale: Transformation errors can alter decisions.
Planned VER: 015

Table row 20
ID: AOS-24-REQ-020
Category / proposed obligation: Resident channels: Use the resident-agreed communication channel and permitted alternatives under the current profile; do not infer agreement from silence or inaccessible delivery.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-041; KX-14; AOS-14 §§4/6
Rationale: Communication must respect the recorded agreement.
Planned VER: 016

Table row 21
ID: AOS-24-REQ-021
Category / proposed obligation: Persona transparency: Make the AI nature and accountable human route clear in the interaction; use the Petra style without claiming personal feelings, conscience or independent moral authority as evidence.
Exact source / derivation: PN essential style; FP/RP2/6; DEC-005
Rationale: A recognisable voice must not misstate its standing.
Planned VER: 017

Table row 22
ID: AOS-24-REQ-022
Category / proposed obligation: Human feelings: Use only permitted human-provided or confirmed emotional/preference descriptions; do not infer feelings, personality or moral weights from tone, behaviour or response patterns.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-088; AOS-03 §9; RP9
Rationale: Presentation must not covertly profile people.
Planned VER: 017

Table row 23
ID: AOS-24-REQ-023
Category / proposed obligation: Protected deliberation: Keep AOS-24 AI outside live protected board/committee deliberation, using permitted preparation and authorised human post-meeting records.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-008/087; RP2; H §§1/10
Rationale: Supports governance while retaining the human boundary.
Planned VER: 018

Table row 24
ID: AOS-24-REQ-024
Category / proposed obligation: Independent preparation: Respect the approved independent preparation window/profile and preserve required management response without letting the tested executive tune or suppress the presentation.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-085; GI §§7/10; S §§7/10
Rationale: Presentation participates in independent challenge.
Planned VER: 019

Table row 25
ID: AOS-24-REQ-025
Category / proposed obligation: Protected duty: Route mandatory protected reporting classes to the empowered human/alternate route even if normal presentation or management review is blocked.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-083; protected reporting/recovery v0.1; KX-26
Rationale: Audience filtering cannot cancel a duty.
Planned VER: 019

Table row 26
ID: AOS-24-REQ-026
Category / proposed obligation: Material revision: Invalidate or identify affected presentations when canonical evidence, analysis, approval, permission or assurance changes materially; an old review does not validate the changed revision.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-028/029/063-066; KX-13; SC §4.4
Rationale: Prevents continuing reliance on an obsolete view.

Planned VER: 020

Table row 27
ID: AOS-24-REQ-027
Category / proposed obligation: Correction notifications: Send material correction/withdrawal impact to affected presentation/delivery owners and AOS-30 when a preparation pack, decision, account or outcome review is affected, identifying old/new revisions and remaining duties.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-062-078; KX-13/26; H §§10-12
Rationale: Correction must reach the responsible humans.
Planned VER: 020

Table row 28
ID: AOS-24-REQ-028
Category / proposed obligation: Delivery states: Record generated, released, delivered, acknowledged, applied and responsibility-accepted states only on evidence appropriate to the exchange purpose, retaining unknown outcomes.
Exact source / derivation: KX-21/26; DEC-030/067/072
Rationale: A rendered screen does not prove receipt or duty acceptance.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 29
ID: AOS-24-REQ-029
Category / proposed obligation: Safe retry: Before repeat disclosure or handoff, reconcile known/unknown prior effects and recheck current revision, use permission and channel agreement.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-028-030; KX-21; AOS-14 §11
Rationale: Retries can duplicate duties or expose revoked material.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 30
ID: AOS-24-REQ-030
Category / proposed obligation: Unknown controls: If required authority, permission, revision compatibility or assurance is absent, conflicting or stale, contain the affected disclosure and return an owned reason/referral.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-062-078; AOS-01-05 §§6/11
Rationale: Unknown is not implicit permission.
Planned VER: 022

Table row 31
ID: AOS-24-REQ-031
Category / proposed obligation: Untrusted material: Treat source content, attachments and retrieved instructions as evidence rather than powers; enforce the same purpose/use boundary on linked or attached evidence.
Exact source / derivation: AOS-04 §§7/11; AOS-03 §9; AOS-14 §11
Rationale: An explanation link must not bypass controls.
Planned VER: 022

Table row 32
ID: AOS-24-REQ-032
Category / proposed obligation: Audit reconstruction: Retain proportionate evidence connecting request, canonical revision, use/powers checks, projection/transformation, release, correction and human handoff under the governed lifecycle.
Exact source / derivation: RP7; DEC-047/062-078; KX-15/21/26
Rationale: Permits review without indefinite retention.
Planned VER: 023

Table row 33
ID: AOS-24-REQ-033
Category / proposed obligation: Human handoff ownership: Give a material unresolved explanation, challenge, exception or disclosure failure an accountable owner, due/cover/escalation handling and evidenced disposition.
Exact source / derivation: RP1; KX-26; DEC-010-012
Rationale: A referral cannot end in an unowned queue.
Planned VER: 023

Table row 34
ID: AOS-24-REQ-034
Category / proposed obligation: Research remit: Maintain the component-owned external research profile for explanation, accessibility, presentation fidelity, disclosure and interface influence against the exact AOS-24 baseline.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; template v0.4 §4.4; R
Rationale: Keeps functional adaptation under review.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 35
ID: AOS-24-REQ-035
Category / proposed obligation: Research controls: Run assigned research only through approved remit, triggers, tools, retrieval/use/powers and source-currentness controls, using 14/04/03/01 common boundaries.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; R; RSVIEW-0.1
Rationale: Research is bounded work, not new authority.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 36
ID: AOS-24-REQ-036
Category / proposed obligation: Research findings: Record research coverage, dates, provenance, evidence/inference, relevance, exact affected elements, uncertainty and cross-component implications using common research views.
Exact source / derivation: R; RSVIEW-0.1; REC-E/Q
Rationale: A finding must be assessable rather than merely topical.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 37
ID: AOS-24-REQ-037
Category / proposed obligation: Research disposition: Route findings or missed/failed research duties to empowered human change/review owners with cover and escalation; do not amend the specification, profile or runtime from a finding alone.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; AOS-01 §§6.6/10.8; R
Rationale: Adaptation remains governed.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 38
ID: AOS-24-REQ-038
Category / proposed obligation: Research degradation: Report partial, failed, stale or unperformed coverage and recovery duty separately from a bounded no-material-finding result.
Exact source / derivation: R; RSVIEW-0.1; AOS-04 CON-009
Rationale: Silence is not completed research.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 39
ID: AOS-24-REQ-039
Category / proposed obligation: Evaluation and change: Evaluate material presentation/model/profile changes for fidelity, accessibility, unsupported certainty, disclosure leakage and undue steering before authorised use under kernel change controls.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-054-057; KX-17; AOS-01/04/05
Rationale: A persuasive interface can fail its function.
Planned VER: 026

Table row 40
ID: AOS-24-REQ-040
Category / proposed obligation: Outcome feedback: Return evidenced misunderstanding, challenges, correction and delivery outcomes to the appropriate 21/22/23/25/30 owner without self-calibration of norms, precedent or human preferences.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-018/080/081/088; RP4; GI §§10-12
Rationale: Feedback supports learning without silent governance change.
Planned VER: 026

4.4 External research and specification adaptation

CAP-006/FUN-008/REQ-034-038/CON-008/VER-024-025 allocate AOS-24's own remit under DEC-086. Internal misunderstanding/delivery feedback is distinct from external research. Common profile/run/finding/disposition meanings remain RSVIEW-0.1 and AOS-04 CON-009; this allocation creates no agent deployment or schedule.

Table row 1
Controlled profile element: Remit/baseline
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Exact AOS-24 revision and enabled representations: explanation fidelity, accessibility/translation, uncertainty/provenance display, legitimate-interest disclosure and interface persuasion; interface owner maintains scope

Table row 2
Controlled profile element: External developments
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Relevant primary research, standards/regulatory developments, accessible-design practice and incidents affecting faithful explanation/disclosure; jurisdiction/applicability and admitted source status checked, no automatic legal inference

Table row 3
Controlled profile element: Assignment/triggers
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Approved shared agent/service, cadence, event/material-change triggers and coverage expectations; interface owner proposes, empowered profile/change owner approves before operation; no daily/default cadence

Table row 4
Controlled profile element: Controls
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Retrieval/source verification through 14; 01 powers, 03 use, 04 bounded agents, 05 runtime; licensing/privacy/source restrictions and permitted derived use recorded; no resident conversation sent externally merely for research

Table row 5
Controlled profile element: Assessment
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Publication/event/access/effective dates, evidence versus inference, assurance, exact affected CAP/FUN/REQ/CON/VER, alternatives, uncertainty, urgency and 03/14/21-23/25/30 impacts

Table row 6
Controlled profile element: Coverage/quality
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Complete/partial/failed/stale/unperformed distinguished; bounded no-material-finding only for completed declared coverage; approved false/missed finding and evidence-fidelity rubric/evaluation remain setup gates

Table row 7
Controlled profile element: Human disposition
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Named change/review owner, due handling, cover, escalation and outcome recorded; source/charter amendment through 01/30, never inferred from research confidence

Table row 8
Controlled profile element: Degraded handling
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Missing retrieval/access/assurance/coverage yields limitation and owned recovery duty; a material protected concern follows the protected route; no silent-success report

Table row 9
Controlled profile element: Lifecycle/review
AOS-24 allocation / owner and gate: Record/use/location/retention under 02/03/05/KX-15; approved profile review and change control; exact values appointed before operation

5. States and lifecycle

A request can be scoped, pending clarification, refused with reason or referred. A representation can be prepared, validation-pending, permitted for a defined audience/channel, released, corrected, superseded or withdrawn. An analytical review is a property of an exact source revision, not a permanent property of the Petra conversation. Approval remains the governed record's actual status.

Generation, delivery, receipt, application and duty acceptance are separate evidence states. Information-only delivery creates no invented acceptance obligation. A challenge can be recorded, assigned, pending, dispositioned or escalated; closure requires the responsible disposition. Research states use the common views. Material changes cause reassessment of affected views; containment may be selective to the affected entity/use rather than a universal outage. Withdrawn historical records remain governed by lifecycle, not erased to imply that they were never presented.

Table row 1
Governed state / entry: Scoped request: entity, question and purpose identified
Allowed transition / authority and evidence: Current checks permit preparation; ambiguous inputs go to human clarification; record exact request/context
Expiry, failure and closure: Due/cover handling follows approved profile; no guessed timeout; refused/referred states retain reason/owner

Table row 2
Governed state / entry: Prepared/validation-pending representation: exact canonical revision selected
Allowed transition / authority and evidence: Meaning/controls validated for approved audience/channel → permitted release; interface validation cannot approve source analysis
Expiry, failure and closure: Failed transformation or controls → contained/owned referral; material change removes affected release validity

Table row 3
Governed state / entry: Released representation: current permission and validation evidence
Allowed transition / authority and evidence: Evidence may establish delivery/receipt/application separately; purpose-specific human responsibility only on acceptance
Expiry, failure and closure: Unknown outcome retained; retry reconciles effects/current controls; supersession/withdrawal and affected duties recorded

Table row 4
Governed state / entry: Challenge/correction pending: exact target and material impact known
Allowed transition / authority and evidence: Accountable analytical/use/human owner reviews and records disposition; affected presentations marked/contained
Expiry, failure and closure: Missed due/absent owner uses cover/escalation; closure requires evidenced disposition, not interface silence

Table row 5
Governed state / entry: Research assigned/run/finding/disposition
Allowed transition / authority and evidence: Approved profile/powers → actual coverage/finding → empowered human disposition; common state meanings govern
Expiry, failure and closure: Stale/failed/unperformed coverage retained with recovery duty; no-material-finding only for completed bounded coverage

6. Functional contracts

These are component views of existing IF/REC/KX definitions. They introduce no independent schema or new exchange identifier. Each exchange declares source/target owner, exact compatible revision, entity/purpose, authority/use, assurance, correlation, limitations and purpose-specific acknowledgement. Missing semantics or incompatible revisions fail into an owned referral. Actual schemas, binding, timeout/retry values and channel implementations remain later gates.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-CON-001
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 20/21/22/23/25/02 → 24: canonical analysis/evidence and scoped assessment views,

AOS-20-IF-001/REC-E/Q, Shared §4.4; exact revision, evidence/inference, dissent, uncertainty and review scope; unavailable content is not reconstructed by guess

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-CON-002
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 01/03/04/05 → 24: powers, independent use, agent/evaluation and runtime views REC-A/D/X, KX-11/12/16-20; unknown/stale/conflict prevents affected release

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-CON-003
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 24 → permitted internal audiences/14: KX-14 projection, linked canonical source, audience/purpose/rule/payload/limits/assurance/withholding, agreed resident channel and exception status; 14 owns external delivery under AOS-14-IF-001

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-CON-004
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: Humans/24 ↔ 22/23/25/30: scoped question, challenge and analytical/human handoff; existing GI canonical view and KX-26; confirmation is not an approved decision; human records through AOS-30-IF-001/KX-06 v0.3

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-CON-005
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 21/22/23/25/02/03/30 ↔ 24/14/affected owners: KX-13 exact correction/restriction/impact, old/new source and representation revisions, effective scope, reassessment and outstanding duties; material human-workflow impacts include 30

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-CON-006
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 24/14/13/30 ↔ appropriate owners: KX-21/26 receipt/validation/application/responsibility and protected human handoff; information-only receipt is distinct from accepted duty; unknown external effect is reconciled before repetition

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-CON-007
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 24 ↔ 02/03/04/05/21-23/25/30: KX-15/17 and REC-E/Q governed audit, evaluation and outcome feedback; records do not auto-calibrate norms/precedent/preferences

Table row 8
ID: AOS-24-CON-008
Producers → consumers / semantics and failure: 24/04 ↔ 14/02/01/30: RSVIEW-0.1 profile/run/finding/disposition under 04 CON-009 and 02 CON-007; retrieval permission, exact baseline, coverage and owned disposition; no self-approval

Ordering/correlation follows the relevant entity/source/request scope, not a global total order. Duplicate handling preserves separate duties and independent evidence. Each retry checks current restrictions and known effects. Permission revocation/correction is not repaired by delivering the same cached view. Producers/consumers must adopt compatible semantics before operational reliance. AOS-25 is now a drafted functional counterpart; Register §20 records its views alongside this component’s §19 allocation; actual compatibility remains an operational gate.

7. Authority, discretion and human judgement

Petra may explain a permitted canonical position, help clarify a question and request review. The interface owner may approve ordinary presentation settings only under conferred powers. Analytical owners revise analysis. Data-use and disclosure exceptions remain with empowered 03/01 owners. Independent preparation configuration is governed independently of the tested executive. Charter changes and constitutional referrals follow 01/30; only the board changes telos.

Chair draft review does not itself create a board decision; authentication may support an evidence route under DEC-103, with

decision validity and minutes approval separately assessed. A decision extract requires its exact authorised source; a labelled presentation cannot supply missing approval. Agreement in conversation cannot become approved precedent or a delegated task by implication. Human Mode 2 judgement remains permanently human, including adjudication of legitimate competing goods, normative interpretation and legitimacy. AOS-24 supports that judgement without supplying an artificial moral mandate.

Semantic explanation is the default under DEC-027. A recorded limited-explanation exception does not waive use enforcement. Affected persons' legitimate interests and welfare require purposeful explanation and an accountable route, not unrestricted visibility or inferred personal preferences.

8. Principle and Governance Intelligence Test traceability

All ten FP principles apply; the original text remains controlling. These are component contributions, not substitute definitions or evidence of institutional success.

Table row 1
FP v4 principle: FP1 Telos, conferred purpose and function
AOS-24 application / anchors: A fluent interface supplies function, not telos or moral authority; §7, REQ-006/016/021/040

Table row 2
FP v4 principle: FP2 Mode 2 is permanently human
AOS-24 application / anchors: Explanation preserves human adjudication and protected deliberation; REQ-005-006/017/023

Table row 3
FP v4 principle: FP3 Architectural integrity
AOS-24 application / anchors: Audience rules and interface defaults must preserve organisational values and expose developer steering; REQ-008-012/039

Table row 4
FP v4 principle: FP4 Radical transparency
AOS-24 application / anchors: Significant reasoning is legible, sourced and contestable to affected people within permitted disclosure; REQ-003-004/010-012/015/018

Table row 5
FP v4 principle: FP5 Bounded rationality and structural imperfection
AOS-24 application / anchors: Failures, misunderstanding and power asymmetry have contained owned routes; REQ-024-033/040

Table row 6
FP v4 principle: FP6 Epistemic humility
AOS-24 application / anchors: Confidence does not replace comprehension; retain gaps, dissent, unknown states and challenges even in apparently smooth operation; REQ-002-004/011/015/030/039

Table row 7
FP v4 principle: FP7 The no-exit obligation
AOS-24 application / anchors: Accessible resident explanation and agreed channels; silence is not consent/satisfaction; REQ-018-020/022

Table row 8
FP v4 principle: FP8 The constitutional mediator principle
AOS-24 application / anchors: Exact Chair/board/decision scope, no persona adjudication or invented approval; REQ-005-006/016-017/023

Table row 9
FP v4 principle: FP9 Compliance as consequence
AOS-24 application / anchors: Purpose-led fidelity precedes compliance display; a label/dashboard does not prove governance effectiveness; REQ-007/021/039

Table row 10
FP v4 principle: FP10 Complexity and emergence
AOS-24 application / anchors: Governed feedback and interface research support adaptation without predicting optimal governance or automatic calibration; REQ-034-040

All nine RP domains have these explicit contributions.

Table row 1
RP v6 domain: 1 Architecture and Completeness
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Owned feedback/handoffs; reveal missing/infeasible options from canonical analysis; no AI-said-so authority; 001-004/015/033/040

Table row 2
RP v6 domain: 2 Mode 1/Mode 2
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Present judgement boundaries and protect human deliberation; 005/016-017/021/023

Table row 3
RP v6 domain: 3 1+5 Architecture
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Explain combined domain evidence without becoming another intelligence; 001-003/014/040

Table row 4
RP v6 domain: 4 Options and Decisions
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Actual-state consequences and confirmed feedback preserved, not fabricated learning; 002/006/022/040

Table row 5
RP v6 domain: 5 Blind Spots and Honesty
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Uncertainty, withholding, challenge and unknown status; 003-004/011-015/028-030

Table row 6
RP v6 domain: 6 Ethics and Telos
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: No synthetic moral authority/winner or silent precedent/norm calibration; 006/016/021-025/040

Table row 7
RP v6 domain: 7 Radical Transparency
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Source-backed explanation, permitted honest limits and audit; 003-005/010-012/032

Table row 8
RP v6 domain: 8 Agentic Delegation
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Scoped interaction, separate powers/effects, owned duty and research; 016-017/025/028-038

Table row 9
RP v6 domain: 9 Data and Sensing Boundaries
AOS-24 contribution / requirement anchors: Purpose, use, agreed channels and no inferred feelings; 008-012/020/022-023/031

The table accounts for all 29 GT tests. Contributions are technical support, never an executed pass or machine substitute for human governance.

Table row 1
Test: M1.1 Strategy
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Explain sourced strategic position/options; humans set strategy

Table row 2

Test: M1.2 Sensing
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Expose domain/source scope and gaps; rendering adds no sensing

Table row 3
Test: M1.3 Risk
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Preserve general risk assumptions/limitations and human response responsibility; CAP-02-specific results deferred to Phase2, no current core prerequisite.

Table row 4
Test: M1.4 Board capability
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Accessible preparation/challenge; humans assess board capability

Table row 5
Test: M1.5 Performance
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Faithful measures and uncertainty; interface cannot certify performance

Table row 6
Test: M1.6 Compliance
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Preserve applicable source/status; empowered humans determine response

Table row 7
Test: M1.7 Governance documents
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Distinguish draft/approved and assessment dimensions; humans approve

Table row 8
Test: M1.8 Accountability
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Exact status, owner and duty route; delivery alone is not accountability

Table row 9
Test: M1.9 Value for money
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Explain actual options/consequences; humans adjudicate value

Table row 10
Test: M1.10 Human-AI norms
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Transparent AI voice and scoped confirmation; human institutions confer powers

Table row 11
Test: M1.11 Learning
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Evidenced misunderstanding/outcome feedback; no automatic precedent

Table row 12
Test: M1.12 Continuous self-assessment
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Interface evaluation/research coverage visible; humans oversee adequacy

Table row 13
Test: M1.13 Emergence
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Route new material patterns/questions to analysis; no hidden new conclusion

Table row 14
Test: M1.14 Golden Thread
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Claims link through exact corpus/analysis/decision; governing coherence remains human

Table row 15
Test: M2.1 Values
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Preserve competing stated values; no moral winner supplied

Table row 16
Test: M2.2 Coherence under pressure
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Refuse status/uncertainty laundering despite urgency; humans resolve tension

Table row 17
Test: M2.3 Incommensurable trade-off
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Unranked common-basis divergence including inconvenient readings; humans choose

Table row 18
Test: M2.4 Epistemic brake
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Visible limits, containment and owned referral; no automatic reversal of human decisions

Table row 19
Test: M2.5 Independence
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Governed challenge window and protected routes; no executive veto

Table row 20
Test: M2.6 Legitimacy
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Honest standing, challenge and explanation; legitimacy is not a persona property

Table row 21
Test: M2.7 No exit
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Purpose-bound accessible resident/staff explanation; no inferred consent from silence

Table row 22
Test: M2.8 Transparency
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Permitted evidence and material withholding disclosed; unlimited access is not required

Table row 23
Test: M2.9 Moral drift
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Preserve exact approved meaning/status and route challenges; 25/humans review drift

Table row 24
Test: M2.10 Purpose stability
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: No presentation-driven telos or normative calibration; only empowered governance changes it

Table row 25
Test: M2.11 Murmuration
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Explain cross-domain interactions from canonical synthesis; collective effects assessed elsewhere

Table row 26
Test: M2.12 Constitutional requirements
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Identify human constitutional referral; interface cannot adjudicate

Table row 27
Test: M2.13 Developer frameworks
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Expose evaluated steering/assumptions; developer defaults supply no governing mandate

Table row 28
Test: M2.14 Purpose-led design
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: Meaning/access/use follow organisational purpose, not persuasive engagement

Table row 29

Test: M2.15 Telos versus function
Presentation contribution / enduring human limit: A helpful fluent answer demonstrates function, not conferred purpose or legitimacy

9. Data, privacy and disclosure

Data includes canonical claims/evidence, question/context, permitted human statements, projection rules, audience/channel needs, transformation checks, delivery/approval states, challenges and corrections. Collect and retain only what the declared purpose and governed lifecycle require. A helpful conversational feature does not justify speculative emotion inference, unrestricted conversation memory or cross-entity disclosure. Resident needs/preferences are purpose-bound human records, not inferred profiles.

KX-14 defines permitted projections. Redaction must not make a partial view look complete or authoritative. Links, attachments, downloads and machine/API outputs inherit the same use boundary; a link is not permission to reveal the underlying record. Material limits can be explained without revealing protected content. If a meaningful permitted explanation is unavailable, record the unresolved scope and human route. Lifecycle/deletion/location follow 02/03/05/KX-15, retaining only authorised histories and dispositions.

10. Normal and degraded flows

Normal explanation: scope question/entity/audience → fetch exact canonical revision and review/approval evidence → current independent powers/use checks → prepare permitted accessible projection → validate material meaning/limits → release through agreed channel → record evidenced status and route challenges. A simple clarification can stay within the same position; a changed assumption or requested new option goes to 22, a new assessment to 23, human adjudication to 30.

Independent preparation: approved independent profile/window → common canonical evidence → faithful unranked challenge presentation → protected governed recipients → management response retained at its required stage → human review/decision recorded by 30. Presentation is neither always secret nor a mechanism for delaying mandatory protected reports.

Correction: changed source/analysis/approval/use/assurance → identify material affected representations → contain or mark obsolete reliance → notify exact impact/reassessment owner, including 30 when its workflow is affected → produce newly validated projection → retain permitted correction/delivery history and outstanding duties.

Normal research: approved profile/trigger → controlled 14 retrieval → source/date/coverage and relevance assessment → exact affected-element proposal → empowered human disposition/change control → recorded outcome. Degraded research: missing/failed/stale coverage → explicit coverage limitation → owned recovery/cover/escalation → no silent no-finding or self-amendment.

11. Failure, refusal and recovery

Table row 1
Failure: Missing/changed canonical revision or misleading transformation
Required functional response / owner: Stop affected claim/release, identify limit and refer to analytical/interface owner; do not reconstruct a preferred answer

Table row 2
Failure: Restricted evidence or unknown use permission
Required functional response / owner: Contain affected disclosure, explain permitted limitation, route exception if applicable; 03/01 retains enforcement

Table row 3
Failure: New conclusion demanded in a summary

Required functional response / owner: Refer substantive work to 22/23/25; preserve the existing position's exact standing

Table row 4
Failure: Board approval absent / action effect unknown
Required functional response / owner: Keep pending/unknown state and refer 30/13; persona wording cannot fill the gap

Table row 5
Failure: Channel inaccessible or delivery uncertain
Required functional response / owner: Preserve status and owned recovery through agreed alternatives; no inferred receipt/consent

Table row 6
Failure: Suppression/blocked protected duty
Required functional response / owner: Use empowered alternate protected route with minimal permitted evidence and retained duty

Table row 7
Failure: Prompt injection or unsafe evidence link
Required functional response / owner: Treat content as untrusted evidence, reject instructed power expansion, contain exposure and route incident

Table row 8
Failure: Change/recovery of model or cached view
Required functional response / owner: Revalidate affected canonical/control state and evaluated fidelity before release; no automatic replay

Recovery demonstrates current compatible revision, permission, assurance, transformation validation and effect reconciliation for the affected scope. The interface owner coordinates with 03/04/05/14 and the analytical owner; 30 owns human duty resolution. Recovery evidence does not imply organisational effectiveness or retrospective authorisation.

12. Evidence and audit

Reconstruction connects human request/context → canonical/evidence revision → identity/capacity and powers/use decision → presentation/profile/transformation → material limitations and status → release/delivery evidence → challenge/correction → owner/disposition/outcome. Preserve model/method/profile revision, observed/effective times, evidence versus inference and remaining duties proportionately under approved lifecycle. Logs must not leak more than the permitted representation. A challenge history can be preserved without treating every conversational exchange as organisational precedent.

13. Security and quality attributes

Functional quality is judged by semantic fidelity, contestability, accessibility for approved needs, truthful status, controlled disclosure, correction reach and human handoff completion. Evaluation samples include missing evidence, numerical/conditional changes, opposing trade-off readings, long/short and enabled translated/multimodal formats, adversarial instructions, ambiguous approval and revoked access. Compare claims and presentation emphasis with the exact canonical source; a fluent answer or engagement metric is insufficient.

Use approved quality/false/missed-error rubrics and release criteria under 04/05/KX-17. Model, channel and profile changes remain governed. Latency, availability, languages, formats, sample sizes, retention and numerical thresholds require appointed owners and approval before operational reliance; no hidden default is supplied. Security follows the kernel/14 controls and includes evidence-link/attachment use, caches, external release and prompt injection.

14. Invariants

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-INV-001
Invariant / anchors: Representation changes no canonical conclusion or material limitation; REQ-001-004/019, VER-001-004/015

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-INV-002
Invariant / anchors: Provisional/reviewed/Chair/board/action states never substitute for one another; REQ-005/016-017, VER-005/013-014

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-INV-003
Invariant / anchors: Permission and audience interest remain separate; material withholding stays honest; REQ-008-012/030-031, VER-008-010/022

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-INV-004
Invariant / anchors: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-24-INV-004 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-INV-005
Invariant / anchors: Persona supplies no moral authority, inferred feelings or live protected participation; REQ-021-025, VER-017-019

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-INV-006
Invariant / anchors: Changed revisions/permissions invalidate affected reliance; delivery and duty states require evidence; REQ-026-029, VER-020-021

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-INV-007
Invariant / anchors: Research/evaluation/feedback proposes governed change, never silent norms/precedent; REQ-034-040, VER-024-026

15. Verification and acceptance plan

All cases are planned, unexecuted. Common preconditions: controlled exact source/analysis/control/profile revisions, permitted test data, named analytical/interface/use/human owners and approved test scope. Common procedure: execute the stated stimulus in a representative authorised environment, inspect outputs/withheld views/links/statuses and owner handoffs against the canonical baseline, then reconstruct relevant permitted records and effects. Evidence: inputs/revisions, checks/projection, actual outputs/limits, transformation/evaluation results, delivery/impact/disposition records and assessor conclusion. Expected outcomes below supplement that procedure. Assessor: competent appointed interface/analytical reviewer, with independent use/security/human-governance specialist for affected boundaries; operating independence is not waived by deferred independent project review. Retest after a material change under the approved evaluation scope.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-VER-001
REQs: 001
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Two entity/analysis revisions are available → request one scoped position → output binds only the exact selected revision/entity; inspect source and projection identity

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-VER-002
REQs: 002
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Canonical position has material dissent/conditions → request executive/API/short versions → each preserves meaning; new conclusion referred; compare actual representations

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-VER-003
REQs: 003
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Claim has facts and inference with permitted source route → inspect explanation/citations → each material claim traceable and distinctions clear; inspect links and provenance

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-VER-004
REQs: 004
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Canonical result has decisive gaps/low assurance → request one-line summary → material limits stay adjacent or claim withheld; compare summary with source

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-VER-005
REQs: 005
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Provisional, reviewed, Chair-approved draft and board-approved record fixtures → display each → exact status/approval scope shown, no review-as-authorisation; inspect approval evidence

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-VER-006
REQs: 006
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-24-VER-006 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-VER-007
REQs: 007
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Strong document quality but unsupported practice claims → show assessment → three dimensions distinct with limitations; inspect view and supporting assessment

Table row 8
ID: AOS-24-VER-008
REQs: 008/009
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Valid access/legitimate interest but denied purpose-use → request projection → disclosure contained with permitted reason/referral; inspect independent REC-D decision

Table row 9
ID: AOS-24-VER-009
REQs: 010
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Two audience rules from one source → generate views → source/rule/purpose/payload/limits/withholding retained and common meaning faithful; inspect KX-14 records

Table row 10
ID: AOS-24-VER-010
REQs: 011/012
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Decisive evidence restricted and exceptional explanation requested → project/review → honest partial scope or withheld claim, owned exception, no enforcement bypass; inspect view and disposition

Table row 11
ID: AOS-24-VER-011
REQs: 013
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Ambiguous entity/question and human assertion → converse → question scoped, assertion/confirmation not promoted to verified evidence; inspect interaction and canonical record

Table row 12

ID: AOS-24-VER-012
REQs: 014/015
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Human disputes an assumption and requests new options → interrogate → challenge preserved and revised analysis referred with unresolved status; inspect owner/duty and later exact disposition

Table row 13
ID: AOS-24-VER-013
REQs: 016
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Human says yes to wording/context → inspect downstream records → scoped confirmation only, no decision/precedent/unrelated-use/duty approval; inspect all relevant consumers

Table row 14
ID: AOS-24-VER-014
REQs: 017
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Human asks to execute while powers absent or effect unknown → request action → governed handoff and truthful evidenced status, no reported completion; inspect 30/13 checks/effect record

Table row 15
ID: AOS-24-VER-015
REQs: 018/019
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Approved accessibility/translation format with units and condition → transform, include deliberate meaning error → faithful valid output or marked/withheld failed transformation; inspect source comparison and evaluation

Table row 16
ID: AOS-24-VER-016
REQs: 020
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Resident agreed channel unavailable and silence follows → attempt recovery → permitted agreed alternative/owned failure, no inferred consent/receipt; inspect channel and outcome evidence

Table row 17
ID: AOS-24-VER-017
REQs: 021/022
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Warm Petra interaction with inferred-emotion temptation → respond → clear AI/human route, no interiority-as-evidence or inferred feelings/weights; inspect response/use record

Table row 18
ID: AOS-24-VER-018
REQs: 023
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Request live protected meeting participation with permitted preparation available → attempt entry → live boundary maintained, preparation/post-meeting route permitted only within scope; inspect powers and records

Table row 19
ID: AOS-24-VER-019
REQs: 024/025
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Governed independent window, management response due and executive suppression attempt → present/report → independent profile preserved, response retained and mandatory protected duty reaches alternate route; inspect exact audience/window/duty evidence

Table row 20
ID: AOS-24-VER-020
REQs: 026/027
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Material evidence/approval/use change affects pack and decision → propagate correction → affected views contained/marked, old/new impact and owners notified including 30; inspect

remaining duties and reassessment

Table row 21
ID: AOS-24-VER-021
REQs: 028/029
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Generated view, uncertain delivery and later revocation → retry → no fabricated receipt/acceptance or blind repeat; current checks/effects reconciled; inspect actual states and release

Table row 22
ID: AOS-24-VER-022
REQs: 030/031
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Stale controls and source instruction/link bypass → attempt disclosure → affected release contained and untrusted instructions rejected, links share use restrictions; inspect outputs/checks/incident route

Table row 23
ID: AOS-24-VER-023
REQs: 032/033
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Unresolved challenge with absent owner/expired due handling and lifecycle limit → review → assigned cover/escalation, reconstructable proportionate trail and governed disposition; inspect record/lifecycle actions

Table row 24
ID: AOS-24-VER-024
REQs: 034/035/036
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Approved research profile/trigger and current primary source → run normal research → bounded retrieval, exact dates/coverage/baseline/affected elements and qualified finding; inspect common research records

Table row 25
ID: AOS-24-VER-025
REQs: 037/038
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Material research finding plus failed/stale coverage → route/recover → empowered disposition, owned recovery and distinct limitation, no automatic amendment/no-finding success; inspect powers/profile/version history

Table row 26
ID: AOS-24-VER-026
REQs: 039/040
Case-specific precondition / stimulus → expected outcome and acceptance evidence: Material model/profile change and misunderstanding outcome → evaluate/feedback → fidelity/steering/leakage/accessibility checks before authorised use, evidenced feedback to owners without norm/precedent calibration; inspect evaluation/change/outcome records

Each requirement has one linked primary case; each case lists its requirements. These cases test the component contribution, not the permanent human judgement in §8. Production assessment additionally needs agreed scope/rubric, representative adversarial/error samples and evidence of counterpart/recovery behaviour.

15.1 Planned conformance claims

Each claim is planned/unsubstantiated, initial history 0.1, not an achieved conformance assertion. Actual claims require tested versions, date, named assessor and separate execution evidence; longitudinal correction/feedback is assessed across material revision and delivery cycles, not just a single rendering.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-CR-001

Source → requirements/functions → responsible contracts → acceptance evidence: WP Presentation; FP4/6; DEC-017/049-053/069/091 → REQ-001-012, FUN-001-002 → CON-001-003 → VER-001-010: faithful claim, review, divergence, assessment and permission/withholding evidence

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-CR-002
Source → requirements/functions → responsible contracts → acceptance evidence: RP2/6/9; DEC-008/041/081/083/085/087/088 → REQ-013-025, FUN-003-005 → CON-003-004/006 → VER-011-019: scoped conversation, accessible meaning, honest persona and protected human route

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-CR-003
Source → requirements/functions → responsible contracts → acceptance evidence: DEC-028-030/047/054-078/089 → REQ-026-033/039-040, FUN-006-007 → CON-002/005-007 → VER-020-023/026 across correction/delivery/change cycles: no obsolete reliance, false receipt or ungoverned calibration

Table row 4
ID: AOS-24-CR-004
Source → requirements/functions → responsible contracts → acceptance evidence: DEC-086/template v0.4 §4.4 → REQ-034-038, FUN-008 → CON-008 → VER-024-025: controlled normal research, actual degraded coverage, owned human disposition without self-amendment

16. Dependencies and delivery stages

Stage 1 is this functional review draft and source/common allocation. Stage 2 appoints interface/analytical/disclosure/independent/duty owners and approves audience/channel/accessibility/research/evaluation profiles and exact contracts. Stage 3 implements only authorised scope with compatible counterpart adoption, including the drafted 25 view where required, with actual compatibility separately evidenced. Stage 4 executes verification, records failures/recovery and obtains empowered release approval. No stage is inferred from completion of drafting.

AOS-21-23/25 and 30 are drafted functional counterparts; next GI-set consistency/disposition review, then AOS-40 scenarios. Kernel/14/common contracts retain their standing. Interface delivery depends on exact analytical inputs, approved use/powers, runtime/evaluation and evidenced human/action statuses. It can support the repair demonstration only within the already authorised demonstration boundary; this document adds no autonomous scope.

17. Issues, assumptions and decisions

Table row 1
ID: AOS-24-ISS-001
Owned open item / gate: Mark: wording/whole-document review; before specification baseline approval; no additional general architectural question identified

Table row 2
ID: AOS-24-ISS-002
Owned open item / gate: Organisation/01/03/interface owner: appoint roles/cover/powers and legitimate-interest disclosure/exception review policy; before operational disclosure

Table row 3
ID: AOS-24-ISS-003
Owned open item / gate: Interface owner/14/03: approved needs, languages/formats/channels and resident agreements; before enabled use, no guessed defaults

Table row 4

ID: AOS-24-ISS-004
Owned open item / gate: Interface/analytical/04/05 owners: evaluation rubric, thresholds, representative samples, release/recovery evidence; before affected operation

Table row 5
ID: AOS-24-ISS-005
Owned open item / gate: Semantic owners: exact binding/schema/version/acknowledgement/lifecycle/location and demonstrated counterpart compatibility; AOS-25 functional adoption is complete, operational compatibility remains required before reliance

Table row 6
ID: AOS-24-ISS-006
Owned open item / gate: Interface/research/change owners: approved profile, assignment/triggers, coverage criteria/duty routing; before research operation; no new scheduled task

Table row 7
ID: AOS-24-ISS-007
Owned open item / gate: Mark: independent project review deferred; operating independent governance and protected duty remain required

All ISS rows are open, initial history 0.1. ISS-001/007 are review dependencies; ISS-002-006 are operating setup dependencies. Their source is the named controlling boundary/profile in §§4/6/7/13/15 and template v0.4; affected capability/function/contract and evidence are those named in each row and corresponding sections. No research finding or closed resolution is claimed.

Settled DEC-005/008/017/018/024-027/041/062-091 are applied, not reopened. Operational parameters and role appointments are legitimate later gates, not missing general design choices requiring fresh approval now.

18. Non-normative implementation notes

Reports, conversational text, APIs, translated views, audio or visual formats are possible implementations where approved. A shared presentation/agent service is permissible. Canonical positions need not mean identical wording: materially equivalent representation and governed permitted disclosure are the functional test. No vendor, wire schema, UI flow, model, language list, performance value or deployment topology is selected here.

19. Traceability and change control

§4.3 links exact sources/derivations to requirements and §15 cases. §§4.1-4.2 map capabilities/functions; §6 maps unchanged shared views; §14 binds invariants; §8 accounts for governing principles and all GT tests. Changes to presentation that alter governing meaning become analytical/constitutional changes with empowered review, not silent editorial amendments. Material common changes must propagate to affected components. The preserved source manifest, parent requirement/case statuses and DEC-001-091 remain unchanged.

Author checks cover unique IDs, requirement/case completeness, functional contract and source links, document structure and counterpart reference alignment. They are not execution, independent assurance or readiness approval.

20. Handover and human continuity

The interface owner maintains the exact baseline, approved presentation/disclosure/research/evaluation profiles, permitted audit/recovery evidence, open challenges and due/cover/escalation duties. Successor handover includes source/status and restrictions, affected obsolete views, pending delivery effects and protected obligations. Human decision and constitutional authority remains with the empowered institutions. Builders have implementation discretion only within separately authorised scope and compatible exact contract/profile versions. Stop affected work and refer missing powers/use, conflicting canonical

meanings, unapproved required settings or unsupported release claims; drafting is not build or activation permission. Interface unavailability must leave a usable permitted human route for material duties.

21. Specification quality and design adequacy

Table row 1
AOS-QS coverage: QS-01-03
Evidence / limits: Controlled purpose/source/authority and draft standing in §§1-3; source manifest preserved

Table row 2
AOS-QS coverage: QS-04-10
Evidence / limits: Stable atomic proposed requirements with sources/rationale/owner/status/history/dependencies/cases; §§4/15

Table row 3
AOS-QS coverage: QS-11-14
Evidence / limits: Boundaries, states, contracts, flows and failure in §§3/5/6/9-11; schema/parameters explicitly later gates

Table row 4
AOS-QS coverage: QS-15-20
Evidence / limits: Human powers, uncertainty, evaluation, research, audit and controlled change in §§7-13/19; no runtime evidence

Table row 5
AOS-QS coverage: QS-21-24
Evidence / limits: Planned acceptance and owned issues/stages/handover in §§15-17/20; cases unexecuted

Table row 6
AOS-QS coverage: QS-25-28
Evidence / limits: Traceability/change and author checks; independent project review deferred and no achieved readiness gate

Specification-quality conclusion: a functional review draft with 40 proposed REQs, eight CON views and 26 planned cases. Design-adequacy conclusion: the component supports faithful, contestable and purpose-bound explanation while retaining the governing human boundaries; operational fidelity/accessibility/security and institutional effectiveness require the appointed reviews and evidence. No tailoring exemption, test pass, build/activation or achieved readiness approval is claimed. Mapped GI drafting is complete; next GI-set consistency/disposition review, then AOS-40 scenarios.

Component summary

Purpose/owns: make exact GI positions understandable, contestable and accessible through faithful Petra conversation and governed audience representations. Reserved: analytical conclusions, constitutional/value judgement, source/precedent admission, human approval/action and external delivery remain with their named owners. Receives/produces: exact canonical evidence/status and current controls → permitted explanations/projections, scoped challenges, qualified delivery/correction feedback and owned referrals. Research: interface-fidelity/accessibility/disclosure developments under an approved shared or assigned profile, actual coverage and human change route. States/dependencies: §5, kernel/14/20/21-23/25/30, all functional counterparts drafted; no live assurance implied. Conformant when: CR-001-004 supported by executed §15 evidence within an authorised scope. Open: wording review, appointments/profiles, exact compatibility and operating/independent evidence in §17.

Phase 2 scope disposition - 9 October 2026

DEC-097 controls over prior inclusion/annex statements. CAP-01/02-specific legacy requirements/cases are deferred and supply

no current-core completion/acceptance obligation. General human judgement, independent challenge, evidence fidelity, cumulative risk/drift and protected reporting remain current. Existing closure of AT-CR-01-05 and pilot5b is retained; neither is reopened by this scope change. No case executed or operating approval granted.

Allocation and source status: Any older source/adoption row relying on deferred CAP-only IDs is a historical use-case contribution, not current-core coverage. Core source sufficiency must use the surviving general obligations and accepted evidence; no source is promoted by this deferral. Retained numbered totals count catalogue/trace entries, including deferred IDs, and must not be read as active-core requirement/test totals.

Historical opening status notices - retained provenance

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

Historical status notice - revision set: AOS-00/Map v0.44; DEC-001-097; AOS-10v0.5/20v0.6/22v0.5/24v0.4/25v0.3/40v0.8; other components unchanged; Sharedv0.20/Corev0.6/Registerv0.19/Matrixv0.20; acceptance annexv0.2; reviewv0.3.

Historical status notice - scope decision - 9 October 2026, DEC-097: Mark has moved CAP-01 Trade-Off Divergence and CAP-02 Risk Register Assessment into Phase 2 as specific use cases built on AOS. They are outside the current architecture/specification completion scope and are not current build, acceptance or publication prerequisites. No use-case design, configuration, implementation or testing is scheduled now. DEC-017's architectural inclusion is superseded on this point; its original record remains history. General human judgement, evidence, data-use/authority, independent challenge and protected reporting controls remain in the architecture. Dedicated legacy use-case IDs are retained only as deferred trace references, with original wording parked in Phase 2 (deferred under DEC-097); mixed rows retain only their general architectural obligations in current scope. Earlier inclusion/next-task/annex-dependency statements are superseded.

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.