AOS-30 - consistency and coherence review against the kernel and GI

Document: aos-30-kernel-and-gi-consistency-review-v0-1 · Source revision or record: v0.2

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.

Date: 7 October 2026
Version: 0.2
Status: author functional-architecture review with authorised amendment disposition; CR30-01-03 closed.
Requested by: Mark Sweeny. Independent project review remains deferred.

1. Conclusion

AOS-30 is coherent with AOS-01-05 and AOS-20 at the functional architecture level. No fundamental contradiction, missing governing power or competing component responsibility was identified in the reviewed material. The approved minute-taker/Company Secretary/Chair/board distinction is faithfully expressed in AOS-30 v0.2.

The initial review identified three limited documentary alignment points, now resolved by authorised amendments described in §7. They concern carrying AOS-30's settled meaning into earlier documents and making the correction-feedback connection explicit. They do not require executable schemas, detailed code lists, technology choices or organisation-specific appointments to be settled now. No new general design question is identified.

This review establishes consistency of the written functional design. It does not establish implementation correctness, institutional adequacy or readiness to operate.

2. Scope and evidence

Read the canonical OneDrive to-do list, updated 6 October, AOS-30 v0.2, AOS-01-05 v0.7, AOS-20 v0.2 and the current Kernel Exchange Register v0.7. The register's filename retains its original v0.1 suffix; its current content includes the AOS-30 approved-direction disposition. Earlier components retain the pre-AOS-30 decision baseline through DEC-086; AOS-30 and the register record DEC-087-089.

Review compared responsibilities, semantic exchanges, approval boundaries, ordinary/failure workflows, feedback and correction, privacy, protected reporting, independent review and external research. Detailed technical implementation and a fresh legal/standards assessment were outside scope. Common annexes were considered through the adoption declarations in these documents; this was not a new full review of those annexes or the source corpus.

Principal evidence: each component's §§3, 6, 7 and 9-14; AOS-30 §§4.3, 5, 15 and 17.1; AOS-20 §§4.3, 5 and 6.1; Exchange Register §§6, 14 and final approved-direction disposition. Requirement and planned-case references below identify supporting

written provisions; cases were not executed.

3. Responsibility and behaviour comparison

Table row 1
Relationship: AOS-01 authority / AOS-30 human workflow
Consistency finding: AOS-30 records empowered human decisions and supports the approval sequence; AOS-01 determines instruments, powers and controlled activation. A recorded decision cannot manufacture authority.
Main evidence: 01 §§3/6.1/7/10.2; 30 §§3/7, REQ-008-012/017-020

Table row 2
Relationship: AOS-02 shared records / AOS-30 decision meaning
Consistency finding: AOS-30 owns decision-account and accepted-duty semantics; AOS-02 owns shared structure, custody and governed lineage. Admission, truth, approval and actual effect remain distinct.
Main evidence: 02 §§3/5/6.1/10.4; 30 §§3/5/6.2/12

Table row 3
Relationship: AOS-03 identity and permitted use / AOS-30 participation
Consistency finding: AOS-30 relies on verified capacity, purpose-bound input, approved disclosure and resident-agreed channels. Human approval does not remove processing restrictions. Descriptive feedback remains human supplied or confirmed.
Main evidence: 03 §§3/6.1/9/10.4; 30 §§7/9, REQ-014/015/017/031-035

Table row 4
Relationship: AOS-04 agent behaviour / AOS-30 instruction and feedback
Consistency finding: Task assignment and human instruction confer no extra permission. Agents assist preparation and account structuring, but cannot perform Mode 2 adjudication or convert feedback into autonomous governing change.
Main evidence: 04 §§3/6/7; 30 §§4.2/7, REQ-002/006/007/015/028/037

Table row 5
Relationship: AOS-05 platform / AOS-30 continuing duty
Consistency finding: The platform enforces controls and records actual effects; AOS-30 supports human acceptance, cover and outcome review. Outage, read receipt or restart cannot erase duty, establish service completion or restore withdrawn powers.
Main evidence: 05 §§3/6/10/11; 30 §§5/10.2/11, REQ-021-029/039/040/048

Table row 6
Relationship: GI preparation / human decision
Consistency finding: GI owns substantive analysis, canonical meaning, validation and faithful presentation. AOS-30 coordinates the human workflow and records its disposition. Reviewed analysis remains distinct from a decision or action grant.
Main evidence: 20 §§3/6.1/10.1, REQ-021/022/024; 30 §§3/4.2/6.1/10.1, REQ-004/005

Table row 7
Relationship: GI corpus and oversight / human feedback
Consistency finding: Decision storage is not automatic precedent admission. Interpretation approval and independent review remain separately empowered. Outcome feedback supports governed learning without reopening deferred self-calibration.
Main evidence: 20 REQ-010-012/034-036/045; 30 REQ-015/036-038, VER-022/023

Table row 8
Relationship: Protected findings and research
Consistency finding: Both documents preserve permitted urgent reporting, accountable handoff, alternative recipients and distinct research remits. A finding or acceptance for further work cannot amend a specification or activate a change.
Main evidence: 20 REQ-029-033/037-046/053-057; 30 REQ-025/026/042-047; kernel research declarations

The responsibilities of AOS-13 operational coordination, AOS-14 external exchange and AOS-11 resident relationships are preserved in AOS-30. Their detailed specifications were not reviewed here; their later drafting must adopt these boundaries.

4. Findings and proportionate recommendations

CR30-01 - earlier adoption statements need updating

Classification: documentary alignment; no behavioural contradiction. AOS-20 §6.1 says detailed AOS-30 adoption remains pending its drafting, although AOS-30 now exists. Kernel/GI baseline declarations also precede the AOS-30 disposition. Conversely, AOS-30 §16 describes endpoints as mapped reciprocally, while Register §14 explicitly retains affected-consumer adoption work.

Recommendation: update present-tense status and dependency statements to identify AOS-30 v0.2 and DEC-087-089 as applicable to human-decision exchanges. Describe the register as mapping the intended logical producer/consumer relationships, with local adoption alignment still to be completed. Preserve historical baseline entries as history. This is a short document reconciliation, not a technical interoperability exercise.

CR30-02 - make the board approval distinction explicit at the receiving boundary

Classification: propagation clarification; settled design, no new decision. AOS-30 §§5/6.2/10.3 and REQ-008-012 clearly distinguish minute-taker drafting, Company Secretary stewardship, optional Chair draft approval and board approval of the exact minutes and thereby the decision. The register's final disposition repeats this. Earlier AOS-01 CON-003 and AOS-20 CON-004 use generic empowered-approval language and do not themselves state the Chair/board distinction. They do not authorise a conflicting shortcut, but standalone reading leaves the later qualification implicit.

Recommendation: add a concise shared-reference clarification in AOS-01/AOS-02/AOS-20 decision-record participation, with applicable AOS-03/04/05 references: receiving a Chair-approved draft or certified extract is insufficient for authoritative reliance on a board decision; an extract refers to the exact board-approved source. Preserve different approval routes for non-board decisions. No duplicate schema or new approval mechanism is needed.

Existing AOS-30 VER-005-007 already describe the relevant planned checks. They can serve as functional walkthrough scenarios across the receiving components; no implementation test is required to close this documentary point.

CR30-03 - explicitly include human decision preparation in correction notifications

Classification: limited functional-link clarification. AOS-02 CON-003 lists correction consumers 01/03/04/05/13/21-25 but omits AOS-30. General material-dependency behaviour and AOS-30 REQ-035/§11 already require reassessment, so this is not absence of a system-wide correction rule. However, a corrected source can affect an AOS-30 preparation pack or pending decision account as well as GI analysis and agent execution.

Recommendation: name AOS-30 as a conditional correction recipient where its pending preparation, account or outcome review materially depends on the corrected evidence. AOS-30 should flag that dependency and obtain appropriate human review; GI remains responsible for revising its canonical analysis. A source correction cannot silently rewrite approved minutes, make a new governing decision or reverse a completed effect. This follows existing DEC-069/089 and AOS-30 REQ-034-036; no new power or general design choice is proposed.

5. Functional walkthroughs

Table row 1
Scenario considered against the written specifications: Chair approves a draft; a component requests authority to act on it
Coherent expected behaviour: AOS-30 preserves draft status; AOS-01 and receiving components require the applicable board approval

evidence and current controls. CR30-02 makes that shared interpretation explicit.

Table row 2
Scenario considered against the written specifications: Human rejects a GI recommendation
Coherent expected behaviour: Record the empowered decision and rationale; retain analytical history; separately check permitted implementation; do not turn the override into precedent automatically.

Table row 3
Scenario considered against the written specifications: A source changes after a board pack is prepared
Coherent expected behaviour: GI reassesses affected analysis; AOS-30 flags affected preparation/account work and obtains human review; approved historical records remain governed by correction procedures. CR30-03 clarifies notification.

Table row 4
Scenario considered against the written specifications: Protected finding implicates the normal recipient during a platform outage
Coherent expected behaviour: Use only authorised alternative reporting/continuity, retain tracking ownership until accepted transfer, and preserve failed delivery and outstanding duties.

Table row 5
Scenario considered against the written specifications: Resident disputes repair closure
Coherent expected behaviour: Use agreed channels and accessible review, preserve original dispute/commitment, distinguish contractor status from verified outcome, and retain accountable follow-up.

Table row 6
Scenario considered against the written specifications: Workflow research proposes an urgent amendment
Coherent expected behaviour: Record evidence and permitted urgent operational response separately; human disposition and controlled change remain necessary.

These are document walkthroughs, not executed tests or proof of effective human governance.

6. Completion and next step

Requested review and authorised functional alignment complete. No fundamental redesign or new general design question required. CR30-01-03 closed by amendments in §7. Next remaining GI specifications under item 7. Original review did not amend specifications; subsequent amendments were separately authorised by Mark.

Exact wire schemas, code lists, compatibility tests, organisation appointments, numerical settings and operational evidence remain later implementation/commissioning work. Their absence does not prevent completion of this functional consistency review or continued component drafting. Existing organisation-specific authority, privacy and independent-review prerequisites remain applicable before operation.

7. Authorised amendment disposition - 7 October 2026

Mark instructed three amendments and closure of AOS-30 work. AOS-00/Map v0.25, DEC-001-089; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3 and AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.9/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.8; source matrix v0.9 and template v0.4 unchanged; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1 unchanged.

Table row 1
Finding: CR30-01
Disposition / evidence: Closed: current drafting/adoption/next-step references corrected in GI, kernel/Boundary, architecture/map and AOS-30; current adoption in Register §15. Dated history retained.

Table row 2
Finding: CR30-02

Disposition / evidence: Closed: kernel §§6.7, GI §6.5, Core REC-R09 and common contracts/register explicitly preserve separate roles and Chair draft versus board minutes/decision approval. Non-board routes and independent authority/use controls preserved.

Table row 3
Finding: CR30-03
Disposition / evidence: Closed: 02 CON-003/REQ-019/§10.2/VER-008 and 30 §6.2.1/REQ-035/VER-021 explicitly include correction receipt; GI §6.5 owns analysis revision and informs workflow. Existing KX-13 scope retained.

AOS-30 functional specification work complete. Author validation checks changed references, unchanged register identities/counts and table structure. No operational case executed; independent review deferred. No new design question, schema or authority introduced.