AOS-25 - Governance oversight, drift and learning

Document: aos-25-governance-oversight-drift-and-learning · 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-104 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.5. Each mandatory protected-finding category requires assessed technical-failure and implicated-person interference arrangements with an appropriately independent authorised alternative and no implicated sole release gatekeeper. Decision/amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-104-protected-reporting-and-implicated-recipients-2026-10-29.md). External reporting is conditional on justified lawful authority, not a default. Exact profiles/permissions, protected_finding v0.3 compatibility and actual evidence remain gates; amended wording retains ordinary separate review and cases are planned/unexecuted. Earlier contrary or narrower baselines are history for this scope.

DEC-103 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.4. 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 DEC-087 is partly superseded; decision/amendment and legal-source record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-103-decision-validity-evidence-and-minutes-2026-10-29.md).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.

Table row 1
Document control: Component / version / date
Value: AOS-25 / 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 v0.4; AOS-22 v0.2; AOS-23 v0.3; AOS-24 v0.1; AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.13/Core v0.6/Register v0.12; source matrix v0.13; Control Coordination v0.2; Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1

Table row 6
Document control: Allocation supplements
Value: AOS-00/Map v0.31; Shared v0.14/Register v0.13/source matrix v0.14; 20 v0.4/21 v0.5/22 v0.3/23 v0.4/24 v0.2/30 v0.4 counterpart-reference alignment only; common meanings 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 oversight owner; independent human reviewer, empowered committee/board, corrective-duty and cover roles require organisation appointment

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: 0.2 - GI-CR-01-04 author consistency correction/closure under Mark’s instruction; existing identifiers and proposed/planned status preserved. 0.1 initial functional draft; no new DEC, IF, schema, deployment or schedule

1. Purpose and scope

AOS-25 examines whether the organisation and its AI-mediated governance remain coherent with conferred purpose over time. It connects individually plausible assessments, decisions, exceptions and outcomes into an account of accumulated drift, blind spots and learning. Without it, each paper can pass review while precedents progressively relocate founding meaning, burdens repeatedly fall on the same people, or the system optimises successfully for the wrong thing.

It owns GI oversight analysis: purpose/precedent and Mode 1/Mode 2 boundary drift, override patterns, cumulative distribution of trade-offs, developer-framework divergence, cross-component effects, evidence blind spots, ordinary agent performance inputs, independent review support, response tracking and research into its own adequacy. It coordinates oversight of the GI research portfolio while specialist components retain their own remits. It does not become a new intelligence, an all-powerful controller, an independent human reviewer or a governance certificate.

AOS-21 owns corpus and approved precedent; 22 owns synthesis/interpretation/options; 23 owns artefact assessment and

currency monitoring; 24 renders canonical positions; 30 records empowered human decisions, approval, duties and outcomes. AOS-01-05 own powers, records, use, agents and runtime; 13 coordinates operations; 14 governs external exchange; 40 will organise assurance/test evidence. AOS-25 can identify patterns and propose review, not change telos, amend governing meaning, auto-prune precedent, rank incommensurable goods, infer personal feelings/preferences or activate exploratory self-calibration.

Stakeholders include boards/committees, independent directors/reviewers, executives, residents, staff, governance/corpus stewards, domain/agent owners and operators. Their legitimate interests, especially the no-exit condition, inform purposeful evidence and explanation. Parent/subsidiary profiles, powers and applicability remain distinct under DEC-090. Permitted group analysis is possible; common membership is not permission to combine data or copy constitutional authority.

2. Authority and sources

FP v4/RP v6 govern; recorded directions constrain proposed wording. Working sources are reconciled, not adopted wholesale. Requirement source keys below identify their exact baseline and functional locators. The source manifest remains unchanged.

Table row 1
Key: FP / RP
Exact source / locator and standing: Foundational_Principles_v4.docx principles 1-10; AOS_Reasoning_Principles_v6.docx domains 1-9, especially RP2 standing review, RP4 decision feedback, RP5 emergent behaviour and RP6 purpose/precedent/developer-framework paragraphs

Table row 2
Key: GT
Exact source / locator and standing: Governance_Intelligence_Tests.docx all M1.1-14/M2.1-15; §8 technical contributions and permanent human limits

Table row 3
Key: WP
Exact source / locator and standing: Governance Intelligence: Internal Architecture - Working Paper, How the corpus holds meaning, Governance of drift - annual report, Cross-cutting drift self-flagging, Validation regime and Charter; originally RP v5, reconciled to v6/DEC-079-085

Table row 4
Key: TD
Exact source / locator and standing: Trade-Off Divergence Tool - Product Specification (Working Draft).md §3 Stage Three, §§4-6 independent configuration, decision mapping and charter prohibition; adopted scope DEC-017, routing constrained by DEC-085

Table row 5
Key: CMP
Exact source / locator and standing: GIL v2 comparison filename v0.1/content v0.2, GIL-C03/04/10/19/22/24/25/27/32/34; retained/changed/retired/deferred standing remains

Table row 6
Key: GI / S / AS / H
Exact source / locator and standing: AOS-20 v0.3 §§3-7/10-17, especially REQ-034-046; AOS-22 v0.2 §§3-7/10/19; AOS-23 v0.3 §§3-7/10/19; AOS-30 v0.3 §§5-7/9-12

Table row 7
Key: C / P
Exact source / locator and standing: AOS-21 v0.4 §§3-7/10/19 corpus/precedent; AOS-24 v0.1 §§3-7/10/19 faithful presentation and correction

Table row 8
Key: SC / REC / KX
Exact source / locator and standing: Shared v0.13 §4.4; Core v0.6 REC-E/Q/A/D/X; Register v0.12 KX-01/06 v0.2/08/13/15-22/26;

common meanings stay authoritative

Table row 9
Key: D / R
Exact source / locator and standing: AOS-00 v0.30 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; RSVIEW-0.1

WP's conversational ratification-to-precedent assumption is superseded by DEC-080/081: confirmation is not empowered adoption. Its historical 2015 standard reference supplies no claim about current regulatory clauses. Dual authorship is implemented as independently prepared human and GI accounts; a particular committee name, special-resolution mechanism or appointment cannot be invented for every organisation. Actual governing instruments supply powers. TD decision mapping remains mixed/uncertain where appropriate and human-confirmed under DEC-088; neither a persona count nor an oversight finding establishes moral error. No new external legal/standard currentness claim is introduced.

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

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

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

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

3. Responsibilities

Table row 1
Responsibility: Longitudinal oversight
AOS-25 owns: Evidence-qualified purpose, precedent, boundary, override and distributional patterns
Reserved / shared owner: 21 maintains meaning/history; 01/30 humans amend/adjudicate

Table row 2
Responsibility: System effects
AOS-25 owns: Cross-component blind spots, model-framework divergence and cumulative effects
Reserved / shared owner: Domains supply evidence; 04/05 evaluation/runtime; 40 assurance scope

Table row 3

Responsibility: Independent review support
AOS-25 owns: GI account, permitted evidence basis, differences and tracked responses
Reserved / shared owner: Independent human authors prepare their own account; empowered institution determines disposition

Table row 4
Responsibility: Learning
AOS-25 owns: Actual consequence links, misunderstanding/corrections and effectiveness questions
Reserved / shared owner: 30 duty/decision records; 22 analytical revisions; no automatic calibration

Table row 5
Responsibility: GI research oversight
AOS-25 owns: Portfolio coverage, shared omissions, unresolved findings and response quality
Reserved / shared owner: 20-24/25 specialist remits; 14 retrieval; 04 shared agent infrastructure

Table row 6
Responsibility: Own research
AOS-25 owns: Specialist external relevance and adaptation proposals for oversight
Reserved / shared owner: 01/30 human change; no autonomous amendment

Logical flow: scoped permitted histories/current instruments → GI oversight account and separately prepared human account → empowered comparison/disposition → accepted corrective duties → evidenced consequences/reassessment. Both reports remain distinct and can disagree. This mandates functional independence and accountability, not a second model, dedicated deployment or unrestricted evidence access.

4. Capabilities, functions and requirements

4.1 Capabilities

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-CAP-001
Observable capability / REQs: Produce bounded, comparable and contestable oversight evidence; 001-005/019/028/045/048

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-CAP-002
Observable capability / REQs: Detect possible purpose, precedent, boundary and developer-framework drift; 006-010

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-CAP-003
Observable capability / REQs: Expose emergent effects, blind spots and cumulative trade-offs; 011-016

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-CAP-004
Observable capability / REQs: Support actual-outcome learning and independently prepared review with owned dispositions; 017-018/020-027

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-CAP-005
Observable capability / REQs: Preserve permitted human boundaries, correction, handoff and governed histories; 029-036/046-047

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-CAP-006
Observable capability / REQs: Conduct own controlled external research and GI research-portfolio oversight; 037-042

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-CAP-007
Observable capability / REQs: Support ordinary performance monitoring and longitudinal evaluation without self-calibration; 043-044

4.2 Functions

Each function records exact input/control revisions and uncertainty; failed preconditions yield an owned limitation, not a completed-clear result. Behaviour is functional rather than a wire/API prescription.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-FUN-001
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Approved cycle/material event → scope and check evidence/controls/coverage/comparability → bounded basis or owned gap; 001-004/028/031/045-047

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-FUN-002
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Scoped instruments/interpretation/precedent/overrides/frameworks → contrast meaning and effects against founding/authorised baseline → possible drift and referral, never amendment; 005-010/019

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-FUN-003
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Permitted multi-case/cross-component history → examine cumulative effects/distribution/quiet gaps → qualified patterns and telos concern response gaps, no persona winner; 011-016

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-FUN-004
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Decision/action/outcome records → connect consequences, limits and alternative explanations → learning questions and accountable feedback; 017-018/032

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-FUN-005
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Annual or material-drift review trigger → GI account, independent human evidence support and report comparison → differences and empowered disposition; 020-023/026/030/048

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-FUN-006
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Review disposition/protected concern → current powers/use and owned handoff → accepted duties/cover/escalation, selective containment or human referral; 024-029/035-036

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-FUN-007
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Corrected evidence/control or material oversight method change → affected revision/evaluation/impact checks → reassessment, notification and controlled release; 033-034/043-044

Table row 8
ID: AOS-25-FUN-008
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: Approved specialist research trigger → controlled retrieval and assessment → coverage/finding/human disposition or owned degraded recovery; 037-041

Table row 9
ID: AOS-25-FUN-009
Trigger / input → behaviour → output and failure: GI research portfolio review trigger → compare remits/coverage/shared gaps and actual responses → owned adequacy questions and proposal, not central takeover; 042

4.3 Proposed requirements

All rows are proposed component-level functional requirements, initial history 0.1, release scope functional review only. Sources distinguish approved directions from their functional derivation; inclusion does not approve exact wording. Accountable owner is the GI oversight owner; Mark is proposed wording approver/custodian. Independent review, disclosure, constitutional/change and human-duty decisions require the separately empowered roles in §§3/7. Common dependencies are 01-05/14/20 and §6; case histories additionally use 21-24/30 and pending 13/40 where applicable. Research rows use §4.4/CON-009. Each row completes the record with source, rationale and primary planned VER in §15; no case is executed.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-REQ-001
Category / proposed obligation: Scoped oversight: Bind each oversight assessment to its exact entity, period, question, source/analysis/control revisions and approved review remit.
Exact source / derivation: GI §§3/6/10; DEC-090; KX-22
Rationale: Makes the assessment reproducible.
Planned VER: 001

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-REQ-002
Category / proposed obligation: Evidence: Preserve supporting and conflicting evidence, assurance, provenance, observed/effective dates and evidence-versus-inference distinctions for material findings.
Exact source / derivation: RP5/7; REC-E/Q; DEC-045-048/062-066
Rationale: A pattern is contestable evidence, not a verdict.
Planned VER: 001

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-REQ-003
Category / proposed obligation: Coverage: Show the assessed population and material coverage limits, distinguishing justified non-applicability, exclusion, missing/unseeded/unassessed evidence and failed checking.
Exact source / derivation: CMP GIL-C04/19; FP5/6; GT M1.2/12
Rationale: A green result must not conceal unseen scope.
Planned VER: 002

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-REQ-004
Category / proposed obligation: Comparability: Qualify comparisons for changed definitions, criteria, entity, period, exposure and population; do not treat incompatible or missing observations as equivalent values.
Exact source / derivation: REQ-001-003 derivation; RP5; REC-E/Q
Rationale: Trend changes may reflect changed measurement.
Planned VER: 002

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-REQ-005
Category / proposed obligation: Two-layer review: Distinguish compliance evidence from coherence with conferred purpose and values, retaining conflicts rather than treating compliance as proof of coherence.
Exact source / derivation: WP Governance of drift; FP9; RP6
Rationale: Technical compliance can coexist with purpose drift.
Planned VER: 003

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-REQ-006
Category / proposed obligation: Purpose drift: Assess evidenced operational outcomes and optimisation behaviour against the exact founding purpose/values and approved changes, identifying possible telos/function substitution.
Exact source / derivation: RP6 purpose drift/telos-function; FP1; GT M2.9/10/15
Rationale: Optimisation success may displace purpose.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-REQ-007
Category / proposed obligation: Precedent drift: Compare accumulated interpretation and approved precedent with the founding statement and authorised changes, not only with the most recent rulings.
Exact source / derivation: RP6 precedent paragraph; DEC-010-012/080/081; WP drift
Rationale: Individually reasonable rulings can drift cumulatively.
Planned VER: 004

Table row 8
ID: AOS-25-REQ-008
Category / proposed obligation: Mode boundary: Review patterns of Mode 1/Mode 2 classification, delegation and boundary changes against their actual empowered instruments; refer ambiguity or bypass without reclassifying reserved human judgement autonomously.
Exact source / derivation: RP2; DEC-005/024/025; GI §§7/10
Rationale: Capability cannot silently redraw a governance boundary.
Planned VER: 005

Table row 9
ID: AOS-25-REQ-009
Category / proposed obligation: Overrides: Examine override, refusal, exception and reversal patterns with their reasons, powers, scope and actual effects; a frequent or rare override alone is not misconduct or safety evidence.
Exact source / derivation: GI REQ-036; RP2/5/7; KX-06/08/17
Rationale: Context distinguishes legitimate judgement from control erosion.
Planned VER: 006

Table row 10
ID: AOS-25-REQ-010
Category / proposed obligation: Developer divergence: Review material deployed/proposed model-framework assessments and operational evidence for divergence from organisational values, exposing missing pre-deployment assessment and changed framework scope.
Exact source / derivation: FP3; RP6 developer frameworks; GT M2.13; KX-17/20
Rationale: Developer commitments do not become organisational authority by default.
Planned VER: 007

Table row 11
ID: AOS-25-REQ-011
Category / proposed obligation: Emergence: Assess permitted cross-component interactions and cumulative effects that individual component evaluations may miss, identifying affected owners and system-level review needs.
Exact source / derivation: RP5 emergent behaviour; FP10; DEC-056/057; GT M1.13
Rationale: Assured parts do not establish assured collective behaviour.
Planned VER: 008

Table row 12
ID: AOS-25-REQ-012
Category / proposed obligation: Quiet-state blind spots: Treat apparently stable or alarm-free operation as compatible with missing coverage, weak challenge or accumulating risk, retaining appropriate review questions and limitations.
Exact source / derivation: FP5/6; RP5; GT M1.12/13
Rationale: No alarm is not proof of sound judgement.
Planned VER: 009

Table row 13
ID: AOS-25-REQ-013
Category / proposed obligation: Distributional patterns: Surface evidenced cumulative trade-off burdens and consequences across relevant groups/time, including no-exit impacts, with permitted scope and uncertainty.
Exact source / derivation: FP7/10; RP4/6; TD §3 Stage Three
Rationale: Per-decision acceptability can conceal repeated burden.
Planned VER: 010

Table row 14
ID: AOS-25-REQ-014
Category / proposed obligation: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-25-REQ-014 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-017; TD §§3/6; GI §§4/7
Rationale: Repeated preference is a review signal, not a moral verdict.
Planned VER: 010

Table row 15
ID: AOS-25-REQ-015
Category / proposed obligation: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-25-REQ-015 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-088; TD §5 decision tracking; H §§5/10; S §19
Rationale: Real decisions need not have one persona winner.
Planned VER: 011

Table row 16
ID: AOS-25-REQ-016
Category / proposed obligation: Unacted telos concerns: Give prominence to evidenced telos-tier concerns raised without an adequate recorded response, distinguishing unresolved, unrecorded, disputed and genuinely dispositioned cases.
Exact source / derivation: TD §3 Stage Three; DEC-083; RP6
Rationale: Neglected purpose concerns matter more than persona win counts.
Planned VER: 012

Table row 17
ID: AOS-25-REQ-017
Category / proposed obligation: Outcome learning: Connect proposals, human decisions, actions, actual outcomes, unintended consequences and remaining duties, separating action completion from effectiveness.
Exact source / derivation: RP1/4; CMP GIL-C34; H §§10-12
Rationale: Learning requires consequence evidence.
Planned VER: 013

Table row 18
ID: AOS-25-REQ-018
Category / proposed obligation: Causal limits: Keep alternative explanations, exposure differences, confounders, delays and attribution limits visible in outcome/pattern assessments.
Exact source / derivation: FP5/6/10; RP5; S §§4/10
Rationale: Correlation cannot establish institutional motives or causation.
Planned VER: 013

Table row 19
ID: AOS-25-REQ-019
Category / proposed obligation: Assessment dimensions: Preserve the distinction between document quality, claim support and practice evidence when combining artefact assessments into oversight findings.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-091; AS §§4/10; CMP GIL-C16
Rationale: Good documentation is not demonstrated practice.
Planned VER: 014

Table row 20
ID: AOS-25-REQ-020
Category / proposed obligation: Self-assessment standing: Label GI self-assessment as such and retain its method, evidence and limits; it cannot substitute for the independently prepared human account.
Exact source / derivation: WP dual authorship; DEC-010/011; GI REQ-034-036
Rationale: The interpreting system cannot independently assure itself.
Planned VER: 015

Table row 21
ID: AOS-25-REQ-021

Category / proposed obligation: Independent cycle: Support independently prepared human interpretation/precedent review alongside GI assessment at least annually and on material drift triggers, with each account prepared without reference to the other before formal comparison.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-010/011; RP6 precedent; WP Governance of drift
Rationale: Independent divergence may reveal what self-flagging missed.
Planned VER: 015

Table row 22
ID: AOS-25-REQ-022
Category / proposed obligation: Review basis: Make the authorised evidence basis, founding/changed instruments, scope and limitations available for both reports; identify differing evidence/revisions before comparison without forcing the independent author to adopt GI framing.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-010/011/085; REC-E/Q; WP dual authorship
Rationale: A fair comparison requires known scope, not identical conclusions.
Planned VER: 016

Table row 23
ID: AOS-25-REQ-023
Category / proposed obligation: Disposition: Route the two reports and material differences to the empowered committee/board route for explicit reaffirmation, corrective action/precedent review or constitutional referral under actual powers.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-012/024/025; WP outcomes; H §§5-7
Rationale: A report must produce a governed response.
Planned VER: 017

Table row 24
ID: AOS-25-REQ-024
Category / proposed obligation: Corrective duties: Track required review/corrective responses with accepted accountable owner, completion date, cover, escalation and exact target/scope.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-012; RP1; KX-26; H §§10-12
Rationale: Discussion alone does not close a feedback loop.
Planned VER: 018

Table row 25
ID: AOS-25-REQ-025
Category / proposed obligation: Closure evidence: Close a corrective duty only on the required completion/review evidence and record remaining risk and follow-up; a disposition or receipt alone is insufficient.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-012/067-078; KX-21/26; RP1
Rationale: Completed action may still need effectiveness review.
Planned VER: 018

Table row 26
ID: AOS-25-REQ-026
Category / proposed obligation: Reserved amendment: Refer proposed precedent pruning, boundary or purpose changes to empowered 21/01/30 workflows; only the board changes telos, and no retrospective automatic reversal follows an oversight finding.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-024/025/080/081/089; KX-08/13; H §7
Rationale: Oversight detects; authorised governance changes meaning.
Planned VER: 017

Table row 27
ID: AOS-25-REQ-027
Category / proposed obligation: Protected findings: Route credible mandatory protected classes promptly through the empowered ordinary/alternate route, without waiting for annual review, executive permission or ordinary report validation.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-083/073-078; GI §10; protected reporting/recovery v0.1
Rationale: A review calendar must not suppress an obligation.
Planned VER: 019

Table row 28
ID: AOS-25-REQ-028

Category / proposed obligation: Provisional status: Record/access provisional findings within current controls with exact limitations, and distinguish them from formally validated oversight; urgent protected reporting need not await validation.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-084; SC §4.4; CMP GIL-C08
Rationale: Preserves timely evidence without invented validation.
Planned VER: 020

Table row 29
ID: AOS-25-REQ-029
Category / proposed obligation: Selective brake: Seek or apply only the separately conferred containment powers for materially affected reliance/effects, preserving independently authorised service and protected duties.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-063/067/089; REC-A/D/X; coordination v0.2
Rationale: A concern does not authorise unlimited suspension.
Planned VER: 019

Table row 30
ID: AOS-25-REQ-030
Category / proposed obligation: Protected deliberation: Use permitted preparation material and authorised human post-meeting accounts while keeping AI out of live protected board/committee deliberation.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-008/087; RP2; H §§1/10
Rationale: Independent human observation remains human.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 31
ID: AOS-25-REQ-031
Category / proposed obligation: Permitted aggregation: Apply independent data-use permission to the oversight purpose and cross-entity joins/derived views; aggregation or group membership must not imply safety or permission.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-049-053/090; RP9; AOS-03 §§4/9
Rationale: Combining records can create an unapproved inference capability.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 32
ID: AOS-25-REQ-032
Category / proposed obligation: Human preferences: Use only permitted human-provided/confirmed descriptions; do not infer feelings, personality or moral weights, or silently calibrate norms/precedent from observed choices.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-018/088; RP4 constrained; AOS-03 §9
Rationale: Oversight must not turn into covert profiling.
Planned VER: 021

Table row 33
ID: AOS-25-REQ-033
Category / proposed obligation: Correction impact: Reassess materially affected oversight on corrected evidence, analysis, approval, permission or criteria and notify dependent owners, including affected AOS-30 preparation/decision/account/outcome workflows.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-062-078/089; KX-13; H §§10-12
Rationale: Corrections must reach the humans relying on the pattern.
Planned VER: 022

Table row 34
ID: AOS-25-REQ-034
Category / proposed obligation: Exact reviewed revision: Bind validation/disposition to exact reviewed revisions; changed material does not inherit an earlier review or approval.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-028/029/063-066; SC §4.4; KX-06 v0.3
Rationale: Reviewed is a scoped state.
Planned VER: 022

Table row 35
ID: AOS-25-REQ-035
Category / proposed obligation: Handoff states: Distinguish production, delivery, receipt, validation, application, responsibility acceptance and substantive resolution with purpose-specific evidence and unknown outcomes retained.

Exact source / derivation: KX-21/26; DEC-030/067/072
Rationale: Sent is not handled.
Planned VER: 023

Table row 36
ID: AOS-25-REQ-036
Category / proposed obligation: Handoff recovery: Preserve owned duties for absent/unresponsive/implicated recipients and failed/overdue review through approved appropriately independent alternatives, without an implicated sole gatekeeper, reconciling prior effects and current controls before repetition.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-073-078/083; KX-21/26; protected reporting/recovery
Rationale: A tracker cannot quietly abandon a human obligation.
Planned VER: 023

Table row 37
ID: AOS-25-REQ-037
Category / proposed obligation: Own research: Maintain AOS-25's controlled external-research remit for drift, oversight, independent evaluation, blind spots and emergent governance risks against its exact specification baseline.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; template v0.4 §4.4; R
Rationale: Oversight itself needs external challenge.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 38
ID: AOS-25-REQ-038
Category / proposed obligation: Research control: Run assigned research through approved remit, triggers, tools, powers/use, source-currentness and retrieval controls under 14/04/03/01/05.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; R; RSVIEW-0.1
Rationale: A research function is bounded work.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 39
ID: AOS-25-REQ-039
Category / proposed obligation: Research evidence: Record actual coverage, provenance/dates/assurance, evidence versus inference, relevance, exact affected elements, uncertainty and cross-component implications in the common research views.
Exact source / derivation: R; RSVIEW-0.1; REC-E/Q
Rationale: Findings must justify their relevance.
Planned VER: 024

Table row 40
ID: AOS-25-REQ-040
Category / proposed obligation: Research disposition: Route specialist research findings to the empowered human change/review owner with due/cover/escalation and recorded outcome; no finding amends a specification or profile automatically.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-086; AOS-01 §§6.6/10.8; R
Rationale: Research proposes; governance adopts.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 41
ID: AOS-25-REQ-041
Category / proposed obligation: Degraded research: Report partial, failed, stale or unperformed research separately from a completed bounded no-material-finding result, retaining owned recovery.
Exact source / derivation: R; AOS-04 CON-009; RSVIEW-0.1
Rationale: Quiet coverage can conceal missing research.
Planned VER: 025

Table row 42
ID: AOS-25-REQ-042
Category / proposed obligation: GI research oversight: Review the coverage, unresolved findings, dependencies and response effectiveness of the GI component research remits without replacing their specialist ownership or inferring adequacy from run completion.

Exact source / derivation: GI §4.4/REQ-037-046; DEC-082/086; R
Rationale: Separate successful runs may leave a shared blind spot.
Planned VER: 026

Table row 43
ID: AOS-25-REQ-043
Category / proposed obligation: Agent performance: Consume ordinary agent/model evaluation, uncertainty, incidents and cumulative-effect evidence for oversight; do not activate exploratory self-calibration or alter governing settings autonomously.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-018/054-057; KX-16/17/19/20; CMP GIL-C22/27
Rationale: Ordinary monitoring is in scope; unapproved adaptation is not.
Planned VER: 027

Table row 44
ID: AOS-25-REQ-044
Category / proposed obligation: Longitudinal evaluation: Evaluate material oversight method/model/profile changes using contrasting hard cases and cumulative histories, including independent findings missed by GI and changed-record/permission scenarios, under kernel change controls.
Exact source / derivation: FP5/6/10; DEC-057; WP Validation; KX-17
Rationale: Single-case plausibility cannot demonstrate drift detection.
Planned VER: 027

Table row 45
ID: AOS-25-REQ-045
Category / proposed obligation: Quality profiles: Use approved materiality, comparison, uncertainty, false/missed finding, coverage and timeliness criteria; show missing required settings as owned gates rather than inventing thresholds.
Exact source / derivation: GI §§13/16/17; DEC-031-041; KX-17
Rationale: Unapproved numbers silently change governance.
Planned VER: 028

Table row 46
ID: AOS-25-REQ-046
Category / proposed obligation: Governed histories: Retain oversight/review/decision links and audit evidence under approved class/purpose/location/retention/deletion policy; do not require unlimited recoverable raw histories.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-045-048; KX-15; CMP GIL-C24/25
Rationale: Learning remains subject to governed data lifecycle.
Planned VER: 029

Table row 47
ID: AOS-25-REQ-047
Category / proposed obligation: Current controls: Where required revisions, powers, use or assurance are unknown, stale, incompatible or conflicting, contain affected reliance and return an owned limitation/referral; untrusted source instructions do not expand powers.
Exact source / derivation: DEC-028-030/062-078; AOS-01-05/14 §§6/11
Rationale: Missing controls cannot become implied permission.
Planned VER: 029

Table row 48
ID: AOS-25-REQ-048
Category / proposed obligation: Oversight challenge: Expose AOS-25’s own assumptions, coverage and self-assessment limits, preserve permitted challenge and seek competent independent review; do not claim automatic governance certification or achieved effectiveness.
Exact source / derivation: FP5/6/8; GT; DEC-010-012/091; WP self-flagging
Rationale: The overseer must remain contestable.
Planned VER: 030

4.4 External research and specification adaptation

CAP-006/FUN-008/REQ-037-041/CON-009/VER-024-025 allocate the component's own research. FUN-009/REQ-042/VER-026

separately review GI portfolio coverage. Neither replaces internal sensing, artefact currency checks or specialist research ownership. Inherit DEC-086, RSVIEW-0.1 and 04 CON-009/02 CON-007; create no schedule or deployment.

Table row 1
Controlled profile element: Remit/baseline
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Exact AOS-25 revision: oversight/drift detection, independent evaluation, cumulative/distributional effects, developer frameworks, epistemic blind spots and emergent governance risk; oversight owner maintains questions

Table row 2
Controlled profile element: External developments/sources
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Relevant primary research, standards/regulatory/practice changes and incidents; authoritative source preference, jurisdiction/applicability/status/currentness and admission required; no automatic applicability

Table row 3
Controlled profile element: Assignment/triggers
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Approved assigned/shared agent/service, cadence, material-event triggers and coverage expectations; oversight/research owner proposes, empowered profile/change owner approves before operation; no default daily/quarterly schedule

Table row 4
Controlled profile element: Controls
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: 14 retrieval/source verification; 01 powers, 03 permitted use, 04 bounded agent/task, 05 runtime; licensing/privacy/derived-use restrictions; internal histories are not exported merely to research a method

Table row 5
Controlled profile element: Assessment/evidence
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Publication/event/access/effective dates, assurance, evidence versus inference, exact affected CAP/FUN/REQ/CON/VER, relevance, alternatives, materiality/urgency, uncertainty and affected component/institutional review implications

Table row 6
Controlled profile element: Coverage/quality
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Complete/partial/failed/stale/unperformed distinguished; bounded no-material-finding only for completed declared coverage; approved false/missed finding/fidelity rubric and representative longitudinal examples remain gates

Table row 7
Controlled profile element: Human disposition
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Named empowered change/review owner, recipients, completion/due handling, cover/escalation and outcome under 01/30; no autonomous specification, norm or profile amendment

Table row 8
Controlled profile element: Degraded handling
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: Failed retrieval, access, assurance or coverage yields explicit limit and owned recovery; urgent protected finding uses separately permitted protected route; no silence-as-clear result

Table row 9
Controlled profile element: Lifecycle/profile review
AOS-25 allocation / owner and gate: KX-15/02/03/05 records/location/retention/deletion and governed profile version/review; exact operational settings require appointed owners/approval

GI portfolio review asks whether 20-25 remits collectively miss a material dependency, whether repeated findings reach accountable humans and whether response evidence is credible. It uses permitted coverage records, not an assumption that every component has an operating agent. It may identify kernel/domain research dependencies and refer them to their owners, without taking over all AOS research or launching tasks.

5. States and lifecycle

Table row 1
State / entry condition: Review due/triggered: approved cycle or material indication
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Scope entity/period/baseline and assign permitted preparation; record trigger/owner
Delay/failure/closure: Annual minimum under DEC-010/011; material trigger does not wait for annual cycle; additional timings are approved profiles

Table row 2
State / entry condition: Evidence scoped/limited: exact sources/current controls known
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Prepare GI account with coverage, or owned limitation if dependencies missing
Delay/failure/closure: Missing history is visible; no “no drift” success from unperformed work

Table row 3
State / entry condition: GI provisional/reviewed account
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Record actual validation state and preserve limits; independent human account remains distinct
Delay/failure/closure: Material changes invalidate affected reviewed reliance; urgent duty uses separately valid route

Table row 4
State / entry condition: Independent human account pending/prepared
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Independent author prepares without consulting GI's account first; record basis/author/limitations
Delay/failure/closure: No substitution by GI, shared model output or late co-signing; absent capacity remains an owned gap

Table row 5
State / entry condition: Comparison/disposition pending
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Empowered institution compares known bases, identifies differences and records actual outcome
Delay/failure/closure: Implicated/unresponsive route uses approved alternative; mere meeting discussion does not close duty

Table row 6
State / entry condition: Corrective duty accepted/in progress
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Owner with date/cover executes separately authorised action; evidence and effectiveness review retained
Delay/failure/closure: Overdue/unknown results escalate under profile; closure requires evidence, remaining risk/follow-up visible

Table row 7
State / entry condition: Reassessed/superseded/closed
Permitted transition, authority and evidence: Exact corrected analysis/disposition and dependent impacts recorded under lifecycle
Delay/failure/closure: No erased historical effects or automatic retroactive reversal; separately surviving duties continue

Research/agent/effect states use their common definitions. A disposition can be reaffirmation, a corrective/precedent action, or constitutional referral; each retains evidence, powers and scope. It cannot confer powers by selecting a state label.

6. Functional contracts

CON views bind existing semantic authorities rather than introduce new IFs or schemas. Common required meanings are exact compatible revision, entity/purpose/period, producer/consumer identity/capacity, evidence/assurance, powers/use, uncertainty/coverage, correlation, effective/observed time and purpose-specific acknowledgement.
Absent/conflicting/incompatible meanings produce owned rejection/limitation. Units/valid-value ranges and actual wire/field binding remain common-schema/profile gates; no local guesses.

Table row 1

ID: AOS-25-CON-001
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 02/21/22/23/24/20 → 25: REC-E/Q and KX-22/AOS-20-IF-001/Shared §4.4 canonical histories, scope/coverage/status/criteria and uncertainties; missing evidence stays missing, not “no concern”

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-CON-002
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 01/03/04/05 → 25: REC-A/D/X, KX-01/08/11/12/16-20 current powers/use/boundaries, model/evaluation/incident/change; unknown controls contain affected reliance

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-CON-003
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 30/13/02 ↔ 25: KX-06 v0.3/07/21/26 decision/approval/obligation, actual effects/outcomes and confirmed purpose-bound mapping; Chair draft distinct from board approval; unknown effect not invented

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-CON-004
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 25 and independent human authors → empowered review route/30/21/20: distinct scoped reports, independent preparation evidence, differences and KX-22/06/26 disposition; GI never authors its independent human assurance

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-CON-005
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 25 → 24/14/permitted human audiences: exact canonical position/limits/review and KX-14 permitted projection; 24 fidelity, 14 external release; no persona ranking/approval inflation

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-CON-006
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 25/30/13 ↔ empowered owner/alternate route: KX-19 protected finding/26 handoff/21 acknowledgement; accepted responsibility, date/cover/escalation and actual response; executive suppression is not closure

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-CON-007
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: Evidence/control/analysis owners ↔ 25/21-24/30/affected consumers: KX-13 exact correction/restriction/impact, old/new revisions/effective scope, reassessment/notification and remaining duties; no historical decision rewrite

Table row 8
ID: AOS-25-CON-008
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 25 ↔ 02/03/04/05/40/30: KX-15/17/20 governed histories, evaluation, release/recovery and audit; permitted longitudinal evidence with no indefinite raw retention or self-release

Table row 9
ID: AOS-25-CON-009
Producer → consumer / existing meaning and failure: 25/04/20-24 ↔ 14/02/01/30/component research owners: RSVIEW-0.1/04 CON-009/02 CON-007 profiles/runs/findings/dispositions and qualified coverage/response review; specialist ownership and human change preserved

Ordering is per declared entity/source/review/duty, not a universal total order. Duplicate reports do not cancel independent sources or surviving obligations. Receipt, validation, application and responsibility acceptance differ by purpose. Failed delivery retains owner/reason; retry reconciles actual prior effects and current controls. Revocation/correction reaches materially dependent review/presentation/human workflows. Exact schemas, timings, compatibility, ordering/retry bindings and counterpart 13/40 adoption remain operating dependencies; functional counterparts 20-24/30 are drafted, not implemented assurance.

7. Authority and human judgement

AOS-25 may compare permitted evidence, identify possible drift and propose action within approved remit. Independent human review and empowered committee/board disposition are indispensable. Each account is prepared without reference to the other account before formal comparison; disagreement is a valuable signal, not a defect to smooth away. Common permitted evidence does not require common framing or identical findings. Changed/different bases must be explicit.

Only the board changes telos. Precedent review/pruning and delegation/boundary changes use their applicable 21/01/30 powers and approved process; no universal committee-minor/board-material shortcut applies. Under DEC-103, draft review does not create a board decision; authenticated evidence, decision validity, minutes approval and execution permission remain separate. Correction can prompt selective containment under separately conferred powers; an oversight conclusion alone cannot reverse completed effects or suspend unrelated authorised service.

Annual and material-triggered interpretation/precedent review is already settled under DEC-010-012. The organisation appoints independent reviewers and an empowered institution, records actual dispositions and gives corrective owners completion dates. Project independent review being deferred does not waive this operating human independence. AI does not observe live protected meetings; human reviewers may use their own lawful/permitted observations and authorised post-meeting accounts, retaining their evidence/status.

Material protected classes include credible telos conflict, Mode 2 bypass, suppression, obligations failure, material safety/welfare and assurance failure under DEC-083. They use the protected ordinary/alternate route without executive veto or annual delay. Semantic explanation remains the default with recorded limited exceptions under DEC-027; exceptions do not waive enforced use restrictions.

8. Governing principles and tests

Table row 1
FP v4 principle: FP1 Telos, conferred purpose and function
AOS-25 application / anchors: Purpose/optimisation distinction and board-only amendment; REQ-006-007/026

Table row 2
FP v4 principle: FP2 Mode 2 is permanently human
AOS-25 application / anchors: Boundary drift referral and no persona moral verdict; REQ-008/014/021-023/030

Table row 3
FP v4 principle: FP3 Architectural integrity
AOS-25 application / anchors: Structural values, developer frameworks and applied powers reviewed; REQ-008-010/043-044

Table row 4
FP v4 principle: FP4 Radical transparency
AOS-25 application / anchors: Contestable evidence, differences, limitations and accountable response; REQ-001-004/020-025/033-036/048

Table row 5
FP v4 principle: FP5 Bounded rationality and structural imperfection
AOS-25 application / anchors: Quiet gaps, confounders, independent missed findings and owned failure; REQ-003/011-012/018/036/044/048

Table row 6
FP v4 principle: FP6 Epistemic humility
AOS-25 application / anchors: Self-account insufficient, no-alarm state not safety, unknowns retained; REQ-012/020-022/028/045/047-048

Table row 7
FP v4 principle: FP7 No-exit obligation
AOS-25 application / anchors: Cumulative resident burdens and human-confirmed context, no silence-as-consent; REQ-013/015-016/031-032

Table row 8
FP v4 principle: FP8 Constitutional mediator principle
AOS-25 application / anchors: Empowered dispositions, institutional judgement and contestable oversight; REQ-021-027/048

Table row 9
FP v4 principle: FP9 Compliance as consequence
AOS-25 application / anchors: Compliance/coherence separate; no automated governance certificate; REQ-005/019/048

Table row 10
FP v4 principle: FP10 Complexity and emergence
AOS-25 application / anchors: Cross-component accumulation and evidenced consequence learning; REQ-011-018/042-044

Table row 1
RP v6 domain: 1 Architecture and Completeness
Contribution / limit: Actual-outcome feedback and owned due/closure; 017/024-025/035-036

Table row 2
RP v6 domain: 2 Mode 1/Mode 2
Contribution / limit: Board-authorised boundaries, standing review and protected human judgement; 008/014/021-030

Table row 3
RP v6 domain: 3 1+5 Architecture
Contribution / limit: GI oversight consumes domain evidence without replacing domain/kernel owners; 001/011/031/042

Table row 4
RP v6 domain: 4 Options and Decisions
Contribution / limit: Consequences/distribution and confirmed mapping, no silent moral calibration; 013-018/032

Table row 5
RP v6 domain: 5 Blind Spots and Honesty
Contribution / limit: Comparative limits, quiet gaps, emergent effects and self-assessment challenge; 003-004/011-012/018/048

Table row 6
RP v6 domain: 6 Ethics and Telos
Contribution / limit: Founding meaning, precedent, developer-framework divergence, purpose-led coherence; 005-010/014/016/026

Table row 7
RP v6 domain: 7 Radical Transparency
Contribution / limit: Reconstructable permitted evidence, dissent/differences and dispositions; 002/020-025/033-036/046

Table row 8
RP v6 domain: 8 Agentic Delegation
Contribution / limit: Current powers, ordinary performance, duty and bounded research; 027-029/035-044/047

Table row 9
RP v6 domain: 9 Data and Sensing Boundaries
Contribution / limit: Purpose-bound aggregation with no inferred personal feelings/weights; 030-032/046-047

All ten FP and nine RP domains apply. The following accounts for every GT test; it supplies technical contributions, not executed passes or substitutes for human judgement.

Table row 1
Test: M1.1 Strategic Coherence
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Purpose/strategy/outcome patterns; humans determine strategic coherence and direction

Table row 2
Test: M1.2 Sensing Architecture
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Coverage, missing populations and unperformed checks; oversight does not itself create lawful sensing

Table row 3
Test: M1.3 Risk Intelligence
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Aggregate exposure/response gaps and risk evidence; owners and humans assess/respond

Table row 4
Test: M1.4 Composition and Capability
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Review competence/capacity gaps and independent authorship; actual board capability remains human assessment

Table row 5
Test: M1.5 Performance Legibility
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Outcomes, comparability and causal limits; indicators do not certify effectiveness

Table row 6
Test: M1.6 Compliance Assurance
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Compliance evidence versus coherence kept separate; no automatic legal certificate

Table row 7
Test: M1.7 Governance Documentation
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Exact instruments/precedent/approval and criteria histories; humans confer governing authority

Table row 8
Test: M1.8 Accountability Architecture
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Accepted duties, dates, escalation and evidence-based closure; sent reports alone are inadequate

Table row 9
Test: M1.9 Value for Money
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Cumulative resources/burdens/consequences made contestable; humans adjudicate value

Table row 10
Test: M1.10 Human-AI Interaction Norms
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Review approval/authority drift and overrides; governing norms are not model-calibrated

Table row 11
Test: M1.11 Learning Metabolism
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Actual consequences and corrective effectiveness feed review; completion is not learning evidence

Table row 12
Test: M1.12 Continuous Self-Assessment
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Bounded GI account, research coverage and independent challenge; self-account alone is insufficient

Table row 13
Test: M1.13 Emergent System Behaviour
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Examine cumulative cross-component effects beyond individual evaluations; system safety needs its own evidence

Table row 14

Test: M1.14 Golden Thread Integrity
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Surface source/currency/response gaps in permitted building-safety governance evidence; domain/named humans retain actual integrity duties

Table row 15
Test: M2.1 Values Architecture
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Compare encoded thresholds/controls with approved values; humans determine values and conflicts

Table row 16
Test: M2.2 Coherence Under Pressure
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Review patterns of difficult decisions and ignored concerns; no motive inferred from outcomes alone

Table row 17
Test: M2.3 Incommensurable Trade-off Capacity
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Unranked longitudinal tensions and burdens; humans decide which good yields

Table row 18
Test: M2.4 Epistemic Brake Function
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Qualified concerns and separately authorised selective brakes; no autonomous general veto

Table row 19
Test: M2.5 Directorial Independence
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Distinct independent human report and protected challenge route; genuine independence remains institutional/human

Table row 20
Test: M2.6 Social Legitimacy
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Permitted lived-outcome/voice evidence and limits; legitimacy is not a sentiment score

Table row 21
Test: M2.7 No-Exit Obligation
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Repeated resident burdens and missing voice cannot be erased by low complaints; humans assess lived effects

Table row 22
Test: M2.8 Radical Transparency
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Explainable material patterns and accountable dispositions within permitted disclosure; unlimited access unnecessary

Table row 23
Test: M2.9 Moral Drift Detection
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Founding-purpose/precedent reconciliation and response tracking; empowered humans determine meaning/remedy

Table row 24
Test: M2.10 Purpose Stability
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Actual approved purpose versus changing strategy/optimisation; only board changes telos

Table row 25
Test: M2.11 Murmuration Capacity
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Evidence of distributed challenge/differing accounts; collective human sense-making is not simulated consensus

Table row 26
Test: M2.12 Constitutional Authority

Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Exact powers, reserved questions and disposition routes; oversight supplies evidence, not legitimacy

Table row 27
Test: M2.13 AI Constitutional Framework Governance
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Prior assessment and continuing divergence/change monitoring; actual framework acceptability is human-governed

Table row 28
Test: M2.14 Purpose-Led Design
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Separate purpose-led coherence from compliance sufficiency; human design rationale remains required

Table row 29
Test: M2.15 Telos/Function Distinction
Oversight contribution / enduring human limit: Evidence of organisational judgement versus system optimisation; observed alignment must be verified, not assumed

9. Data, privacy and disclosure

Oversight uses permitted evidence/analysis, governing instruments/precedent, overrides, evaluations/incidents, human decisions and actual outcomes, confirmed mapping, independent reports, coverage and duty/disposition records. Each has its own status, purpose, provenance and lifecycle. A cross-domain join can reveal personal patterns absent from any individual domain; aggregation is not automatically anonymous or permitted. Group/subsidiary analysis retains distinct powers/applicability and approved scope.

Human-provided/confirmed emotional or preference descriptions can inform a scoped review; no inferred emotion, individual personality, sentiment/motive or moral-weight profile follows. Survey/interview evidence is permitted only under purpose/use controls and retains self-report and sampling limits. Documentary quality, claim support and actual practice remain separate. Live protected AI deliberation capture stays excluded.

Reports and linked evidence use 03/KX-14 audience/purpose permission and 24 faithful presentation; material withholding/unknown evidence remains visible within permitted explanation. KX-15 governs retention, legal holds, location and authorised deletion. Longitudinal review does not justify keeping every raw conversation/content copy indefinitely recoverable; deletion may limit later coverage, which must be declared rather than secretly reconstructed.

10. Normal and degraded flows

Oversight cycle: approved entity/period/question → permitted exact histories/current instruments → coverage/comparability and source/assurance checks → GI account separating compliance/coherence and pattern limits → independent human and GI accounts each prepared without reference to the other account before formal comparison → known-basis comparison → empowered disposition → accepted actions/dates/cover → actual effects/effectiveness review and next-cycle feedback. Different reports/bases are preserved; their disagreement cannot be removed to publish a convenient single consensus.

Material trigger/protected concern: credible drift/bypass/neglected obligation → minimum permitted evidence and current controls → selective dependent-reliance containment only under conferred powers → ordinary/alternate protected human route → responsibility acceptance or owned failed handoff → empowered timely review/response → preserved outcomes and residual duties. It does not wait for the annual cycle or executive report sign-off.

Deferred Phase 2 use case: CAP-01-specific persona/reading mapping and its longitudinal workflow are parked in Phase 2 (deferred under DEC-097). General cumulative distributional-burden, drift and unacted purpose-concern review remain current architectural responsibilities.

Correction: material source/analysis/criteria/approval/use change → identify affected oversight/report/disposition reliance → retain exact old/new impact and contain/mark affected reliance → accountable reassessment and notifications to 21-24/30 as relevant → new reviewed revision and outstanding duties. It neither rewrites approved minutes nor assumes automatic reversal of completed consequences.

Research normal/degraded: approved profile/trigger → controlled 14 evidence → specialist relevance/coverage → exact adaptation proposal → empowered disposition. Failed/stale/unperformed coverage produces an owned limitation and recovery duty, not a no-material-finding success. GI portfolio review: component-owned coverage/findings/responses → examine shared gaps/contradictions → refer adequacy questions to exact owners/change routes; no new task activation or central replacement remit.

11. Failure and recovery

Table row 1
Failure: Missing histories or incomparable metrics
Required functional response / owner: Qualify/withhold affected conclusion, retain denominator/basis limits and refer evidence/oversight owner

Table row 2
Failure: Either account absent or prepared using the other account before comparison
Required functional response / owner: Record independence/capacity gap and owned recovery; no GI report or co-signature substitutes

Table row 3
Failure: Apparent stable/green operation with unperformed checks
Required functional response / owner: Expose coverage and quiet-state limitation; raise appropriate challenge rather than certify no drift

Table row 4
Failure: Confirmed repeated preference mistaken for moral failure
Required functional response / owner: Preserve context, mixed readings and causal limits; refer human judgement without accusation/ranking

Table row 5
Failure: Executive suppression/implicated or unresponsive recipient
Required functional response / owner: Protected alternate route, cover/escalation and surviving duties; receipt/discussion is not closure

Table row 6
Failure: Unknown powers/use, stale review or hostile source instructions
Required functional response / owner: Contain affected reliance, retain reason/owner, reject power expansion from content

Table row 7
Failure: Corrective action completed but outcomes unknown/adverse
Required functional response / owner: Keep effectiveness/remaining-risk review open with accepted ownership and dates

Table row 8
Failure: Lost delivery, uncertain effects or recovery/replay
Required functional response / owner: Reconcile actual effects/current revisions/controls before repetition; no invented responsibility acceptance

Recovery requires compatible exact source/control/report revisions, current use/powers, sufficient declared coverage, required independent review and owned handoff evidence for the affected scope. Separately authorised urgent human duties continue. A restored monitoring service does not prove constitutional coherence or retrospectively authorise old effects.

12. Evidence and audit

Reconstruction links trigger/remit/entity/period → exact histories/instruments/evidence → permitted use/powers/assurance → method/profile/model and comparison basis → GI and independent reports → differences/validation → actual human disposition → accepted corrective duties/cover/dates → action/effect/effectiveness and correction/notification → remaining risk/closure. Retain alternative accounts and uncertainty proportionately under lifecycle; a digest/hash identifies a record, not truth or permission. Trace oversight's own omissions/challenges and the response to them.

13. Security and quality attributes

Quality is judged by evidence fidelity, scope/comparability, detection of material cumulative drift and blind spots, false/missed findings, independence preservation, useful human challenge, privacy, timely owned response and outcome feedback. Evaluation includes individually defensible rulings that drift only in aggregate, genuine authorised purpose change, justified repeated persona alignment, neglected telos concerns, changing definitions, missing/biased samples, contested override histories, developer-framework changes and cross-component effects invisible to local evaluation.

Constructed cases are necessary but insufficient: sustained/replayed permitted histories must show whether independent review catches what self-assessment misses, and whether required responses reach effective closure. Competent human evaluation applies approved rubrics; numerical thresholds, sample sizes, capacity, periods, alert timing and retention require approved profiles. Annual minimum/material triggers are settled; additional cadence/settings are not invented. A method/model/profile change uses 01/04/05/40 change/evaluation controls before authorised operation. Threats include evidence poisoning, suppressed records, prompt injection, misleading joins, unauthorised histories and compromised/implicated review routes.

14. Invariants

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-INV-001
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Oversight retains exact scope/evidence/coverage/comparability; REQ-001-004, VER-001-002

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-INV-002
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Compliance/self-assessment is not human coherence/independent assurance; REQ-005/019-022/048, VER-003/014-016/030

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-INV-003
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Founding meaning and reserved powers are not changed by accumulated model readings; REQ-006-010/026, VER-004-007/017

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-INV-004
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: General cumulative patterns supply no machine adjudication between incommensurable goods or inferred personal profile; current REQ-013/016/032 and VER-010/012/021 retained. CAP-01-specific REQ-014/015 and VER-011 deferred.

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-INV-005
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Annual/triggered human review and protected duty cannot become optional because GI runs smoothly; REQ-021/027/036, VER-015/019/023

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-INV-006
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Disposition/receipt/completed action does not prove effective closure; REQ-017-018/024-025/035,

VER-013/018/023

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-INV-007
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Corrections/current permission control affected reliance; histories obey lifecycle; REQ-031/033-034/046-047, VER-021-022/029

Table row 8
ID: AOS-25-INV-008
Invariant / REQ and VER anchors: Research/performance/feedback proposes governed adaptation, never self-calibration or self-certification; REQ-037-045/048, VER-024-028/030

15. Verification and conformance plan

All cases are planned/unexecuted. Common preconditions: authorised test scope, exact controlled source/analysis/control/profile revisions, permitted representative histories, appointed oversight/analytical/use/independent/human-duty owners and approved assessment rubric. Common procedure: introduce the row's stimulus, produce scoped GI outputs and independently prepared human input where required, inspect controls/reports/differences/handoffs, apply the recorded disposition through separately authorised workflows, and reconstruct relevant consequences/corrections. Evidence: inputs/revisions/scope, actual outputs/limitations/checks, report authorship/basis, disposition/powers and accepted-duty/action/effect/notification records. Assessor: competent appointed oversight reviewer with independent human governance judgement and data-use/security/analytical specialists for affected boundaries. This is operating independence, not a claim of achieved independent project review. Tests assert technical contributions, not a correct machine answer to Mode 2 questions.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-VER-001
REQs: 001/002
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Competing entity/period/source revisions and conflicting evidence → assess requested scope → exact bounded evidence/inference/assurance and conflicts retained; inspect source links/basis

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-VER-002
REQs: 003/004
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Missing/unseeded/excluded population and changed measure definitions → compare trend → denominator/coverage/comparability qualified, no unknown-as-zero or false trend; inspect actual comparison

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-VER-003
REQs: 005
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Technically compliant decisions undermine a founding commitment → review → compliance/coherence assessed separately and human concern referred; inspect reports, no certification

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-VER-004
REQs: 006/007
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Individually plausible precedent chain progressively diverges from founding text; alternative fixture has genuine authorised change → accumulate → possible drift detected against exact founding/change baseline, legitimate amendment not mislabelled; inspect paired histories/findings

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-VER-005
REQs: 008
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Incremental delegated classifications move reserved judgement into Mode 1 → review → actual authorising instruments checked and bypass/ambiguity referred, no autonomous boundary

rewrite; inspect powers/referral

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-VER-006
REQs: 009
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: High justified override count and low concealed misuse count → review context → no count-only misconduct/safety verdict; reasons/scope/effects retained; inspect history/limits

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-VER-007
REQs: 010
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Model-framework changes or lacks required prior assessment and shapes material outputs → assess → divergence/missing-assessment concern to empowered owner, no assumed developer-value adoption; inspect framework/evaluation records

Table row 8
ID: AOS-25-VER-008
REQs: 011
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Locally satisfactory components produce a cumulative conflicting effect → combine permitted history → system-level concern/owners exposed despite local passes; inspect effects and review duty

Table row 9
ID: AOS-25-VER-009
REQs: 012
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Stable indicators with failed coverage/weak challenge → assess quiet period → limits and questions visible, no no-drift assurance; inspect coverage and output

Table row 10
ID: AOS-25-VER-010
REQs: 013/014
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Several decisions repeatedly burden one group with fact-based justifications → review → qualified distribution/tension pattern without machine adjudication between incommensurable goods or unsupported accusation; inspect canonical findings and24 rendering. CAP-01 persona tracking is deferred.

Table row 11
ID: AOS-25-VER-011
REQs: 015
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Deferred to Phase 2; not a current architectural requirement/capability/test. Legacy wording: AOS-25-VER-011 (deferred under DEC-097); identifier retained for traceability only.

Table row 12
ID: AOS-25-VER-012
REQs: 016
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Telos concerns include unresolved, missing, rejected with rationale and completed responses → report → inadequate-response pattern prominent, categories distinguished; inspect duty/decision links

Table row 13
ID: AOS-25-VER-013
REQs: 017/018
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Action complete but outcomes delayed/adverse with confounders → learn → effectiveness and causal limits visible, remaining duties owned; inspect consequences/follow-up

Table row 14
ID: AOS-25-VER-014
REQs: 019
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: High document quality but weak claim/practice evidence →

aggregate → dimensions remain distinct, no effectiveness promotion; inspect assessment inputs/output

Table row 15
ID: AOS-25-VER-015
REQs: 020/021
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Setup: annual review due, and a separate earlier material-trigger fixture in which GI misses drift found by the human reviewer. Procedure: prepare the two accounts independently, then inspect authorship/history. In separate adversarial attempts, offer the human account to GI before GI preparation and GI's account to the human author before human preparation. Expected result: both reviews occur at the applicable trigger; GI is labelled a self-account; each original account is prepared without reference to the other. An account that used the other before preparation cannot claim independent preparation. Common permitted underlying evidence remains usable; original accounts, differing evidence bases and later responses remain distinct. Status: planned, not executed.

Table row 16
ID: AOS-25-VER-016
REQs: 022
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Human and GI reports differ in evidence revisions as well as conclusions → compare → known basis/limits explicit, dissent preserved without forced GI framing; inspect comparison and sources

Table row 17
ID: AOS-25-VER-017
REQs: 023/026
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Reports propose pruning precedent or changing telos/delegation → disposition → actual empowered reaffirm/correct/referral route, board-only telos, no automatic amendment/reversal; inspect 01/21/30 approval/applied state

Table row 18
ID: AOS-25-VER-018
REQs: 024/025
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Committee records correction but owner unaccepted/action incomplete/effectiveness uncertain → track → accepted owner/date/cover/escalation and evidence-based closure only, residual risk retained; inspect duty states

Table row 19
ID: AOS-25-VER-019
REQs: 027/029
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Credible protected concern during annual/window delay, requested total suspension without powers → route → protected alternate route without executive gate, only authorised selective containment and surviving duties; inspect reports/powers/effects

Table row 20
ID: AOS-25-VER-020
REQs: 028
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Provisional evidence urgently material but not validated → record/report → precise provisional status under permitted access, protected report not blocked, no formal-validation claim; inspect controls/status

Table row 21
ID: AOS-25-VER-021
REQs: 030/031/032
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Live-meeting request, cross-entity join and temptation to infer feelings/weights → assess → protected live boundary and independent use checks enforced, only permitted confirmed descriptions/mappings; inspect use/powers/data/output

Table row 22
ID: AOS-25-VER-022
REQs: 033/034
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Correction/revocation materially affects oversight and board

pack/decision → reassess → exact affected reviewed state invalidated, old/new impacts and owners notified including 30; inspect outstanding duties

Table row 23
ID: AOS-25-VER-023
REQs: 035/036
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Delivered report without accepted owner; implicated normal recipient/release controller, false alternative under the same gate, suppression, lost response and uncertain prior effects → assess approved class-specific alternate and recover → technical and organisational independence assessed separately; actual permitted alternate/cover and original tracker maintained, no automatic external disclosure, false acceptance or route-assurance claim. Reconcile current controls/effects before repetition. Planned, not executed.

Table row 24
ID: AOS-25-VER-024
REQs: 037/038/039
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Approved own research profile/trigger and relevant primary source → run normal research → bounded retrieval, exact baseline/dates/coverage/affected elements and qualified implications; inspect common research records

Table row 25
ID: AOS-25-VER-025
REQs: 040/041
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Material research finding alongside failed/stale coverage → dispose/recover → empowered change owner, owned recovery and distinct limitations, no auto-amendment/no-finding success; inspect history/duty

Table row 26
ID: AOS-25-VER-026
REQs: 042
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: GI remits each report completed runs but a shared topic is unassigned and responses lack effect evidence → portfolio review → common gap and response limits routed to exact owners, no invented operating agent/central takeover; inspect remit/coverage/disposition records

Table row 27
ID: AOS-25-VER-027
REQs: 043/044
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Ordinary performance evidence and changed oversight method; independent cumulative case defeats self-report → evaluate → longitudinal/contrasting assessment and governed release, no exploratory self-calibration; inspect evaluation/change records

Table row 28
ID: AOS-25-VER-028
REQs: 045
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Required threshold/rubric/timing unset → attempt operation → named setup gate/limitation rather than guessed defaults; inspect profile and output

Table row 29
ID: AOS-25-VER-029
REQs: 046/047
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Authorised deletion, stale controls and hostile source instructions → assess/recover → lifecycle enforced, coverage limit visible, affected reliance contained and power expansion rejected; inspect disposition/use/control records

Table row 30
ID: AOS-25-VER-030
REQs: 048
Specific precondition / stimulus → expected result and acceptance evidence: Competent human disputes an oversight assumption and has evidence outside GI's sampled scope → challenge → permitted history, limits and independent review/duty retained; no self-certified

effectiveness; inspect response/basis

Each requirement has one primary case and every case lists its requirements. Actual execution records require exact tested versions/date/assessor/evidence and separate conclusions. Cumulative cases must span relevant decision/review/correction cycles; a single paper fixture cannot establish full GI coverage.

15.1 Planned conformance claims

Each CR is planned/unsubstantiated, initial history 0.1. No achieved assertion follows from the wording or author checks.

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-CR-001
Source → REQ/FUN → contract responsibility → acceptance evidence: FP/RP5/6/GT; WP/TD → REQ-001-019, FUN-001-004 → CON-001-003/005 → VER-001-014 scoped, cumulative, comparable and unranked evidence with limits

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-CR-002
Source → REQ/FUN → contract responsibility → acceptance evidence: DEC-010-012/024/025/073-089 → REQ-020-036, FUN-005-007 → CON-002-007 → VER-015-023 independent authorship, empowered disposition, owned response and corrected reliance over cycles

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-CR-003
Source → REQ/FUN → contract responsibility → acceptance evidence: DEC-086/template v0.4 §4.4 → REQ-037-042, FUN-008-009 → CON-009 → VER-024-026 own normal/degraded research and qualified portfolio review without self-amendment

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-CR-004
Source → REQ/FUN → contract responsibility → acceptance evidence: DEC-018/045-048/054-078; FP5/6/10/GT → REQ-043-048, FUN-001/005/007 → CON-002/004/008 → VER-027-030 governed evaluation/history/controls and contestable overseer, not certification

16. Dependencies and delivery stages

Drafting uses the current governing baseline and functional counterparts 20-24/30; this draft completes the mapped GI component drafting set, not whole-set independent assurance or GIL disposition closure. Next author work is a GI-set consistency/disposition review, then AOS-40 acceptance scenarios under to-do item 8. Detailed 13/40 adoption remains pending.

Build requires a separately authorised slice, exact compatible contracts and approved methods/profiles. Activation requires organisation purpose/instruments/precedent, appointed oversight/independent/committee/duty/cover roles, permitted histories/audiences, review calendar/material triggers, evaluated thresholds/quality/capacity and reliable protected/recovery routes. Operation requires maintained source/control currency, actual independent preparation, accepted responses, consequence evidence, coverage and governed research. Absence of an operating annual mechanism cannot be papered over by this drafting milestone.

17. Issues and gates

Table row 1
ID: AOS-25-ISS-001
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Review dependency; template/QS; all CAPs; Mark wording/whole-document review before baseline approval; next GI-set/disposition consistency review and planned 40 evidence allocation

Table row 2
ID: AOS-25-ISS-002
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Operating dependency; DEC-010-012/083; CAP-004/005; organisation/01/30 appoint independent author, empowered review route, duty/cover/escalation and demonstrate independence/accepted outcomes before operation

Table row 3
ID: AOS-25-ISS-003
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Operating dependency; §§4/13, DEC-031-041; CAP-001-004/007; oversight/evaluation owner approves methods, coverage/comparison/materiality/false-missed finding/timeliness rubric and representative longitudinal evidence before reliance

Table row 4
ID: AOS-25-ISS-004
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Operating dependency; 03/DEC-090/091; CAP-001/003/005; data-use/evidence owners approve histories, group joins, audience needs/limitations and retained/deleted scope before use

Table row 5
ID: AOS-25-ISS-005
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Compatibility dependency; §6/common views; all CAPs; semantic owners approve exact schemas/bindings/version/ack/lifecycle/recovery and pending 13/40 adoption before operational reliance

Table row 6
ID: AOS-25-ISS-006
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Research setup dependency; DEC-086/§4.4; CAP-006; component research/change owners approve own profile/assignment/triggers/coverage/recipients/dates/cover and portfolio inputs before research operation

Table row 7
ID: AOS-25-ISS-007
Type / source; affected capability / owned dependency and required evidence / gate: Project review dependency; QS G3; all CAPs; Mark's independent project review remains deferred; no author/GI evidence substitutes for required separate-reviewer gate or operating independent institution

All ISS rows are open, initial history 0.1; no closed disposition or confidence estimate is asserted. Each row names source, affected scope, owner, evidence and gate. Settled architectural directions are applied rather than reopened. Required setup values/appointments remain owned dependencies; no additional general design question is identified.

18. Non-normative implementation notes

Dashboards, cohort/history views, replayed cases and paired review packs are possible implementations. A shared agent/service may fulfil several approved remits; independent human preparation is an institutional condition, not merely using a different model. No vendor, model, wire API, committee name, sample size, risk score, schedule or deployment count is selected here. A diagram/count can make a pattern legible, but must not create persona ranking, implied motive or unsupported assurance.

19. Traceability and change

§4.3 links sources/derivations to each proposed REQ and planned §15 case. CAP/FUN, CON/state and INV links make the responsibility and acceptance path explicit; §8 accounts for all principles/tests. The appended common/source allocations add ownership without changing definitions, parent requirements or DEC status. GIL dispositions C03/04/10/19/22/24/25/27/32/34 are carried into coverage, periodic/triggered review, research separation, histories, no calibration and actual consequence learning;

retired numerical/retention/approval defaults stay retired. WP confirmation assumptions remain reconciled to explicit empowered precedent approval.

Changing an oversight method can alter what the organisation notices; material changes therefore undergo affected-function evaluation and authorised profile/change control. Findings propose, human governance adopts, and operational applied state is separately evidenced. Preserve prior reports, dissent, corrections and actual consequences only within lifecycle. Author structure/ID/table and requirement-case checks are document evidence, not case execution, independent review or readiness approval.

20. Handover and continuity

The oversight owner maintains exact baselines, approved review/research/evaluation profiles, independent authorship arrangements, permitted histories, open material findings and response dates/cover/escalation, actual outcome evidence and affected superseded reports. Successors receive restrictions/uncertainty and surviving protected/corrective duties, not merely a green dashboard. Institution/corpus/change owners retain their powers.

Builders work only within separately authorised scope and compatible exact profiles/contracts. Missing powers/use, unknown governing meaning, required unapproved parameters, absent independent review route or unsupported release claims stop affected work into accountable referral. Draft completion supplies no build or activation permission. Interface/runtime failure leaves a permitted human fallback for material duties; it cannot silently suspend the annual/triggered obligation.

21. Review and control

Table row 1
AOS-QS coverage: QS-01-03
Evidence / limits: Purpose, source status and authority in §§1-3; controlled metadata/manifest

Table row 2
AOS-QS coverage: QS-04-10
Evidence / limits: Atomic proposed REQs with source/rationale/owner/status/history/dependencies/cases in §4.3/§15

Table row 3
AOS-QS coverage: QS-11-14
Evidence / limits: Responsibilities, lifecycle, semantic contracts, workflows and failure in §§3/5/6/9-11; physical mappings later gates

Table row 4
AOS-QS coverage: QS-15-20
Evidence / limits: Human independence/powers, uncertainty, cumulative evaluation/research, audit/change in §§7-13/19; actual effectiveness not claimed

Table row 5
AOS-QS coverage: QS-21-24
Evidence / limits: Planned VER/CR, owned issues/stages and continuity in §§15-17/20; no executed case

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

Specification-quality conclusion: functional review draft with 48 proposed REQs, nine CON views, 30 planned cases and four unsubstantiated conformance claims. Design-adequacy conclusion: supports evidence-qualified oversight and independently contestable learning while retaining permanent human adjudication and governed change. Operational detection, independence,

response effectiveness and institutional legitimacy require actual evidence and appointed human review. No tailoring exemption, test pass, whole-document/build/activation or readiness approval is claimed. Next: GI-set consistency/disposition review, then AOS-40 acceptance scenarios.

Component summary

Purpose/owns: reveal accumulated governance drift, blind spots and consequences; prepare the GI account and track governed response. Reserved: independent human authorship, constitutional/value judgement, source/precedent adoption, powers/use and execution remain with their named owners. Receives/produces: permitted histories/instruments/outcomes/current controls → scoped canonical oversight, differences, protected referrals, accepted corrective duties and research proposals. Research: oversight-specific external remit plus qualified GI portfolio coverage/response review, without replacing specialist duties. States/dependencies: §5; kernel/14/20-24/30 and pending detailed 13/40. Conformant when: CR-001-004 supported by executed §15 evidence across relevant cycles in authorised scope. Open: wording/set review, actual appointments/profiles/independence, exact compatibility and operating 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.