# AOS shared contracts - joint review draft

Document: aos-shared-contracts-v0-1-review-draft · Source revision or record: v0.27

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-105 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.27. Operational technical-control reliance requires declared scope/limits and accepted observed enforcement/failure/recovery evidence; build/prototype and G4/live approval gates remain separate. Decision/amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-105-technical-control-limits-and-evidence-2026-10-29.md). Earlier counts/baselines are dated history; current inventory and annex addendum control catalogue navigation. Existing non-waivable rules and DEC-099-104 retained; all new cases/variants remain planned/unexecuted.

DEC-104 adopted - 29 October 2026: Current revision 0.26. 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 0.25. 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 DEC-087 is partly superseded; decision/amendment and legal-source record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-103-decision-validity-evidence-and-minutes-2026-10-29.md).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.

DEC-102 adopted - 29 October 2026: Mark approved demonstrated adequacy of organisation-defined classifications/settings against governing constraints. Current document revision 0.24; see the decision and amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-102-classification-and-configuration-adequacy-2026-10-29.md). Earlier baselines are dated history. DEC-099-101 retained; detailed amended requirements remain subject to separate review/readiness gates and cases remain planned/unexecuted.

DEC-100 adopted - 29 October 2026: Mark approved separate advance-authorised minimum control-metadata access. Current document revision 0.23; this notice supersedes earlier baseline notices for the affected scope only. See the decision and amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-100-control-metadata-access-2026-10-29.md). DEC-099 remains approved. Requirements remain proposed wording implementing the approved direction; cases remain planned/unexecuted and ordinary separate review/readiness gates apply.

DEC-099 adopted - 29 October 2026: Mark approved the derived-information restriction rule. Current document revision 0.22; earlier functional/editorial baselines below are retained history. The decision and controlled amendment record (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-dec-099-derived-information-restrictions-2026-10-29.md) governs this change. Existing requirement/case/IF identities are retained; amended wording remains subject to the normal separate review and readiness

gates. No case execution or operating approval is implied.

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: Working identifier
Value: AOS-SC; cross-component drafting dossier, not a twentieth component

**Table row 2**
Document control: Version / date
Value: 0.27 / 29 October 2026

**Table row 3**
Document control: Status
Value: Proposed design and contract records; not approved for build or activation

**Table row 4**
Document control: Project owner / proposed baseline approver
Value: Mark Sweeny

**Table row 5**
Document control: Author
Value: Codex, at Mark's request to begin item 6 while item 5b remains open

**Table row 6**
Document control: Accountable semantic owners
Value: Proposed component allocations below; role appointments unresolved

**Table row 7**
Document control: Independent reviewer
Value: Unassigned; independent project review deferred

**Table row 8**
Document control: Quality basis
Value: AOS-QS v0.1; component template v0.4

**Table row 9**
Document control: Readiness
Value: Common logical kernel adoption drafted; no G2, G3 or G4 claim

**Table row 10**
Document control: Scope
Value: Seven original IF briefs plus two proposed companion IF catalogue allocations; common register maps all 33 kernel CONs; Core v0.2 adds assurance; non-kernel adoption remains open

**Table row 11**
Document control: Change history
Value: 0.15 - GI-CR-01-04 author consistency correction/closure under Mark’s instruction; existing identifiers and proposed/planned status preserved. 0.1 initial shared drafting dossier and dated dispositions. 0.2 - 6 October DEC-062-066, common register/Core v0.2/component v0.4 adoption and proposed REC-D/X identifiers; earlier obligation/case statuses preserved 0.3 - incorporates DEC-067-072 and Control Coordination v0.1, Register v0.2 and component v0.5 adoption; original status/history preserved.

# 1. Purpose and standing

An architectural contract defines what an exchange means, who may produce and consume it, what authority it requires, and what each participant must do with its result. An API may implement the exchange; it does not settle those obligations.

This document begins item 6 by co-designing shared controls and the contracts that intelligences inherit. It preserves the seven existing IF identifiers. It supplies one proposed definition per interface in this dossier, not independently varied copies for each consumer. The earlier Contract Model remains explanatory; AOS-00 §5.2 remains the catalogue and allocation baseline. The ownership model was approved by Mark on 4 October; exact contract definitions and normal baseline approval remain pending.

This is not seven completed component specifications. Component requirements, complete record-class schemas, principle/test allocation, operational parameters, threat model, compatibility rules and producer/consumer adoption remain unfinished. Drafting may continue while the AOS-14 research pilot is verified; pilot completion is not a prerequisite for understanding the existing architecture. Findings from the pilot are provisional evidence inputs, not authority to change contracts.

## Baseline actually consulted

**Table row 1**
Source: AOS-00 System Architecture
Version / locator and standing: v0.6, 28 September; §§2-6, §9 and decision dispositions in §10; approved directions distinguished from proposed REQ wording

**Table row 2**
Source: Specification Map
Version / locator and standing: v0.3, 28 September; §§3-8 and drafting order §9

**Table row 3**
Source: AOS-QS
Version / locator and standing: v0.1; QS-01-28, especially interface completeness, no hidden defaults, evidence and readiness

**Table row 4**
Source: Component Specification Template
Version / locator and standing: v0.3, 3 October; requirements, contracts, verification, issues and handover sections

**Table row 5**
Source: Contract Model working draft
Version / locator and standing: 29 September; minimum semantic obligations and supplier/overdue-repair example

**Table row 6**
Source: Foundational Principles
Version / locator and standing: v4, all ten principle headings read from the supplied source

**Table row 7**
Source: Reasoning Principles
Version / locator and standing: v6, all nine domains and individual principle commitments read from the supplied source

**Table row 8**
Source: Governance Intelligence Tests
Version / locator and standing: M1.1-M1.14 and M2.1-M2.15; read as governance assessment criteria, not passed software tests

**Table row 9**
Source: FAR-001 reconciliation

Version / locator and standing: v0.1, 3 October; FAR-R-002 explanation default and §5 issue dispositions

**Table row 10**
Source: AOS-14 component draft
Version / locator and standing: v0.2, 30 September; §§5-6, §17 and state/outcome proposals

**Table row 11**
Source: Issues register / current to-do
Version / locator and standing: Includes 4 October research intake and operational pilot updates

No legal conclusion, vendor selection or new federation model is made here. Research source verification remains in the 4 October issues-register intake; the draft uses its questions without prescribing NIST or OpenA2A implementations.

## 2. Responsibility and trust boundaries

The allocation below follows DEC-005. It describes logical responsibilities, not mandatory applications, processes or products.

**Table row 1**
Specification: AOS-01
Owns in this tranche: Authority determination; permission/prohibition semantics; protected amendment and activation
Receives → produces: Action/context and approved instruments → allow/deny/unresolved and activation records
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Cannot infer new powers from an AI recommendation or an administrator's access

**Table row 2**
Specification: AOS-02
Owns in this tranche: Common record semantics; identifiers, versions, provenance, correction and governed exchange
Receives → produces: Authorised producer records → controlled records and lifecycle evidence
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Storage possession does not determine processing permission or source truth

**Table row 3**
Specification: AOS-03
Owns in this tranche: Identity/access assurance; permitted purpose, inference, consent and disclosure determinations
Receives → produces: Actor, subject, data, operation and purpose → data-use conditions and evidence
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Cannot make technical access a substitute for authority or settle welfare/consent conflicts by default

**Table row 4**
Specification: AOS-04
Owns in this tranche: Common agent task/lifecycle and executor behaviour
Receives → produces: Task scope, current controls and records → bounded execution attempts and outputs
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Cannot expand its delegation, adjudicate Mode 2 or silently self-calibrate authority

**Table row 5**
Specification: AOS-05
Owns in this tranche: Enforceable runtime boundary, health, interruption and recovery
Receives → produces: Approved controls and operational events → enforcement/health/recovery evidence
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Operators implement approved changes; administration does not confer governance authority

**Table row 6**
Specification: AOS-20
Owns in this tranche: GI charter and canonical governance-support analysis
Receives → produces: Controlled evidence and instruments → options, conflicts, uncertainty and reviewable propositions
Reserved or excluded responsibility: Interpretation/preparation does not approve action or resolve incommensurable values

**Table row 7**
Specification: AOS-30

Owns in this tranche: Human handoff, decision/debrief preparation, approval evidence and follow-up
Receives → produces: Escalations/analysis and permitted human post-meeting input → ownership, approved records and tracked dispositions
Reserved or excluded responsibility: No AI presence, observation or real-time capture of board deliberation

AOS-13 owns internal escalation lifecycle semantics; AOS-14 owns external exchange semantics; AOS-24 renders the canonical analysis; AOS-21 governs corpus/precedent admission; AOS-25 examines drift and aggregate effects; AOS-40 defines independent acceptance evidence. Their participation is necessary even though item 6 starts with the shared foundation.

Trust transitions are external source to ingress; producer to governed record; authorised data to permitted analysis; proposal to execution request; authority determination to enforcement; notification to accountable human ownership; draft debrief to approved record; and approved instrument to active policy. A state transition does not create organisational authority.

## Ownership model - direction approved 4 October

Mark approved retaining one shared definition per IF in the controlled contract catalogue. AOS-02 owns common record shapes and schema consistency. Each IF has one semantic owner accountable for its meaning and lifecycle; all producers and consumers participate in change-impact review. Semantic approval and permission to change an organisational governance instrument remain distinct.

This records approval of the ownership direction in AOS-00-DEC-002 (Mark, 4 October, “Yes i agree”). It does not approve all contract wording or resolve the operational change procedure. Map D02 concerns the resolved source hierarchy and is a different identifier; the two must not be conflated. Names of accountable organisational role-holders and the cross-component contract approval route remain to be supplied.

## DEC-099 - derived-information restriction rule

Every transformation or combination must preserve the applicable restrictions of its contributing sources. The proposed use of the resulting information must satisfy those restrictions and account for any additional sensitive information the combination reveals. If the system cannot establish the lineage or permitted use sufficiently, it must withhold that use and refer the uncertainty for accountable review.

Applies to summaries, aggregates, embeddings/search indexes, joins, exports and restored derived copies within the declared governed scope. Transformation supplies no wider purpose or permission; conflicting restrictions can prevent the proposed combination. A different treatment requires an evidenced authorised determination under the governing rules, never mere notice or developer discretion. Completed disclosures and unreachable external copies remain explicit limitations with accountable handling; no recall or universal forgetting guarantee is made. AOS-03 REQ-011/012 and the existing necessity, explicit-consent, separate-governance and review-cycle conditions are retained; no new personal-inference exception is created.

AOS-02 owns common lineage/restriction record meaning and the scoped transformation inventory; AOS-03 owns the independent operation/purpose-specific permitted-use assessment. Producers supply attributable source/transformation evidence; receiving components must establish the current permission for their intended use. An unresolved case retains its accountable review duty. Exact profile definitions, evidence sufficiency, source-combination rules, permitted transformations, destination inventory and enforceable withdrawal/recovery behaviour must be fixed and assessed before dependent implementation reliance. This decision adds no default policy, wire schema or automatic override.

## DEC-100 - independent minimum control-metadata access

The organisation shall authorise in advance a separate, tightly bounded permission for its checking services to read only the minimum control information necessary to assess a request. That permission must be verifiable independently of whether the requested business action is allowed. It grants no wider access to resident, employee or other operational information. If the

required permission or current control information cannot be verified, the affected action remains withheld and the uncertainty is referred for accountable handling.

The control profile identifies the checking service/identity, approving authority and instrument, organisation, permitted metadata records/fields and read operations, assessment purpose, validity/withdrawal/currentness evidence and accountable review route. A service does not obtain this permission from the business request, a model instruction or a favourable result issued by the other check. AOS-01 owns authority for the checking operation; AOS-03 owns permitted metadata use; AOS-02 preserves controlled records; AOS-05 enforces the declared access boundary. Startup and recovery must establish the advance permission/current state through an independently usable approved verification path; no unbounded bootstrap identity, data access or outage privilege is inferred. Separately permitted service/human fallback retains its own authority and duties. Exact profile, verification mechanism and compatibility/evidence are prerequisites before dependent reliance; this direction supplies no credentials, wire schema or live operating permission.

## DEC-102 - classification and configuration adequacy

Organisation-defined classifications and settings must demonstrate that they preserve AOS governing constraints before they can be relied upon. Accountable competent assessment is required before use and after material changes; authorisation alone does not establish adequacy. Missing or inadequate settings block the affected reliance and require owned resolution.

Classification considers actual effects on organisational commitments, protected information, rights, services, financial exposure and resource use, including cumulative effects; financial and resource consequences remain distinct. Settings cannot transfer permanently reserved human judgement to automation, remove mandatory reporting, manufacture data-use permission or bypass a prohibition. “Consequential” triggers the applicable controls; it does not automatically require individual human approval for every properly delegated routine action. Organisations retain responsibility for justified local values and legitimate powers. No universal threshold, duration, moral weight or permission is supplied by this decision.

The profile identifies its owner/approver and competent assessor, scope, governing constraints, chosen values/class definitions and reasons, financial/resource units and aggregation assumptions, normal/boundary/cumulative/adverse examples, assessment evidence/limitations, material-change triggers and action on missing or inadequate settings. An AI recommendation or approval record is insufficient by itself. Actual effect and applicable constraints govern assessment, not the label assigned to an operation. A smaller action cannot evade a bound by splitting related work; mandatory reporting and reserved judgement remain protected. AOS-01 owns the governing validation obligation with relevant domain/control owners; AOS-40 assesses scope-specific gate evidence; profile owners supply the actual configuration and review. Dependent effects remain withheld where required, while separately permitted service/reporting duties retain their own powers and owners.

## DEC-103 - separate decision, evidence, minutes and execution

AOS shall distinguish the validity and effective time of a human decision, the provenance/authentication and evidential standing of its record, the separate approval status of minutes, and current permission to execute an action. It shall assess decision validity and sufficient evidence under the organisation’s applicable law, legal form, constitution/registered rules, powers and approved evidence/reliance policy. It shall not universally require later minutes approval to bring a decision into existence, nor require a second board approval of a separate decision record where those applicable arrangements do not require it.

Minutes approval and authentication are evidence events, not universal substitutes for the actual decision process. An authenticated record or extract may support reliance through an authorised evidence route, but neither its signature nor its label can manufacture a decision, cure missing powers/conditions or make disputed evidence conclusive. Preserve actual decision, record, authentication/approval, effective and execution times separately; no automatic backdating. Contradictory, missing or insufficient evidence withholds affected automated reliance for accountable human resolution without declaring that an otherwise valid legal decision does not exist. Organisation-specific additional assurance gates may be adopted, but must be labelled as AOS/organisation reliance policy rather than general law. Separately authorised urgent/service duties remain owned. Minute-taker drafting and Company Secretary stewardship remain distinct; human decision powers, protected constitutional processes, boardroom AI exclusion, current authority/data-use checks and DEC-088/089 remain unchanged.

The approved organisation profile binds legal form/jurisdiction, actual constitution/registered rules and powers, valid decision/record/authentication routes, relevant statutory evidence standing, exact required source/validity conditions and competent evidence-assessment/escalation roles. AI cannot infer unseen deliberation or declare legal validity; record the authorised human assessment and limits. No compulsory extra decision-wording approval is invented. A stricter automated-reliance threshold is explicit policy. KX-06 v0.3 is a revised logical view; exact types, code lists, required/conditional fields and reviewed old/new consumer compatibility must be fixed before dependent use. DEC-087 original text is history to the extent superseded; role separation and protected powers remain.

## 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.

## DEC-105 - declared technical control limits and observed assurance

Operational reliance on implemented technical controls requires explicit scope, limits and failure/recovery behaviour supported by accepted observed evidence. The evidence must cover all enabled action paths within the declared control/threat scope, independently of the acting agent; permission-change enforcement points and timing uncertainty; shared cumulative bounds under concurrency; conservative treatment of unknown effects/reservations; and recovery that applies current restrictions without reviving withdrawn authority or repeating completed effects.

The approved control profile fixes exact functions/paths/dependencies/versions, threat assumptions, effect boundary, currentness and revocation/fencing mechanism, timing/uncertainty bounds and units, accounting scopes/consistency and admission, uncertain exposure/release evidence, recovery source/currentness/completeness, permitted fallback/continuing duty, observability/oracle, assessors and objective acceptance conditions. Timeout, cancellation, worker retirement or failover alone cannot prove no effect, release possibly used capacity or permit consequential repetition. No instantaneous global revocation or recall of an irreversible disclosure is promised. Limits are assessed under actual constraints and powers, not silently accepted as waivers of non-waivable safeguards. Missing/failed evidence blocks affected operational-reliance claims with an owned remedy; separately authorised service/reporting duties remain owned and do not acquire extra permissions.

G3 remains authorisation of a bounded build with fixed scope, explicit dependencies/profiles and required separate review; G4 requires implemented observations, and actual operational approval is separate. An explicitly authorised bounded prototype can investigate the mechanisms before operational assurance exists; this decision itself authorises neither a prototype nor live

effects. A failed prototype requires investigation of the implementation, assumptions and alternatives; it is not alone proof of architectural impossibility. Model refusal, a generated explanation, intended configuration, an old checkpoint or retrospective log alone is not evidence that all effect paths were enforced or recovery was current. Actual acceptance must link observations to the exact requirement/local-case/variant/profile and endpoint scope, with limitations and competent assessor disposition.

AOS-05 produces control-boundary/dependency observations and declares the implemented limits with authoritative semantic/control owners. AOS-40 evaluates scoped acceptance and preserves build, implementation-verification and operational approval distinctions. Approved profile/instrument owners determine legitimate settings; accountable human assessors disposition limitations without waiving non-waivable constraints.

## 3. Common semantic envelope

These are proposed logical fields, not an executable JSON schema or a chosen wire format. References must resolve under the recipient's authorised access. A reference is not permission to fetch its target. Personal data and secrets must not be copied into the envelope merely to make logs convenient.

**Table row 1**
Field or group: Record identity and version
Proposed meaning and validation: Stable logical record identity plus immutable revision identity; a correction identifies the earlier revision
Further definition / owner: AOS-02: runtime identifier format and revision rules

**Table row 2**
Field or group: Contract identity and revision
Proposed meaning and validation: Exact IF and semantic version applied; both ends declare a compatible interpretation
Further definition / owner: AOS-02 with semantic owner: compatibility matrix; no automatic major-version assumption

**Table row 3**
Field or group: Organisation/instance scope
Proposed meaning and validation: Identifies the separate organisational context; joining records cannot import another organisation's authority
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/03/05: isolation and cross-instance rejection criteria

**Table row 4**
Field or group: Producer and acting identity
Proposed meaning and validation: Human/service/agent identity, role at the time and verified evidence references
Further definition / owner: AOS-03/04: verification assurance and role succession

**Table row 5**
Field or group: Subject and payload
Proposed meaning and validation: Typed subject reference, record class, payload or governed payload reference; observations distinct from inferences, proposals, decisions and outcomes
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/domain owner: type, cardinality, units, ranges and redaction

**Table row 6**
Field or group: Purpose and processing basis
Proposed meaning and validation: Declared purpose; permitted operations/inferences; consent or other approved basis where applicable; restrictions travel with derived data
Further definition / owner: AOS-03: purpose relationships, basis validity and lawful conflict handling

**Table row 7**
Field or group: Time
Proposed meaning and validation: Separate event/observation time, receipt time and effective time; date-only values remain date-only; timezone/precision/clock uncertainty explicit where relevant
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/05: clock tolerance and sequence rules; no invented midnight cutoff

**Table row 8**

Field or group: Source and provenance
Proposed meaning and validation: Origin system, source revision, transformation references, source-authority assessment and relevant limitations
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/21/domain owner: authoritative-source register and provenance assurance

**Table row 9**
Field or group: Authority context
Proposed meaning and validation: Action/request, applicable instrument versions, delegation/decision references, current conditions and accountable human role
Further definition / owner: AOS-01/03: action binding and authoritative decision vocabulary

**Table row 10**
Field or group: Correlation and causation
Proposed meaning and validation: Connects a case, request, attempt and outcome without treating every retry as a new legitimate action
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/04/13: identity and duplicate reconciliation rules

**Table row 11**
Field or group: Quality and uncertainty
Proposed meaning and validation: Missing/conflicting/stale evidence, observed quality and validated confidence meaning; absent confidence is not zero or certainty
Further definition / owner: AOS-04/22/23: quality rubric and acceptance thresholds

**Table row 12**
Field or group: Lifecycle and obligations
Proposed meaning and validation: Status, permitted transitions, acknowledgement class, owner/deadline, exchange conditions and unresolved outcome
Further definition / owner: Relevant semantic owner: required statuses and fulfilment evidence

**Table row 13**
Field or group: Retention and disclosure
Proposed meaning and validation: Record-class policy reference, access restrictions, correction/deletion rules and permitted audit projection
Further definition / owner: AOS-02/03: reconcile reconstruction with minimisation and deletion

Unknown, unavailable, not applicable and intentionally withheld are separate meanings. A required but unknown value does not become valid by using a placeholder. Each final contract must specify required/optional/conditional cardinalities and the result when a value is missing. A future encoding must make absence and invalidity machine distinguishable.

## Shared delivery and recovery rules proposed for review

- Separate transport acceptance, semantic acceptance, human ownership and confirmed outcome. A delivery receipt cannot satisfy all four.
- Validate purpose and authority at the receiving/processing/execution boundary, not only at ingestion. Data admitted for one use may be prohibited for another.
- Do not assume exactly-once delivery, a global total order or atomic external effect. Each contract defines its own ordering scope and duplicate identity. Unsupported semantics are visible failures.
- A retry represents another attempt at the same request unless an authorised new request is created. It does not refresh permission, erase prior evidence or establish that the earlier attempt failed.
- If actual effect is unknown, reconcile it before a potentially consequential repeat. Follow-up, cancellation and compensation each need their own authority; the system cannot promise to undo an external effect.
- On revocation, context change, consent withdrawal or restart, re-evaluate affected pending work before dependent processing/execution. Define the precise enforcement boundary and race semantics before build; do not imply instantaneous global revocation.
- Unavailable authority/data-use controls withhold dependent action under DEC-003. A separately authorised escalation or safety fallback may remain possible. Outage does not erase human responsibility.

- Default constraint explanations identify meaning, authority basis and escalation route. Security/privacy/feasibility exceptions require a recorded reason and review under FAR-R-002; an explanation exception never waives enforcement.

Numerical expiry, retry, acknowledgement, escalation and recovery intervals remain unresolved in §8. They are not implementation defaults.

# 4. Seven original shared contract records

All seven records have proposed revision 0.1 in this dossier, not an approved release version. Their owning component specifications must eventually reference the controlled definition rather than restate it. The common envelope and §3 rules apply to each record; contract-specific dependencies below remain binding drafting gaps.

## 4.1 AOS-02-IF-001 - Evidence exchange

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-02, with domain source stewardship. Producer → consumer: approved source/domain or human input → authorised domains, GI and governance workflows. Purpose: preserve evidence, provenance, authorised use and correction across component boundaries.

Inputs/outputs: an evidence submission identifies its subject, record class, source/version, observation time, collection purpose, provenance, quality limitations and payload reference. The receiving result distinguishes accepted, accepted-with-restrictions, rejected and unresolved; acceptance records the governed evidence revision and applicable restrictions. A quarantined external input is not an accepted operational fact.

Preconditions/permissions: producer identity and submission right established; consumer processing purpose separately permitted; source-authority status explicit. Observation admission does not establish its truth. A model interpretation cites its input evidence and remains labelled inference.

Lifecycle: submitted → validated/rejected/unresolved → available within permissions → corrected/superseded or retained/deleted under the applicable policy. A correction preserves lineage; its effect on prior analyses and pending actions is assessed rather than retroactively rewriting history. Delivery: acknowledgement means semantic acceptance of a specified revision. Duplicate source event/revision cannot silently overwrite a different payload. Late/out-of-order evidence is labelled and assessed against the relevant subject history, not simply treated as newest truth.

Failure/revocation: invalid scope, unverifiable source or missing required semantics prevents admission for the dependent purpose. Withdrawal of consent affects uses dependent on that basis; it does not silently cancel a separately approved retention duty or authorise continued use. Conflicts go to the named source/data steward through an authorised route. Open: final schemas, authoritative record register, deletion evidence, correction notifications and conflict handling, P02/P04/P05/P08. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R01/R02/R03; SC-V01/V02/V06.

## 4.2 AOS-01-IF-001 - Authority determination

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-01. Producer → consumer: authorised control function, evaluating requester/context → executor and relevant routing/exchange controls. Purpose: decide whether a precisely identified requested action is currently permitted within approved instruments.

Inputs: request identity/revision; actor and human principal where applicable; action type/target and material parameters; domain/context/conditions; organisation scope; purpose; relevant data-use determination; policy/delegation versions; required human decision evidence. Output: allow, deny or unresolved, with action binding, checked versions, conditions, reason, validity and determination evidence. Control unavailability is a distinct operational result, not allow. An allow with conditions requires every applicable condition to be satisfied; it is not a fourth permissive category that avoids checking.

Preconditions: organisation-approved consequential-action classification and validated schedule configuration; no core waiver; legitimate data use established where needed. Technical credentials and GI recommendations cannot substitute for delegation.

Lifecycle: requested → evaluated → determined → consumed/expired/invalidated. Consumption is evidence of use, not proof of effect. Before execution, the executor checks the relevant validity/context/revocation boundary. Exact freshness, atomicity and change races remain P03; no indefinite cache licence exists.

Failure/revocation: deny, unresolved, unavailable, expired, revoked or mismatched action binding withholds dependent execution. A changed target/amount/purpose is not covered by a determination for the original request. Refer uncertainty through a separately authorised internal route. Replays/retries do not broaden the grant. Open: actor assurance P04, race/validity P03, classification/configuration P07, failure fallback P06/P09, explanation exceptions P10. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R04/R05/R06/R15; SC-V03/V04/V09/V10.

## 4.3 AOS-13-IF-001 - Escalation lifecycle

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-13; human decision/ownership records use AOS-30. Producer → consumer: authorised detecting domain or GI → routing/workflow service, accountable human role and oversight. Purpose: get a finding to the authorised audience and keep responsibility visible until disposition and required follow-up.

Inputs: case/trigger identity, evidence, classification/uncertainty, internal routing delegation, required audience, responsible role, receipt/response windows and cover policy. Outputs: routing result, delivery evidence, explicit human acknowledgement/ownership, deadline events, decision/disposition and linked outcome/follow-up.

Proposed lifecycle: created → routed → delivered → human-owned → disposition recorded → follow-up pending → closed. Unacknowledged, overdue, recipient unavailable and routing failed are explicit exceptions. Delivery alone does not transfer accountable ownership; the sending workflow retains tracking responsibility until the approved ownership-transfer condition is evidenced. Exact institutional allocation remains P06 rather than being assigned to an unnamed person by software.

Closure: identify who may close, the disposition, remaining obligations, evidence and any authorised termination with an unresolved result. Closed must not mean repaired, safe or successful unless the applicable outcome evidence supports that meaning. A linked action can remain open after an initial decision.

Failure/retries: correlate repeated signals without suppressing materially changed evidence. Expired deadlines activate approved cover/escalation rules, not guessed recipients. Mandatory-audience findings cannot be silently removed by an operational suppression instruction; protected routing and assurance require definition. Internal escalation is distinct from external contact and each requires its own delegation. Open: P06/P09, duplicate/materiality rules P02, protected audience mechanism P12. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R07/R08/R09; SC-V05/V08/V11.

## 4.4 AOS-20-IF-001 - Canonical analysis

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-20; AOS-24 owns rendering fidelity, not an independent conclusion. Producer → consumer: AOS-21-23/25 under the GI charter → AOS-24, authorised executives/humans and AOS-30. Purpose: preserve one identified analysis revision, its evidence and review status across presentations.

Inputs/outputs: analysis identity/revision, purpose/telos and governance-source references, state/evidence snapshot, assumptions, options including the infeasible/unacceptable option when material, consequences/trade-offs, uncertainty, excluded coverage, dissent/conflict and requested human question. Outputs include canonical analysis plus review/disclosure status. Model/provider and evaluation references identify relevant limitations without requiring private model reasoning.

Proposed lifecycle: draft → submitted for the specified review → reviewed/returned → superseded or withdrawn. Review status identifies reviewer, scope and exact revision; reviewed is not approved action. Missing executive validation must remain visible where the approved workflow requires it. Model-generated confidence is not validated calibration.

Delivery/failure: renderings identify the same canonical revision and review state. Audience-specific redaction/translation preserves material substance and limitations within authorised disclosure; a translation cannot silently become a new canonical conclusion. Evidence correction or policy change flags affected analyses for reassessment under P02/P11; an old result is not automatically current. Conflict between incommensurable values goes to Mode 2, with unresolved judgement explicit. Open: GI charter roles, review status and evaluation P07/P11; disclosure P05; stale analysis P02. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R10/R11; SC-V02/V07/V11.

## 4.5 AOS-30-IF-001 - Human decision/debrief

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-30; approved corpus admission belongs to AOS-21 within its custodian's delegation. Producer → consumer: authorised human via permitted post-meeting process → AOS-02/20/21/22/23/24/25 where purpose-permitted and relied on, and authorised executors through separate action controls. Purpose: make a human decision and its consequences reconstructable without observing deliberation.

Inputs/outputs: human-provided post-meeting account; actual decision-making body/role and acting persons; decision and scope; evidence/analysis references; approved rationale, rejected options and reasons; conditions, dissent/limitations where authorised; effective time and follow-up owner/date. Emotional register and revealed preferences remain part of the RP domain 4 source obligation; AOS-30 v0.2 §6.2/§17.1 DEC-088 approves contextual human-provided/confirmed capture with purpose/access/lifecycle controls, with exact policy settings open under D04/P05/P11. No AI may infer them from boardroom observation. Output is a draft or human-approved decision record with exact revision and approval evidence, not an AI-authored grant of power.

Proposed lifecycle (DEC-103): human-evidenced decision under actual powers → attributed record with separate drafting/stewardship/authentication → evidence adequacy assessed for the intended reliance; minutes approval tracked separately under the applicable rules → permitted reliance / owned insufficient-or-disputed status → controlled correction/supersession. Actual instrument-required approvals remain required; no universal second board approval or later minutes gate. The record cannot manufacture a decision or confer powers.

Failure/correction (DEC-103): incomplete/disputed evidence cannot support dependent automated reliance; preserve the exact record, uncertainty and accountable review. Record approval/authentication is not legal validity and does not reverse actual effects. Current human-view semantics are AOS-30 v0.7 §6.2 / KX-06 v0.3. Minute-taker/stewardship separation and DEC-088/089 remain; DEC-087 is superseded only as to universal minutes approval/decision creation and blanket exclusion of authenticated evidence routes. Exact legal-form/instrument/evidence policy, profile, wire definitions and compatibility remain prerequisites. SC-R12/R13 and SC-V08/V09/V11 retain their identities.

## 4.6 AOS-01-IF-002 - Policy amendment and activation

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-01; AOS-30 supplies human process evidence; AOS-05 implements activation within authorised controls. Producer → consumer: authorised governance workflow → enforcement functions, agents and corpus custodian. Purpose: distinguish proposed, approved and actually active authority, and preserve protected amendment routes.

Inputs/outputs: instrument/change type, exact proposed content/revision and prior baseline; proposer and required approval/review records; effective-time conditions; organisational context; affected contracts/agents/work; activation request and per-dependent activation status. Approval does not itself prove runtime activation. Technical rollback cannot silently restore authority withdrawn or suspended by governance action.

Distinct routes: telos amendment requires the board acting as a body and cannot be delegated (DEC-024). Schedule amendment requires executive proposal, AI/Governance/Ethics Committee review and board sign-off (DEC-025). Temporary suspension requires a schedule-authorised person/role; it reduces permission. Reinstatement uses the schedule's approved process. Routine corpus correction and provider replacement do not bypass these routes; their own approvals are required.

Proposed lifecycle: proposed → reviewed → approved/rejected → activation pending → active/activation incomplete → superseded/withdrawn. Suspension has a linked effective restriction and reinstatement record; it is not deletion of the policy or an

implicit schedule amendment. Exact distribution barrier, mixed-version handling and interruption semantics remain P03. An affected capability cannot claim the new authority is active merely because one component acknowledged it.

Failure/retries: correlate duplicate activation requests; detect stale version and conflicting amendment/suspension. Preserve restrictive state pending authoritative reconciliation. Do not infer a dual-key approval mechanism or appoint suspender/reinstater roles. Open: P03/P07/P09/P12, successor approval/version evidence and rollback safety. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R14/R15; SC-V04/V09/V10.

## 4.7 AOS-14-IF-001 - External exchange

Semantic owner: proposed AOS-14, subject to AOS-01/03/04/05 controls and AOS-02 shared records. Producer → consumer: internal requester or external source → controlled ingress/egress and authorised recipient. Purpose: establish who exchanges what, for what purpose, under which authority/obligations and with which known result.

Inputs: external party/source/destination, direction, operation/payload, purpose, internal requester, authority/data-use determinations, counterparty evidence and declared obligations. Assess actor-to-principal binding, mandate/scope, model/deployment provenance where relevant, delegation lineage, policy context, revocation currency and common claim semantics for the proposed exchange. The required profile is risk/purpose dependent and remains P04, rather than demanding all metadata from every public-source retrieval.

Outputs: admissibility/disclosure determination, conditions, identity/provenance limitations, exchange attempt evidence, transport/semantic acknowledgement, actual-effect evidence where required and obligation records. Admission does not establish truth, and a counterparty's claimed mandate is not automatically the organisation's verified authority determination.

Proposed lifecycle: proposed → assessed → authorised/constrained/denied/unresolved → pending → dispatched → outcome pending → confirmed/failed/partial/indeterminate → closed under a defined closure rule. Quarantine is a restricted evidence state; escalation does not authorise release. The existing AOS-14-CON-001-004 may decompose request, determination, evidence and obligation views of this IF; they must not become conflicting schemas. AOS-14 v0.6 §§6.1-6.2 now incorporates the logical mapping; exact compatible wire schemas/profiles remain jointly approved build dependencies.

Failure/revocation/retries: missing, stale, unverifiable or semantically misunderstood required claims prevent treating the exchange as authorised. Unknown external effect remains indeterminate. An authorised reconciliation query may establish effect before any retry; no global guarantee of exactly-once effect is implied. Re-evaluate pending exchange after applicable revocation or purpose change. Obligation fulfilment remains visible after dispatch. Open: actual-effect/closure profile P02/P04, external boundary P12, obligations P08, connector rules P09. AOS-14 CAP-007's broad federation wording is qualified by OQ-012's deferral; no federated identity system is adopted here. Draft obligations/cases: SC-R05/R06/R16/R17/R18; SC-V03/V04/V06/V10/V12.

# 5. Companion shared-control records - current allocation

The seven original IFs are retained. The Kernel Exchange Register v0.1 now allocates proposed AOS-03-IF-001 / REC-D and AOS-04-IF-001 / REC-X and defines all 33 kernel CON views through common logical shapes. REC-Q carries fact assurance. The table below preserves the earlier drafting subjects; current definitions are Core v0.2 and the register. No identifier allocation approves exact field wording.

**Table row 1**
Supporting record: Data-use determination
Proposed owner and minimum semantics: AOS-03: actor, subject/data scope, operation/inference, purpose/basis, disclosure, consent/basis version, conditions and invalidation reason
Links / unresolved detail: Evidence, authority, analysis and external exchange; P04/P05/P08

**Table row 2**
Supporting record: Agent task and lifecycle

Proposed owner and minimum semantics: AOS-04: instance/role, task identity and scope, model/tool/configuration versions, delegation reference, permitted state transitions, suspension, retirement and in-flight work
Links / unresolved detail: Authority and policy activation; P03/P07/P09/P11

**Table row 3**
Supporting record: Execution attempt/result
Proposed owner and minimum semantics: AOS-04 with AOS-05 runtime evidence: exact request, authority/data-use determinations, attempt identity, checkpoint, actual effect and reconciliation state
Links / unresolved detail: Evidence, escalation and external exchange; P02/P03/P09

**Table row 4**
Supporting record: Constraint explanation/exception
Proposed owner and minimum semantics: AOS-01/03/04/05: meaning, authority basis, escalation route; exception reason, reviewer/authority, disclosure scope and version
Links / unresolved detail: FAR-R-002; P10; enforcement remains mandatory

Logical supporting shapes and kernel adoption now appear in the register v0.1. Exact transport schemas and commissioned profiles/roles, current-control/recovery mechanisms and non-kernel adoption remain build dependencies. Proposed identifiers identify families; they do not promote requirement or readiness status.

## 6. Draft obligation register

The following SC-Rxx identifiers are stable within this dossier. They are proposed interface/component obligations awaiting allocation into controlled component REQ records; they do not reuse an existing REQ number. Parent REQs below are AOS-00 v0.6 proposed wording; DEC references are approved directions where recorded. Once allocated, retain SC references as derivation links rather than silently renumbering history.

Shared record metadata: origin 0.1, 4 October 2026; status proposed; release scope whole-suite logical contract drafting, with no authorised implementation slice. Owner means responsible specification, whose accountable role appointment remains open. Project baseline approval is Mark's; applicable organisational authority must separately approve operational instruments. Each row names its category, source/derivation, dependencies and planned objective verification. No row is approved or executed.

**Table row 1**
ID: SC-R01
Proposed single obligation: A shared-contract record shall identify the exact contract revision under which its producer created it.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/versioning; REQ-021 and QS-12/21; prevent incompatible silent interpretation
Owner; dependencies: 02; P01/P02
Planned verification: SC-V01: both ends identify the same approved-compatible meaning

**Table row 2**
ID: SC-R02
Proposed single obligation: An admitted evidence revision shall retain a resolvable provenance link to its source revision under the authorised access policy.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/data; REQ-012/036; preserve source authority
Owner; dependencies: 02; P02/P08
Planned verification: SC-V02: reconstruct source and distinguish correction

**Table row 3**
ID: SC-R03
Proposed single obligation: A receiving component shall withhold processing for a purpose not permitted by the current data-use determination.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/privacy; REQ-004 and RP domain 9, purpose limitation; avoid permission inheritance
Owner; dependencies: 03/receiving component; P04/P05
Planned verification: SC-V06: new purpose is blocked; approved original use separately tested

**Table row 4**

ID: SC-R04
Proposed single obligation: An executor shall execute only the action revision and context covered by its current authority determination.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/authority; REQ-006; prevent action substitution
Owner; dependencies: 01/04; P03/P07
Planned verification: SC-V03: changed target/context cannot use original allow

**Table row 5**

ID: SC-R05
Proposed single obligation: An executor shall withhold dependent execution when its authority determination is denied, unresolved or unavailable.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/authority; DEC-003/REQ-007; conservative dependent behaviour
Owner; dependencies: 01/04/05; P03/P09
Planned verification: SC-V03: all three outcomes withhold action

**Table row 6**

ID: SC-R06
Proposed single obligation: Following invalidation of an applicable determination, an executor shall obtain a valid determination before resuming dependent pending work.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/revocation; REQ-006/040 and §6 authority-boundary derivation; no stale restart
Owner; dependencies: 01/03/04/05; P03
Planned verification: SC-V04: defined invalidation boundary and stale recovery tested

**Table row 7**

ID: SC-R07
Proposed single obligation: An escalation workflow shall record separately the evidence of message delivery and the evidence of accountable human ownership.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/accountability; REQ-010 and QS-14; delivery is not ownership
Owner; dependencies: 13/30; P06
Planned verification: SC-V05: delivery-only case remains unowned/open

**Table row 8**

ID: SC-R08
Proposed single obligation: An escalation workflow shall close a case only when its approved closure conditions are evidenced.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/closure; REQ-010, RP domain 1 feedback; avoid false completion
Owner; dependencies: 13/30; P06/P08
Planned verification: SC-V05: absent disposition/outcome requirements prevent closure

**Table row 9**

ID: SC-R09
Proposed single obligation: A routing control shall reject a suppression instruction that conflicts with a required-audience finding's approved delivery obligation.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/protected routing; RP domain 8, “Certain classes of finding…”; mechanism derived, classes unresolved
Owner; dependencies: 01/05/13; P06/P12
Planned verification: SC-V11: suppressing instruction cannot remove required route

**Table row 10**

ID: SC-R10
Proposed single obligation: A presentation shall identify the exact canonical analysis revision and review status it renders.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/presentation; REQ-013; fidelity and review visibility
Owner; dependencies: 20/24; P02/P11
Planned verification: SC-V07: audience outputs match canonical revision/status

**Table row 11**

ID: SC-R11
Proposed single obligation: An analytical output shall identify evidence limitations material to the conclusion it presents.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/uncertainty; REQ-014, FP6 and RP domain 7; prevent false confidence

Owner; dependencies: 04/20-24; P11
Planned verification: SC-V07: seeded missing/conflicting evidence remains visible

**Table row 12**
ID: SC-R12
Proposed single obligation: A human decision record shall preserve decision validity/effective scope, attributable evidence/authentication, separate minutes-approval status and execution permission under the applicable organisation arrangements; absent sufficient evidence shall withhold affected automated reliance without imposing a universal later minutes approval or second decision-record approval gate (DEC-103).
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/governance; DEC-008/087/REQ-024; no draft activation
Owner; dependencies: 01/30; P05/P07
Planned verification: SC-V08: sufficient evidence assessed independently of minutes; signature alone cannot create decision authority

**Table row 13**
ID: SC-R13
Proposed single obligation: AOS-30 shall reject real-time boardroom capture as an input to the human decision/debrief contract.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/prohibition; REQ-008, RP domain 2 boardroom principle; preserve deliberative boundary
Owner; dependencies: 30; P05/P11
Planned verification: SC-V08: real-time AI capture path rejected

**Table row 14**
ID: SC-R14
Proposed single obligation: The policy activation mechanism shall activate an amendment only when the required approval route for its change type is evidenced.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/constitutional control; DEC-024/025, REQ-045/046; protected change
Owner; dependencies: 01/05/30; P03/P07
Planned verification: SC-V09: telos and schedule bypass cases rejected

**Table row 15**
ID: SC-R15
Proposed single obligation: A reinstatement mechanism shall restore suspended delegation only through the reinstatement process approved in the operational schedule.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/authority; DEC-025/REQ-048; no administrator restoration
Owner; dependencies: 01/04/05; P03/P07
Planned verification: SC-V09/V10: restart/rollback cannot bypass reinstatement

**Table row 16**
ID: SC-R16
Proposed single obligation: An external-exchange executor shall withhold an exchange when required external trust evidence cannot be verified under its approved exchange profile.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/external trust; REQ-011/040; provisional research-derived clarification
Owner; dependencies: 14 with 01/03; P04/P12
Planned verification: SC-V12: missing/stale/ununderstood required claim blocks exchange

**Table row 17**
ID: SC-R17
Proposed single obligation: An outcome record shall distinguish confirmed external effect from indeterminate effect.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/outcome; REQ-012, QS-14/19 and AOS-14 ISS-005 clarification; prevent false success
Owner; dependencies: 02/14; P02/P04
Planned verification: SC-V12: dispatch without effect evidence remains indeterminate

**Table row 18**
ID: SC-R18
Proposed single obligation: A consequential retry shall require the prior attempt's possible effect to be reconciled under the approved action profile before re-execution.
Level/category; source and rationale: Component/recovery; AOS-00 §8 and QS-14 engineering derivation; avoid duplicate consequence
Owner; dependencies: 04/05/13/14; P02/P09

Planned verification: SC-V10: unknown prior effect prevents blind repeat

**Table row 19**
ID: SC-R19
Proposed single obligation: A constraint response shall supply its meaning, authority basis and escalation route unless a recorded, reviewed security/privacy/feasibility exception applies.
Level/category; source and rationale: Interface/explanation; FAR-R-002; legible control without disclosure waiver
Owner; dependencies: 01/03/04/05; P10
Planned verification: SC-V12: default explanation and reviewed exception both inspected

Source assessment limits: the dossier develops FP1-8/10 through purpose, human judgement, structural boundaries, transparency, uncertainty, resident accountability and adaptation. FP9 remains the purpose-first assessment of the eventual design; this draft does not verify regulatory compliance. All RP domains affect the wider contracts, but detailed individual source disposition is unfinished. Important residuals include Mode 2 defence review, no-exit sensing, developer-constitution assessment, ethical conflict handling, cumulative drift, emotional register and revealed-preference capture, and Golden Thread duties. They remain with the responsible components rather than being declared satisfied by an envelope.

GT M1.2/7/8/10/11/13 and M2.3/4/8/9/12/13/15 inform this tranche's evidence and human boundaries. Other GT tests are not asserted irrelevant: their source-to-component allocation belongs in the detailed specifications/AOS-40. No organisational GT pass follows from SC-V software cases.

## 7. Planned verification and overdue-repair walkthrough

All SC-Vxx cases are planned, unexecuted. The assessor is the relevant AOS-40-appointed technical/governance reviewer; appointments and qualification criteria are unresolved. Human judgement quality requires separate assessment. Test evidence will identify tested component/contract/instrument versions, fixture and date, expected versus observed result, assessor and retained records.

**Table row 1**
Case / requirements: SC-V01 / R01
Method; fixture and procedure: Inspection and integration test; two producers/consumers declare compatible and incompatible contract revisions; submit each
Objective expected result / evidence: Compatible meaning is explicitly selected; unsupported revision produces defined rejection/unresolved response, never silent acceptance; retain declared revisions and validation result

**Table row 2**
Case / requirements: SC-V02 / R02
Method; fixture and procedure: Test; admit original repair date and completion evidence, then corrected and contradictory revisions in reversed arrival order
Objective expected result / evidence: Source and correction lineage reconstructable; arrival order cannot alone establish source truth; affected analysis/action review status visible; retain history and impact record

**Table row 3**
Case / requirements: SC-V03 / R04/05
Method; fixture and procedure: Test; allowed action, same grant with changed target/context, then deny/unresolved/unavailable determination
Objective expected result / evidence: Only precisely permitted action can execute; all invalid requests withheld; separately permitted fallback assessed independently; retain request/control/executor traces

**Table row 4**
Case / requirements: SC-V04 / R06
Method; fixture and procedure: Test/analysis; queued action, authority/consent invalidation, policy delivery delay and restart at each proposed checkpoint
Objective expected result / evidence: Under the approved race boundary, stale authority cannot resume dependent work; unknown state remains withheld/reconciled; retain timing/version traces and threat assumptions; blocked until P03 resolved

**Table row 5**

Case / requirements: SC-V05 / R07/08
Method; fixture and procedure: Test; overdue repair, unavailable owner, delivery without human acknowledgement, elapsed response window, then permitted cover and disposition
Objective expected result / evidence: Case remains open without ownership/closure evidence; approved cover route operates; owner/team contact and outcome tracked; retain acknowledgements, deadlines and closure evidence; P06 timings required

**Table row 6**

Case / requirements: SC-V06 / R03
Method; fixture and procedure: Test; evidence permitted for repair support submitted for behavioural or workforce inference; withdraw basis for a separately consented use
Objective expected result / evidence: Unauthorised inference and consent-dependent continuation blocked; other independently authorised use assessed separately; retain data-use basis and disclosure evidence

**Table row 7**

Case / requirements: SC-V07 / R10/11
Method; fixture and procedure: Inspection/test; two audiences render same analysis containing missing evidence, a material conflict and pending review
Objective expected result / evidence: Same canonical revision/status and material limitations; authorised redactions visible without distorted conclusion; retain canonical-to-render comparison and reviewer rubric

**Table row 8**

Case / requirements: SC-V08 / R12/13
Method; fixture and procedure: Test/inspection; permitted human input; valid decision with pending minutes and sufficient authenticated evidence; unsupported signature, contradicted signed record, wrong powers, changed revision and real-time AI capture request
Objective expected result / evidence: Separate decision validity/effective time, evidence/authentication, minutes approval and permission to execute. Actual instruments/evidence policy govern; sufficient evidence can support reliance before minutes approval without universal second approval. Insufficient/disputed evidence withholds affected reliance; no signature creates authority. Prohibited live capture rejected; retain exact attribution, assessment and history. Planned, not executed.

**Table row 9**

Case / requirements: SC-V09 / R14/15
Method; fixture and procedure: Test; board-only telos amendment; schedule change missing executive/Committee/board stages; authorised suspension and unauthorised reinstatement
Objective expected result / evidence: No bypass activates; valid route records approval separately from actual activation; suspension restricts and reinstatement follows approved schedule; retain policy/version/decision evidence

**Table row 10**

Case / requirements: SC-V10 / R15/18
Method; fixture and procedure: Test/analysis; uncertain external dispatch, restart, retry and rollback to pre-suspension policy
Objective expected result / evidence: No blind repeat or stale restoration; authorised reconciliation records actual/indeterminate outcome and restrictive state; retain attempts, recovery and revocation evidence

**Table row 11**

Case / requirements: SC-V11 / R09
Method; fixture and procedure: Adversarial test and governance inspection; GI surfaces incommensurable conflict or required-audience finding; operational actor requests suppression
Objective expected result / evidence: Human Mode 2 remains required; protected finding is routed under approved policy; unresolved human question not silently decided; retain attempted suppression and disposition

**Table row 12**

Case / requirements: SC-V12 / R16/17/19
Method; fixture and procedure: Test/inspection; external agent with verified principal/mandate, stale revocation evidence, unknown claim semantics, unknown effect and disclosure-sensitive constraint
Objective expected result / evidence: Required trust profile enforced; indeterminate effect not success; default explanation or reviewed exception evidenced; retain source/profile/control/attempt/exception records

## Bounded overdue-repair trace - conceptual, not execution evidence

1. A source provides the completion date communicated to the resident and its communication evidence, plus subsequent completion/date-change events, via Evidence exchange. An internal target date cannot silently replace that promise (DEC-022).
2. Process Intelligence compares incomplete status against the communicated date using approved date/time semantics. Missing/conflicting dates produce an exception for authorised review; no arbitrary end-of-day cutoff or grace period is inserted.
3. Authority and data-use controls validate the internal escalation and resident notification as separately defined actions. Internal routing permission cannot authorise external commitment or general profiling.
4. Escalation records delivery, human ownership and the approved response/cover route. A resident receives the named case owner's and accountable repairs team's contact details through the approved channel (DEC-023/026); delivery evidence and unavailable-contact exceptions remain visible.
5. GI may prepare analysis if conflict or uncertainty requires it; the human resolves reserved questions. The approved decision is recorded through Human decision/debrief, with follow-up and actual completion/outcome evidence.
6. Closure applies the approved case criteria. Message sent, owner assigned, repair completed, resident informed and obligations discharged remain distinguishable events. An unresolved termination records its authority and reason; it cannot be presented as successful repair.

This walkthrough exercises meaning and dependencies only. It does not select housing suppliers, live channels, resident data, jurisdictional obligations, response windows or deployment technology.

# 8. Decision and parameter register

P identifiers are stable dossier questions, not new approved decisions. P01 ownership and the later recorded general directions govern. Remaining P01-P12 commissioned values, exact schemas, organisational appointments and execution evidence stay owned/gated; older proposal questions are interpreted through the subsequent approved decisions and supplements, not reopened by this review. Proposed owners identify who must develop the answer; Mark approves project architecture, while commissioning organisational bodies approve their actual instruments. A role vacancy is not a licence for the builder to decide.

**Table row 1**
ID: P01
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Ownership direction approved under DEC-002 on 4 October: one shared definition per IF, AOS-02 common shapes, one semantic owner. Still define change-impact review and appoint roles
Proposed owner / gate: Mark for DEC-002 direction; component owners for procedure; before contract baseline approval
Affected contracts/requirements: All IFs; R01 and later consumer adoption

**Table row 2**
ID: P02
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Record types, keys, units, timestamp/date semantics, valid/invalid values, ordering scopes, duplicate identities, correction notifications and stale-analysis handling
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-02 with domains; before dependent build
Affected contracts/requirements: All IFs; R01/02/10/17/18

**Table row 3**
ID: P03
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Action binding, grant validity, revocation/suspension propagation, enforceable execution checkpoint, mixed-version barrier, in-flight effects and restart races
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-01/03/04/05 with security/governance review; before action build
Affected contracts/requirements: Authority/policy/agent/execution; R04-06/14/15

**Table row 4**
ID: P04
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Identity/principal assurance, delegated lineage and external trust profiles; acceptable age of revocation evidence; common claim semantics; excessive-disclosure limits

Proposed owner / gate: AOS-03/14 with 01/02; before dependent exchange build
Affected contracts/requirements: Evidence/authority/external exchange; R03/16/17

**Table row 5**
ID: P05
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Permitted purpose/inference; consent withdrawal; welfare/consent conflict governance; resident/workforce boundaries; post-meeting capture/disclosure
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-03/11/12/30 with residents/workforce and appropriate governance authority; before dependent processing
Affected contracts/requirements: Evidence/analysis/debrief/exchange; R03/11-13

**Table row 6**
ID: P06
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Human accountability transfer, delivery/acknowledgement/response deadlines, named cover, contact validity, no-response path and closure policy
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-13/30 with operational owners; before workflow build
Affected contracts/requirements: Escalation/debrief; R07-09

**Table row 7**
ID: P07
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Actual approved schedule/consequential classification; GI charter and review route; telos/schedule approval evidence; suspend/reinstate roles
Proposed owner / gate: Organisational board/governance authority; AOS-01/20/30 specify validation; before affected build/activation as applicable
Affected contracts/requirements: Authority/analysis/debrief/policy; R04/12/14/15

**Table row 8**
ID: P08
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Record-class retention/deletion, privacy projection, external obligation owner and fulfilment evidence; lawful basis and disclosure verified
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-02/03/14 with professional owners; before dependent build
Affected contracts/requirements: Evidence/escalation/debrief/exchange; R02/08/17

**Table row 9**
ID: P09
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Retry limits/backoff, reconciliation permissions, interruption/rollback, manual fallback, availability/recovery limits and operating capacity
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-05 with 04/13/14 and operational owners; before affected build
Affected contracts/requirements: All consequential workflows; R05/18

**Table row 10**
ID: P10
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Constraint explanation schema; exception approver/review evidence; permissible redaction and security/privacy/feasibility grounds
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-01/03/04/05 under FAR-R-002; before constraint-interface baseline
Affected contracts/requirements: Authority/data-use/agent/execution/external exchange; R19

**Table row 11**
ID: P11
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: GI analysis/debrief record schemas, review rubric, uncertainty/confidence/evaluation, canonical rendering, revealed-preference/emotional-register permissions
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-20-25/30 with governance/source custodians; before analysis/debrief build
Affected contracts/requirements: Analysis/debrief; R10-13

**Table row 12**
ID: P12
Unresolved decision/parameter and validation needed: Independent-enforcement threat model, protected delivery classes/audiences, boundary definition, cumulative effects and bypass tests; federation remains deferred
Proposed owner / gate: AOS-01/05/14/25/40; before relevant assurance claim

Affected contracts/requirements: Authority/escalation/policy/exchange; R09/16

Current logical evidence/authority/data-use/execution record definitions and component adoption exist. Next implementation-specific profiles, organisation appointments and compatible execution bindings are11a; actual verification11b. Pilot5b is closed on Mark's9October confirmation. No default timing, permissions or approval values are invented.

# 9. Review, adoption and handover

## Historical initial author review - superseded for current drafting status

**Table row 1**
Area: Identity, status and scope
Assessment / evidence: Present; approval and reviewer vacancies explicit

**Table row 2**
Area: Existing interface identity
Assessment / evidence: Seven IFs preserved; no competing new IF numbers allocated

**Table row 3**
Area: Requirement records
Assessment / evidence: Nineteen draft obligations with source, category, owner, dependencies and planned cases; controlled component REQ allocation unfinished

**Table row 4**
Area: Interface completeness
Assessment / evidence: Meanings, participants, lifecycle, permissions, failure, retries/revocation and evidence developed; executable schemas, timing/compatibility and assurance still blocked by P01-12

**Table row 5**
Area: Sources
Assessment / evidence: FP/RP/GT consulted; selected applicability and exact derivations given; complete principle/test disposition unfinished

**Table row 6**
Area: Design adequacy
Assessment / evidence: Consistent with recorded responsibility/human boundaries as an initial draft; enforcement sufficiency, institutional procedure and operational capacity not established

**Table row 7**
Area: Verification
Assessment / evidence: Twelve planned cases, none executed; blocked parameters visible; assessor roles not appointed

**Table row 8**
Area: Independent assurance
Assessment / evidence: None; project review deferred; G3 separate-reviewer evidence remains required

This dossier is organised for collaborative drafting, not a complete G2/G3 handover. A combined-document mapping to the component template is proposed for this tranche: purpose/sources §§1-2; responsibilities §2; contract functions/state/data/authority/workflows/failure/evidence §§3-5; draft requirements/invariants §6; planned verification §7; dependencies/issues §8; review/change/handover §9. Formal tailoring approval and complete component-template coverage remain future work; the mapping does not waive missing content.

## Historical initial adoption sequence - current reciprocal allocation is in later supplements

1. Ownership direction approved by Mark and recorded in AOS-00 v0.7 DEC-002. Complete P01 role appointments and change-impact/approval procedure; contract baseline approval remains separate.
2. Develop the supporting control records in §5 and detailed schemas/validation with the relevant semantic owners. Resolve approval/race/privacy/closure semantics before choosing implementation encodings.
3. Populate AOS-01-05, AOS-20 and AOS-30 component specifications using template v0.3. Allocate component REQ/VER records with SC derivation links. AOS-13/14/24 and other participants reference the same contract baseline and record their obligations.
4. Reconcile AOS-14 v0.2's CON decomposition, terminology and federation/closure proposals with the newer reconciliation dispositions; preserve history and do not silently elevate proposals.
5. Extend the source traceability matrix and AOS-40 catalogue against actual component requirements; neither is marked complete by this dossier.
6. Obtain substantive project review, separate readiness assessments and approved bounded scope before G3. No build or activation authorisation is granted here.

Builder stop conditions: missing operational permission, undefined date/time comparison, unknown schema/contract compatibility, unappointed semantic owner, unresolved action/revocation race, absent human fallback/receipt/closure policy, uncertain external effect, missing protected change route or omitted source conflict. A builder may propose an implementation; it cannot answer those material questions through code.

Next starting point: action 3 logical control coordination adopted; next action 4 is protected reporting and recovery (KR-04/05), subject to instruction. Scope-specific profiles, non-kernel adoption and independent/executed evidence remain open.

Decision disposition, 4 October: Mark approved the three-part ownership model after reviewing the recommendation. AOS-00 v0.7 DEC-002 and Map v0.4 now record it. The baseline consulted for initial drafting above remains the actual initial baseline; the decision status in this addendum supersedes the earlier open ownership status. No draft SC obligation, schema, verification result, readiness gate or whole document is approved through that agreement.

## Detailed record annex - 4 October 2026

AOS Core Record Contracts v0.1 review draft (aos-core-record-contracts-v0-1-review-draft.md) develops the Evidence exchange and Authority determination briefs in §§4.1-4.2 and the Data-use/Execution companion subjects in §5. For those four record families, use the annex as the single detailed proposed field/lifecycle definition; this dossier retains the seven-contract context and earlier obligation history. No later-date precedence or contract approval is inferred if a conflict is found: resolve it before baseline approval.

The annex adds explicit logical fields/cardinalities/validation, state and failure rules, twenty-four draft obligations, fourteen planned verification cases and an overdue-repair walkthrough. It records Q01-03, approved by Mark on 4 October under AOS-00 v0.8 DEC-028-030 / Map v0.5: final control-check boundary; correction impact on pending work; unknown/partial-effect continuation. The existing ownership direction remains approved; companion IF identifiers, role appointments, exact profiles and component adoption remain open. No SC/REC obligation or verification case has acquired approved/executed status. Next: complete the supporting profiles and component records. Approval covers the recommended directions and their enforcement-boundary, selective-pause and authorised-reconciliation qualifications; exact schemas and obligation wording remain proposed.

Operational profile annex, 5 October: Operational Profiles v0.1 (aos-operational-profiles-v0-1-review-draft.md) develops approved DEC-031-035 under AOS-00 v0.9 / Map v0.6. It is the proposed profile drafting reference, complementing the existing shared/core record definitions without duplicating or approving their schemas. Earlier drafting baselines remain historical. Profile

wording/values and component adoption remain open; no SC/REC obligation or case status is promoted.

Date/evidence and channel disposition, 5 October: DEC-036-041 under AOS-00 v0.10 / Map v0.7 approve the five date/evidence recommendations and require resident-agreed channel(s). Operational Profiles v0.1 supplies the current proposed detail and cases. For resident communication, the action/determination/execution chain must carry or resolve the applicable channel-agreement revision and selected channel(s); promise/contact evidence must preserve communication via those channels. Organisation permission alone is insufficient evidence of resident agreement. Exact conditional fields/validation and component adoption remain proposed; current SC/REC obligations/cases retain their status.

Initial component allocation, 5 October: AOS-01 v0.1 (aos-01-authority-constitutional-controls-and-change.md) derives proposed general authority requirements and planned cases, preserving AOS-01-IF-001/REC-A. This is initial allocation, not adoption/approval of executable schemas or complete source traceability. Shared definitions remain authoritative drafting references; other components must adopt their respective obligations. Process-specific fixture decisions do not define general delegation policy.

AOS-02 initial component allocation, 5 October: AOS-02 v0.1 (aos-02-unified-data-layer-and-shared-records.md) now allocates common-definition/semantic-owner, evidence/source/identity/time/lineage/correction/access/outcome and compatibility obligations, preserving AOS-02-IF-001/REC-E. Existing common family schemas remain the single proposed detailed definitions; component baseline and producer/consumer adoption remain open. HACT is a referenced sector alignment candidate; exact field mappings/version and conformance are not inferred. No SC/REC status is promoted.

AOS-03 initial component allocation, 5 October: AOS-03 v0.1 (aos-03-identity-access-consent-and-data-use.md) now allocates proposed identity/capacity, exact purpose/basis/use, consent/change, inference/barrier, disclosure/projection and lifecycle/location obligations around the existing REC-D definition. No competing schema or approved IF number is introduced. Five design questions Q01-Q05 await Mark. Common schemas remain the single proposed detailed definitions; exact reciprocal adoption and commissioning are open. No SC/REC requirement status or readiness promotion. Next: resolve the five AOS-03 choices and develop shared-schema/consumer coverage.

AOS-03 approved direction disposition, 5 October: Mark agreed Q01-Q05, recorded as DEC-049-053 in AOS-00 v0.13. AOS-03 v0.2 incorporates all five; earlier pending-choice notes are historical. Exact shared schemas/consumer adoption and commissioning remain open. Next AOS-04; no SC/REC requirement status or readiness promotion.

## 10. Action-2 current common catalogue - 6 October 2026

Mark approved DEC-062-066 under AOS-00/Map v0.16. Kernel Exchange Register v0.1 (aos-kernel-exchange-register-v0-1.md) is the definitive kernel register, with all 33 CONs reciprocally mapped to the same field/lifecycle/version/acknowledgement definitions. Core Record Contracts v0.2 owns REC-E/A/D/X/Q detailed fields. AOS-01-05 v0.4 adopt these proposed logical definitions. Earlier references to v0.1/four records/seven IFs identify drafting history; the seven originals remain stable and the two companions now have proposed controlled identifiers.

Each exchange declares required stage acknowledgements; information-only exchanges require no human acknowledgement absent a purpose obligation. Version compatibility requires exact accepted versions or reviewed translations with declared losses/intended-use acceptance. Supporting evidence does not certify truth; REC-Q incomplete status is visible and use-specific suitability remains separate. Original evaluations link to later checkpoint/effect evidence without rewriting history. §§3-5 are read with the register and Core v0.2 supplements; any actual mismatch must be recorded and resolved before dependent acceptance.

Current logical action-2 reconciliation is complete for the kernel ends. All SC-R/SC-V original statuses remain proposed/planned. New KXR/KXV records supply explicit refinement/source/field/consumer links. Non-kernel adoption, exact operational instruments/profile values, mechanisms in actions 3/4, and executed independent evidence remain open.

## Action-3 current supplement, 6 October 2026

Kernel Control Coordination v0.1 (aos-kernel-control-coordination-v0-1.md) and Kernel Exchange Register v0.2 define approved

DEC-067-072 at logical record/protocol level. AOS-01-05 v0.5 adopt this v0.3 against AOS-00/Map v0.17. Earlier versions and pending-profile notes remain drafting history; current logical protocols are supplemented as follows.

**Table row 1**
Existing family/view: REC-A / authority / KX-02
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: Exact current-source/restriction evidence and context refs; CHECK consumes original result with current authority state, not a rewrite of original evaluation.

**Table row 2**
Existing family/view: REC-D / use / KX-03
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: Exact identity/basis/consent/current restriction sources, independently evaluated original decision; CHECK verifies current receiving use and permissible notification scope.

**Table row 3**
Existing family/view: REC-X / execution / KX-04
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: final_control_check references CHECK; actual request/attempt/arguments/current version vector/pre-effect evidence plus ACC/RSV where bounded; withheld reason links WHD, unknown effect retains reservation, later evidence remains distinct.

**Table row 4**
Existing family/view: Policy activation / KX-05
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: ACT required-member compatible applied vector and restriction-priority fence; approval alone cannot prove activation.

**Table row 5**
Existing family/view: Evidence/assurance correction / KX-13
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: CHG dependent target/application/no-material-dependency/owned unresolved records; history/assurance retained under permitted lifecycle.

**Table row 6**
Existing family/view: Task/lifecycle / KX-16
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: Linked effect/group/profile and BRK resumption/reconciliation; no auto-replay or cancellation-based capacity release.

**Table row 7**
Existing family/view: Escalation / KX-07, acknowledgement / KX-21
Current common fields/protocol and boundary: WHD operational owner, minimal permitted notification, deadline/cover, actual responsibility acceptance, failed-delivery exception, traceable coalescing and appropriate resident-agreed-channel update through responsible workflow.

Annex §§3-9 are the single logical field/transition/acceptance definitions; each required compound value is typed under its common header/schema. Changed KX families name revision 0.2, ACC/RSV/WHD KX-24/25/26 revision 0.1. All original SC/REC obligation/case statuses stay proposed/planned; KCR/KCV provide new action-3 source and case links. Role appointments, effect estimation/group/period/numerical settings, actual concurrent accounting/fencing, wire schemas, independently usable reporting route/human capacity, recovered authoritative-state proof and executed conformance remain open. Recovery/protected reporting are action 4.

## Action-4 current supplement, 6 October 2026

Baseline at this dated adoption step: AOS-00/Map v0.18; AOS-01-05 v0.6; Core/Shared v0.4; Exchange Register v0.3; Control Coordination v0.2. Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1 (aos-kernel-protected-reporting-and-recovery-v0-1.md) §§2-8 supplies the single reporting/recovery dictionary and protocols under approved DEC-073-078. REC-E/A/D/X/Q retain original evidence/evaluation meaning; reports bind advance authority/use and recipient verification, while recovery binds complete current authoritative sources, applied lifecycle dispositions, isolated validated configuration, effect/reservation reconciliation and

scoped acceptance. Protected-copy integrity alone cannot establish currentness or completeness.

KX-19 protected_finding v0.2, KX-20 recovery v0.2 and KX-26 WHD v0.2 add exactly the annex §5 fields. All original IF/CON IDs remain; relevant producer/consumer views and role ownership are §§2/5. Receipt/validation, human responsibility acceptance, actual release/application and service completion are separate statuses. No future full-schema conformity is inferred from adopting this logical supplement. Annex §6 cases and component additions trace every direction; §7 references primary standards with derivation/AOS-choice distinctions and ISO clause verification limits. Historical action-3 versions and former open action-4 notes remain dated history; this supplement is current.

## AOS-20 initial charter/analysis adoption - 6 October 2026

AOS-20 v0.1 supplies whole-GI charter/responsibility and review semantics under DEC-079-085 against AOS-00/Map v0.20. Existing AOS-20-IF-001 remains canonical analysis; AOS-24 renders permitted exact revisions, AOS-30 records empowered human decisions, and AOS-01 retains authority. AOS-20 §6 CON-001-009/Register v0.4 §12 maps all required shared views, including protected duty, oversight, research-for-GI-adaptation and controlled runtime/recovery. No record-family or kernel field definition is duplicated or silently changed. The candidate/coverage supporting view is proposed with exact schema adoption open. Graduated provisional/formal review, independent challenge preparation, explicit precedent approval and research observe/challenge/propose complement existing receipt/validation/responsibility/application distinctions. Core v0.4/Coordination v0.2/Reporting-Recovery v0.1/kernel v0.6 remain; 21-25/30 detailed adoption and executed evidence open.

## Common research adoption - 6 October 2026

Baseline at this dated adoption step: AOS-00/Map v0.22, DEC-001-086; AOS-01-05 v0.7; AOS-14 v0.3; AOS-20 v0.2; Shared v0.6/Core v0.5/Register v0.5; source matrix v0.7; template v0.4. AOS-02 v0.7 §6.6 is the single proposed profile/run/finding/disposition logical definition; AOS-04 v0.7 CON-009 owns behaviour/profile meaning. Exchange Register v0.5 §13 (aos-kernel-exchange-register-v0-1.md) declares RSVIEW-0.1, exact component adoption, common owner/producer/consumer links and gated wire/profile work. It supersedes earlier candidate-definition/adoption-pending statements at the documentary logical level. No new approved IF/REC family or alternative field dictionary is introduced.

Research evidence/assurance links use REC-E/Q; authority/use/task/effect links use REC-A/D/X. Finding assessment, canonical GI analysis, agent recommendation, empowered human disposition and separate amendment/activation records retain different meanings. AOS-20 v0.2 §6.2 supplies GI-specific assessment qualifiers; the Boundary charter maps its recommendation vocabulary into finding content rather than human decision status. Current checks, staged acknowledgement, deduplication/material correction, licensing/privacy/lifecycle and controlled recovery remain inherited. Missing required fields/permissions/versions produce invalid/unresolved reliance, never favourable coercion or guessed defaults.

Component-level REQ/VER coverage and source traceability are Register §13 and source matrix v0.7 §11. Detailed non-kernel drafting/consumer adoption, exact executable types/cardinalities/units/version compatibility, approved profile values/roles/quality criteria and executed assurance remain owned prerequisites. No source finding, charter change, live agent activation or readiness is approved by these references.

## AOS-30 initial drafting adoption - 6 October 2026

AOS-30-Governance-Hub-and-Accountable-Decision-Workflows.md (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-30-governance-hub-and-accountable-decision-workflows.md) v0.1 specifies software support for the human Governance Hub: preparation/referral, protected deliberation/post-meeting record, exact empowered approval, accepted responsibility/cover, resident challenge, controlled action/correction, outcome feedback, constitutional review and component-owned external research. 48 proposed component REQs, eight CON views preserving AOS-30-IF-001 and 31 planned VERs; none executed. AOS-00/Map v0.23, DEC-001-086 unchanged; AOS-30 v0.1; AOS-01-05 v0.7, AOS-14 v0.3 and

AOS-20 v0.2; Shared v0.7/Core v0.5/Register v0.6; source matrix v0.8; template v0.4. Register §14/source matrix §12 align exact logical references and affected-consumer work.

Three recommended directions remain for Mark: Q01 account author/approver and collective-validity/certified extract evidence; Q02 human-described emotional register/revealed preferences under explicit use controls; Q03 disputed account/correction versus changed governing decision and scoped dependent reliance. Existing DEC-008/018/024/025/081 and other approved powers remain unchanged; no new DEC or direction approval inferred. KX-06 v0.3 is proposed logical detail, not an executable schema or silent downstream upgrade. Profile/role/capacity/quality/wire/compatibility and independently executed/institutional evidence remain open. Next review Q01-Q03 before dependent policy adoption; no research automation created or changed.

## AOS-30 approved-direction disposition - 6 October 2026

Historical AOS-30 approval snapshot, 6 October 2026 - DEC-087 partly superseded by DEC-103: Mark agreed Q01 with an explicit role and approval qualification, and Q02/Q03 as recommended. DEC-087: The minute-taker drafts the account and is a clearly separate role from the Company Secretary as authorised steward. The Chair may approve the exact draft for submission; only the board approves the minutes and thereby the decision. Draft approval, stewardship, board approval, decision validity and actual application are separately evidenced. A Chair signature or certified extract cannot substitute for board approval; an extract references the exact board-approved minutes and decision before dependent authoritative reliance. DEC-088: Contextual emotional-register and revealed-preference descriptors must be explicitly human-provided or confirmed, purpose-bound and governed by access, retention and uncertainty controls. Missing or restricted material remains explicit. No AI inference from observation, individual profiling, sentiment scoring or compulsory person-by-person emotional account. Descriptors may inform proposals/review but cannot silently change governing instruments, precedent, moral weights or calibration. DEC-089: Preserve exact disputed records/history and use an empowered reviewer with an alternative route when implicated. Distinguish clerical account correction from a new governing decision. Withhold materially dependent automated reliance where authority/evidence is unresolved while retaining separately authorised service/reporting duties. No automatic blanket freeze or retrospective reversal of actual effects. Current baseline: AOS-00/Map v0.24, DEC-001-089; AOS-30 v0.2; AOS-01-05 v0.7, AOS-14 v0.3 and AOS-20 v0.2; Shared v0.8/Core v0.5/Register v0.7; source matrix v0.9; template v0.4. The earlier initial-draft/pending-choice entries are historical. General choices are resolved; exact requirement wording, organisation profiles/appointments, privacy/retention policy, KX-06 executable schema and affected-consumer compatibility, source-row allocation and actual assurance remain open under item 6. No whole-document approval, executed verification, independent review or build/activation/readiness approval is inferred.

## AOS-30 functional alignment - 7 October 2026

Under DEC-103 and current AOS-30 §§5/6.2/10.3, decision validity/effective time, record authentication/evidence, minutes approval and permission to execute are distinct. Reliance uses sufficient attributable evidence assessed under the actual organisation’s legal form, instruments and approved evidence policy; a valid decision may precede minutes approval. A Chair-authenticated record or extract may be evidence through an authorised route, but no signature, draft or extract alone creates decision authority or resolves conflicting evidence. No universal second approval of exact decision wording is imposed where applicable arrangements do not require it. Minute-taker drafting and Company Secretary stewardship remain distinct; non-board decisions use their applicable empowered route. Current authority/data-use/conditions and observed effects remain separate. Missing or disputed sufficient evidence blocks affected automated reliance for accountable resolution, not a declaration of legal invalidity.

Existing KX-06 logical v0.2 participation is aligned in AOS-01-05 v0.8/AOS-20 v0.3/AOS-30 v0.3 and Register v0.8 §15. AOS-30 conditionally receives KX-13/AOS-02 corrections affecting preparation/account/outcome review; GI updates canonical analysis and AOS-30 obtains human review without silent approved-record rewrite or effect reversal. Functional CR30-01-03 findings closed; executable schema compatibility is later implementation work. Earlier dated AOS-30 adoption-pending/next-drafting statements are superseded for existing functional drafts. Existing obligation/case identifiers and statuses remain.

## AOS-21 initial functional allocation - 7 October 2026

AOS-21 v0.1 (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-21-corpus-organisation-knowledge-and-precedent.md) AOS-21 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: scoped organisation/subsidiary profiles; external/operational/constitutional corpus; sourced artefact catalogue and criteria; delegated human stewardship; explicit approved precedent; currency, coverage, material correction and independent review; own DEC-086 research remit. 48 proposed REQs, eight CON views and 30 planned cases, none executed. DEC-090/091 applied; no new DEC or IF. Next AOS-23 using permitted corroboration with documentary quality, claim support and practice evidence separate. Functional drafting complete; wording/whole-document review and implementation/commissioning dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.27, DEC-001-091; AOS-21 v0.1; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.10/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.9; source matrix v0.10; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

Existing canonical evidence/assurance, authority/use/execution, human decision, policy change, impact, protected handoff and research meanings are referenced, not altered. AOS-21 §§6/19 supplies eight producer/consumer views and requirement/case mappings. AOS-20 CON-002/004/006 and AOS-30 CON-004/005 now have a drafted corpus consumer/steward endpoint; detailed AOS-22-25/13/40 counterpart allocation and actual compatibility remain open. Functional adoption does not approve physical schemas or operating profiles.

## AOS-23 initial functional allocation - 7 October 2026

AOS-23 v0.1 (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-23-governance-artefact-assessment-and-monitoring.md) AOS-23 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: permitted ingestion/normalisation; scoped criteria/application; document quality, claim support and practice evidence assessed separately under DEC-091; evidence/uncertainty and graduated human review; artefact/source currency monitoring, owned/protected alerts, reporting-cycle inputs, corrections/outcome feedback and own DEC-086 research remit. 52 proposed REQs, nine CON views and 32 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF or numerical default. Next AOS-22 synthesis/interpretation/options, followed by AOS-24/25; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.28, DEC-001-091; AOS-23 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.2 (functional endpoint/reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.11/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.10; source matrix v0.11; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

AOS-23 §6 adopts existing evidence/assurance, current control, canonical analysis, human decision/review, handoff, correction, lifecycle/recovery and common research meanings. AOS-21 §§6/16 now has its drafted assessment counterpart; 20 owns canonical content, 24 rendering, 22 broader synthesis, 25 aggregate oversight and 30 human approval/duty/outcome. AOS-23 alone does not complete item 7 or GI. Later 22/24/25/13/40 detailed allocation and actual compatibility/independent evidence remain open. No common schema meaning is changed.

## AOS-22 initial functional allocation - 7 October 2026

AOS-22 v0.1 (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-22-synthesis-interpretation-and-option-preparation.md) AOS-22 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: permitted cross-domain synthesis; evidence-grounded proposed interpretation; human constitutional/value referral; actual-state options including infeasible alternatives; CAP-01 rigour/shared-basis divergence without ranking or recommendation between readings; independently governed preparation; canonical review, protected handoff, correction/outcome feedback and own DEC-086 research. 52 proposed REQs, nine CON views and 32 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF or inferred moral-weight/default. Next AOS-24, then AOS-25; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.29, DEC-001-091; AOS-22 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.2 (counterpart/reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.12/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.11; source matrix v0.12; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

AOS-22 §6 adopts existing evidence/assurance, corpus/control, canonical analysis, exact human decision, independent preparation/disclosure, protected handoff, correction/lifecycle/recovery and research definitions. AOS-21/23 now recognise their drafted synthesis counterpart with unchanged REQ/VER/CON content. CAP-01 remains a configuration under DEC-017; 22 owns

rigour/divergence synthesis, 23 assessment, 24 fidelity, 25 longitudinal review and 30 human judgement. Ordinary commensurable operational comparisons are distinct from CAP-01's no-persona-ranking prohibition and permanent human moral adjudication. Remaining 24/25/13/40 allocation, actual implementation compatibility and independent/operating assurance stay open. No new IF/REC family or semantic dictionary change.

## AOS-24 initial functional allocation - 7 October 2026

AOS-24 v0.1 (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-24-petra-presentation-and-explanation.md) AOS-24 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: faithful canonical rendering and provenance; uncertainty/review and exact Chair/board/action standing; unranked CAP-01 divergence and distinct assessment dimensions; accessible Petra interaction, scoped confirmation and challenge; purpose-bound audience disclosure; independent/protected preparation, correction notifications including affected AOS-30 workflows, evidenced delivery and own DEC-086 research. 40 proposed REQs, eight CON views and 26 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF, deployment, schedule or numerical default. Next AOS-25 oversight, drift and learning; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.30, DEC-001-091; AOS-24 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.4/AOS-22 v0.2/AOS-23 v0.3 (reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.13/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.12; source matrix v0.13; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

AOS-24 §6 references the existing canonical, evidence/assurance, independent use/powers, projection, exact human approval, correction, delivery/duty, lifecycle/evaluation and research meanings. Rendering changes no analytical conclusion or human authority. AOS-21-23 now recognise the drafted presentation counterpart with all existing requirement, case and contract rows preserved. Remaining AOS-25/13/40 detailed allocation and actual implementation/assurance remain open; item 7 is not yet closed. Source manifest, DEC and parent REQ/VER statuses preserved.

## AOS-25 initial functional allocation - 7 October 2026

AOS-25 v0.1 (../Governance-Intelligence/aos-25-governance-oversight-drift-and-learning.md) AOS-25 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: purpose/precedent and Mode 1/2 drift, overrides, developer-framework divergence, cumulative/system effects, coverage and distributional patterns; unranked CAP-01 longitudinal evidence; GI account alongside independently prepared annual/material-triggered human review; empowered disposition, accepted corrective owners/dates and actual consequence learning; protected handoff, corrections including affected 30 workflows, own DEC-086 research and GI research-portfolio oversight. 48 proposed REQs, nine CON views, 30 planned cases and four unsubstantiated CRs; none executed. No new DEC/IF or automatic calibration/deployment/schedule. Mapped GI component drafting is complete; wording, whole-set consistency/disposition review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.31, DEC-001-091; AOS-25 v0.1; AOS-20 v0.4/AOS-21 v0.5/AOS-22 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.4/AOS-24 v0.2/AOS-30 v0.4 (counterpart-reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4; Shared v0.14/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.13; source matrix v0.14; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval.

AOS-25 §6 references unchanged canonical/evidence, powers/use, human decision/obligation, paired review/disposition, permitted projection, protected/owned handoff, correction/lifecycle/evaluation and research views. Independent human account and GI self-assessment remain distinct. Pattern detection never amends telos/precedent, supplies a persona winner or claims certification. AOS-20-24/30 now identify drafted counterparts; all existing requirement, verification and contract rows preserved. Actual schema/control compatibility, appointments/profiles, independent operating review and evidence remain later gates. Next: author GI-set consistency/disposition review across AOS-20-25 and AOS-30, then AOS-40 acceptance scenarios under item 8; independent project review remains deferred. Source manifest and parent DEC/REQ/VER statuses unchanged.

## GI consistency reciprocal closure - 7 October 2026

GI-CR-01-04 are closed at the functional-document level under Mark's instruction. KX-06 retains its existing proposed logical

v0.2; no new IF, transport or powers are introduced. Its permitted consumers include 23 CON-005 and 24 CON-004, alongside 22 CON-004 and 25 CON-003. Relevant actual outcome feedback includes 22/23/24/25 through 02 custody/permitted projections. Exact compatibility and observed delivery remain operational gates.

RP v6 precedent integrity → 20 REQ-034/VER-014; 21 REQ-025/VER-017; 25 REQ-021/VER-015; 30 REQ-038/VER-023: each GI/human account is prepared without reference to the other before comparison; originals, different bases and subsequent responses remain distinct. FP2/RP2 → 20 REQ-019/VER-005 and 22 REQ-016/VER-009: approved moral weights cannot transfer Mode 2 judgement; commensurable Mode 1 comparison remains separate. 30 VER-021 adds the planned cross-component correction/approval/outcome walkthrough. All cases remain unexecuted.

The GI review v0.2 closes all four findings and accounts for all 38 GIL disposition destinations; original source manifest and previous source statuses are preserved. Full source-item/operating assurance is not inferred. Item 7 is complete at the author functional-specification level; next AOS-40.

## Boundary v0.6 reciprocal logical adoption - 9 October 2026

The authoritative definition remains Shared Contracts§4.7 AOS-14-IF-001;02 common record semantics and evidence custody;01 authority,03 identity/use,04 agent behaviour and05 enforcement retain ownership. AOS-14§§6.1-6.2 supply the exact logical Boundary decomposition and mandatory commissioning completeness. No new IF/REC/wire schema is created. Unknown labels or missing mandatory profiles withhold dependent operation, not merely produce a diagnostic.

**Table row 1**
View / exact adoption: 14-CON-001 request →14-IF-001
Producer → consumer / owning meaning: 10-13/04 or permitted external intake →14 assessed exchange/executor;14 boundary semantics,02 record master
Requirement / verification chain: 14 REQ010-013/019/026/047; VER008/009/011/015/027

**Table row 2**
View / exact adoption: 14-CON-002 determination →14-IF-001
Producer → consumer / owning meaning: 14 consuming01/03 current determinations and04/05 enforcement evidence → requesting executor/13/02
Requirement / verification chain: 14 REQ015-022/024-027/037/039/042/052/055; VER010-012/014-016/022-024/030/033

**Table row 3**
View / exact adoption: 14-CON-003 evidence →14-IF-001/02 evidence custody
Producer → consumer / owning meaning: 14/connector/04/05 plus attributed counterpart/domain outcome →02 custody; permitted10-13/25/30/40
Requirement / verification chain: 14 REQ014/017/023/028-032/036/038/040/041/043-046/048-054; VER009/010/013/017-019/021-026/028-032/034

**Table row 4**
View / exact adoption: 14-CON-004 obligation →14-IF-001
Producer → consumer / owning meaning: 14 recognised exchange source with01/03/domain legal/semantic steward →02/13/30 and appointed empowered duty owner
Requirement / verification chain: 14 REQ033-035; VER020/021; ISS006 exact general representation remains open

**Table row 5**
View / exact adoption: 14-CON-005 own research and shared retrieval →02§6.6/04-CON-009 RSVIEW-0.1
Producer → consumer / owning meaning: Assigned specialist profile/agents and14 governed collection →02 custody/component reviewer/13 tracked duty/30 disposition; each component owns substantive relevance
Requirement / verification chain: 14 REQ001-008; VER001-006; shared retrieval cannot merge substantive owners

Producer and consumer apply the same approved exact manifest and preserve direction/operation, source/authority/use

standing, attempts, staged acknowledgements and actual effect uncertainty. Inbound admit/conditional admit map to operation-bound Permit/Constrain; reject maps Deny; quarantine remains restricted evidence state and escalation remains a non-permissive review state; unresolved/invalid withhold.02 accepted/accepted-with-restrictions/rejected/unresolved remain a separate admission axis, never proof of truth or exchange permission. Exact valid context and mapping are authoritative in14§6.1;§6.2 requires approved cardinality/types/units/time/window/ordering/duplicate/retry/revocation/lifecycle and compatible revision profiles before dependent build.

Assembled overdue-repair14 VER034 connects existing10/11/13/30 cases and40 v0.5 VER007-010/020-025/036/038. This records counterpart contributions; it does not amend40 case statements, claim every case fully covers every new Boundary obligation or substitute for an approved case-coverage manifest. All cases unexecuted. Shared-implementation/model scores and receipt/closure cannot upgrade domain work or human decisions. SENS-CR-02 remains open for10-13's other local views and whole-suite adoption; this addendum closes only Boundary incorporation.

## Approved Boundary decision adoption - 9 October 2026

**Table row 1**
Approved decision / subject: AOS-00-DEC-092 - Consequential external exchange
Direction / rationale: An external exchange is consequential when it can create or change an organisational commitment, disclose protected information, affect rights or service, trigger external action, or create a material obligation or risk. Materiality considers financial exposure and resource impact separately: payments, expenditure, liabilities or contingent exposure; and staff time, workload, capacity, equipment, facilities or other resource commitments and displacement of existing duties. Low monetary cost does not establish low resource impact. Record known quantities with their units/time basis and uncertainty; no invented money-to-time conversion or universal threshold. Apply organisation-approved criteria, including cumulative commitments. Routine public-information retrieval may use a lighter approved route only where its actual purpose, content and effects meet that profile. Uncertain classification goes to an accountable reviewer and cannot silently use the lighter route.
Affected Boundary records: ISS-004; REQ-010-012/020-022/027/051; VER-008/012/016
Approval and standing: Mark;9October2026; Q1 agreed (Q1 with financial/resource clarification); approved architectural direction, exact component wording remains proposed

**Table row 2**
Approved decision / subject: AOS-00-DEC-093 - Outcome-specific exchange evidence
Direction / rationale: Define the required outcome and sufficient evidence for each exchange type. Sending, delivery, recipient acceptance and actual fulfilment remain distinct facts. Contractor receipt does not prove completed work. Where the required effect remains unknown, retain that standing and reconcile before retrying. An authorised person may close further investigation under the approved profile only with an explicit unknown outcome and retained owner/status of every outstanding duty; closure cannot become confirmed success.
Affected Boundary records: ISS-005; REQ-029-032/036/053; VER-018/019/021/031/034
Approval and standing: Mark;9October2026; Q2 agreed (Q1 with financial/resource clarification); approved architectural direction, exact component wording remains proposed

**Table row 3**
Approved decision / subject: AOS-00-DEC-094 - Common external-obligation ownership
Direction / rationale: Use a common obligation record carrying source, applicability, exchange, responsible human owner, deadline where applicable, fulfilment evidence and current status. Boundary recognises exchange-associated obligations; relevant domain stewards determine substantive meaning and applicability under their authority; AOS-02 owns common record semantics; AOS-13 tracks accepted responsibility and fulfilment; AOS-30 supports accountable human disposition. Preserve financial and resource impacts separately where applicable, including unknown values. Uncertain or conflicting obligations go to an empowered human; automated recognition does not create legal authority or settle substantive meaning.
Affected Boundary records: ISS-006; REQ-033-036; VER-020/021
Approval and standing: Mark;9October2026; Q3 agreed (Q1 with financial/resource clarification); approved architectural direction, exact component wording remains proposed

**Table row 4**
Approved decision / subject: AOS-00-DEC-095 - Operation-specific organisational boundary
Direction / rationale: Determine the boundary from organisational authority and control over the particular operation and data use.

Hosting location alone is insufficient. A supplier system may carry out a delegated internal function while its onward disclosure or independent action crosses the external boundary. Each arrangement declares controlling parties, authority, operation/data-use scope, actual governed exchange points and independent shared-control enforcement. Ambiguous or missing control allocation remains an owned gap and withholds dependent consequential action.
Affected Boundary records: ISS-007; REQ-010/011/026/047; VER-008/015/027
Approval and standing: Mark;9October2026; Q4 agreed (Q1 with financial/resource clarification); approved architectural direction, exact component wording remains proposed

**Table row 5**
Approved decision / subject: AOS-00-DEC-096 - Boundary patterns and system oversight
Direction / rationale: Boundary detects cumulative external-exchange patterns, including repeated disclosures, accumulating commitments, unusual counterparties, excessive restriction and attempts to evade controls by splitting actions. AOS-25 combines permitted Boundary signals with other domains to assess wider drift and emerging/system risks. Shared AOS-01/03/04/05 controls enforce approved limits and accounting; empowered humans decide policy/limit changes. Boundary cannot create a private budget, waive restrictions or adjudicate systemwide governance.
Affected Boundary records: ISS-003; REQ-027/043-046; VER-016/025/026
Approval and standing: Mark;9October2026; Q5 agreed (Q1 with financial/resource clarification); approved architectural direction, exact component wording remains proposed

These directions do not appoint organisational officers, select numerical thresholds, convert resource impact into money or certify external obligations legally. Shared owners retain their meanings and independent enforcement. Proposed component requirements and planned cases retain stable identities; an approved direction is distinct from G3/build or operating approval. The organisation-specific profile must state criteria and aggregation windows for financial and resource materiality; exchange-type expected effect/evidence and authorised unresolved closure; obligation field types/cardinalities/lifecycle and owners; operation/data-use authority and control points; and Boundary-versus25 pattern routing/triggers. Missing or invalid mandatory settings withhold dependent effects/reliance and retain an owned gap. No deferred federation activation or new source-status promotion is implied.

## Current sensing reciprocal adoption - 9October2026

The single current40-view producer/consumer manifest is Registerv0.17 SENSING-ADOPTION-2026-10-09, reciprocally referenced by10v0.4/11v0.3/12v0.3/13v0.2/14v0.8/40v0.6. All existing IF/REC/KX definitions retain identity and owner; no new field dictionary. Source/direction/operation/purpose/current-control/acknowledgement/effect axes and change/recovery behaviour follow the existing masters and14§6.1. Missing approved schemas/profiles remain owned build gates. SENS-CR-02 adoption gap closed at logical-document level; actual endpoint compatibility and tests unexecuted.

## Acceptance corrections and controlled allocation - 9 October 2026

AT-CR-01-05 closed at functional-document/author-review level. AOS-40 v0.7 retains40 proposed requirements and38 planned parent cases, with108 individually assessable variants in the controlled acceptance annex. All variants remain planned/unexecuted. Architecture/Mapv0.43; Sharedv0.19/Corev0.6/Registerv0.18/SourceMatrixv0.19; DEC001-096 unchanged. Original parent acceptance and local component obligations remain necessary. Exact approved current-core execution scope/endpoints/profiles, human appointments, implementation evidence and independent/institutional assurance remain separate dependencies. Pilot5b remains closed.

Controlled allocation: Acceptance variants and coverage (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-40-acceptance-variants-and-coverage-v0-1.md) §§2-6 define result rules, all38 parent joins,108 fixture/procedure/oracle variants, exact specialist counterparts and the660 retained local-case inventory. An inventory entry alone gives no assembled coverage; actual scoped execution must bind exact local requirement/contract/endpoints/variant/evidence or retain an owned exclusion. Remaining annex and execution-scope choices stay with AOS-40 ISS-002/003/007 and relevant semantic/assurance owners before affected reliance.

CON-003 master correction: AOS-40-REQ-012/013 → AOS-40-VER-006; AOS-40-REQ-014 → AOS-40-VER-001; AOS-40-REQ-016 → AOS-40-VER-009/021/038; AOS-40-REQ-022 → AOS-40-VER-021. The authoritative definition remains the Kernel Exchange Register; current projections adopt that one definition. These links distinguish finding/retest, traceability, accepted human duty and protected reporting. No transport receipt is proof of accepted duty or remedy.

Change: Authorised documentary corrections AT-CR-01-05; no new constitutional decision, requirement, parent case or interface; no source-status promotion or gate approval.

## 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.

## Final functional-document completion disposition -9October2026

Author completion review (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-core-documentation-completion-review-v0-1.md) records the bounded checks and closure of documentary tasks6/8/9. Source statuses, manifest, DEC001-097, proposed component requirements and planned cases are unchanged. No current-core coverage from deferred CAP-only IDs. Exact approved run/endpoint bindings, compatible implementation profiles and actual competent/independent/service/institutional evidence remain prerequisites before affected reliance. Next documentary task: item12 extension/conformance specification;12a supplier briefing,13a AOS Change Constitution and13/14 publication programme remain open. Mark substantive review is5d; implementation preparation and verification are11a/11b.

## 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 - functional-document completion - 9 October 2026: Items6,8 and9 are complete for functional drafting, planned case allocation and author consistency review. See final completion review (../Supporting-Specifications/aos-core-documentation-completion-review-v0-1.md). This is documentary completion, not whole-document approval, executed acceptance, G3/G4 or operating/institutional assurance. CAP-01/02 remain parked in Phase2; pilot5b and prior author correction closures remain closed. Mark review and implementation-specific contracts/run scope/verification are separate work. Items12/12a/13a/13/14 remain outstanding; the complete documentation/publication programme is not finished. Earlier dated task/baseline statements are history. AOS-00/Mapv0.45; DEC001-097 unchanged; Sharedv0.21/Corev0.6/Registerv0.20/Matrixv0.21; component and acceptance/Phase2 revisions unchanged.

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.

Historical status notice - acceptance corrections - 9 October 2026: AT-CR-01-05 closed at functional-document/author-review level. AOS-40 v0.7 retains40 proposed requirements and38 planned parent cases, with108 individually assessable variants in the controlled acceptance annex. All variants remain planned/unexecuted. Architecture/Mapv0.43; Sharedv0.19/Corev0.6/Registerv0.18/SourceMatrixv0.19; DEC001-096 unchanged. Original parent acceptance and local component obligations remain necessary. Exact approved current-core execution scope/endpoints/profiles, human appointments, implementation evidence and independent/institutional assurance remain separate dependencies. Pilot5b remains closed. Earlier dated baseline/progress notices below are history; this correction and the linked controlled annex govern current acceptance planning.

Historical status notice - sensing consistency closure - 9 October 2026: Mark authorised the remaining consistency work. SENS-CR-01-05 are closed at the functional-document/author-review level: all40 logical CON views across10-14 and40 have exact central adoption, producer/consumer/shared-owner and REQ/VER links; all80 controlled FP/RP/GT sources have precise current contributions and owned residual/gate dispositions; current body/control statements are reconciled. Versions10v0.4/11v0.3/12v0.3/13v0.2/14v0.8/40v0.6; Architecture/Mapv0.42; Sharedv0.18/Corev0.6/ExchangeRegisterv0.17/SourceMatrixv0.18; reviewv0.4. DEC001-096 unchanged. Sensing269 proposed REQs/176 planned VERs;40 retains40/38. No new requirement/case/interface, source promotion or execution. Exact compatible wire schemas/profiles, organisation appointments/capacity, independent review, legal/institutional/practice evidence and scoped build/activation remain separate; independent project review remains deferred. Earlier dated notices/addenda are historical. Current controlling allocation is the9October manifest and source addendum below.

Historical status notice - approved Boundary directions - 9 October 2026: Mark agreed all five review recommendations at09:51UK time, qualifying material obligations to distinguish financial exposure from resource impacts. AOS-00-DEC-092-096 records those architectural directions; prior DEC001-091 unchanged. AOS-14 v0.7 incorporates the decisions into existing requirements/cases/contracts and resolves ISS003-007 at architectural-direction level. Exact organisation-specific materiality criteria, outcome evidence, obligation schemas/owners, declared control paths and pattern profiles remain implementation/commissioning gates; federation remains deferred. Architecture/Mapv0.41; Sharedv0.17/ExchangeRegisterv0.16/SourceMatrixv0.17; reviewv0.3. Other component versions unchanged.55 proposed Boundary requirements/34 planned cases; no new REQ/VER/IF, executed test, whole-document or build/operating approval. Earlier dated notices are historical. Next: remaining whole-sensing common/source/status corrections SENS-CR-02-04; independent review remains deferred as previously agreed.

Historical status notice - Boundary completion - 9 October 2026: AOS-14 v0.6 completes the functional proposed core/research/supplier migration:55 requirements/34 planned cases, all80 FP/RP/GT contribution rows and explicit typed determination/contract mapping. Architecture/Map v0.40; DEC-001-091 unchanged. Shared Contracts v0.16/Exchange Register v0.15/Source Matrix v0.16 adopt Boundary-only links; Core v0.6, kernel01-05 v0.8 and10 v0.3/11 v0.2/12 v0.2/13 v0.1/25 v0.2/30 v0.5/40 v0.5 unchanged. Working naming resolved under existing OQ-013; federation deferred OQ-012; other material Boundary questions/commissioning and independent review remain gates. No new DEC/IF, case execution, build readiness or activation approval. Earlier dated baseline/next-step notes are history; no historical source status promoted. Next: Mark's Boundary review and scoped decision dispositions; complete remaining whole-sensing common/source/status remedies from SENS-CR-02-04.

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.

Historical status notice - AOS-25 allocation - 7 October 2026: AOS-25 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: purpose/precedent and Mode 1/2 drift, overrides, developer-framework divergence, cumulative/system effects, coverage and distributional patterns; unranked CAP-01 longitudinal evidence; GI account alongside independently prepared annual/material-triggered human review; empowered disposition, accepted corrective owners/dates and actual consequence learning; protected handoff, corrections including affected 30 workflows, own DEC-086 research and GI research-portfolio oversight. 48 proposed REQs, nine CON views, 30 planned cases and four unsubstantiated CRs; none executed. No new DEC/IF or automatic calibration/deployment/schedule. Mapped GI component drafting is complete; wording, whole-set consistency/disposition review and operating dependencies remain. Next: author GI-set consistency/disposition review across AOS-20-25 and AOS-30, then AOS-40 acceptance scenarios under item 8; independent project review remains deferred. AOS-00/Map v0.31, DEC-001-091; AOS-25 v0.1; AOS-20 v0.4/AOS-21 v0.5/AOS-22 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.4/AOS-24 v0.2/AOS-30 v0.4 (counterpart-reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4; Shared v0.14/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.13; source matrix v0.14; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated baseline/next-step entries remain history.

Historical status notice - AOS-24 allocation - 7 October 2026: AOS-24 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: faithful canonical rendering and provenance; uncertainty/review and exact Chair/board/action standing; unranked CAP-01 divergence and distinct assessment dimensions; accessible Petra interaction, scoped confirmation and challenge; purpose-bound audience disclosure; independent/protected preparation, correction notifications including affected AOS-30 workflows, evidenced delivery and own DEC-086 research. 40 proposed REQs, eight CON views and 26 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF, deployment, schedule or numerical default. Next AOS-25 oversight, drift and learning; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.30, DEC-001-091; AOS-24 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.4/AOS-22 v0.2/AOS-23 v0.3 (reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.13/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.12; source matrix v0.13; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated baseline and next-step entries remain history.

Historical status notice - AOS-22 allocation - 7 October 2026: AOS-22 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: permitted cross-domain synthesis; evidence-grounded proposed interpretation; human constitutional/value referral; actual-state options including infeasible alternatives; CAP-01 rigour/shared-basis divergence without ranking or recommendation between readings; independently governed preparation; canonical review, protected handoff, correction/outcome feedback and own DEC-086 research. 52 proposed REQs, nine CON views and 32 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF or inferred moral-weight/default. Next AOS-24, then AOS-25; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.29, DEC-001-091; AOS-22 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.3/AOS-23 v0.2 (counterpart/reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.12/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.11; source matrix v0.12; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated baseline entries remain history.

Historical status notice - AOS-23 allocation - 7 October 2026: AOS-23 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: permitted ingestion/normalisation; scoped criteria/application; document quality, claim support and practice evidence assessed separately under DEC-091; evidence/uncertainty and graduated human review; artefact/source currency monitoring, owned/protected alerts, reporting-cycle inputs, corrections/outcome feedback and own DEC-086 research remit. 52 proposed REQs, nine CON views and 32 planned cases, none executed. No new DEC/IF or numerical default. Next AOS-22 synthesis/interpretation/options, followed by AOS-24/25; wording review and operating dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.28, DEC-001-091; AOS-23 v0.1; AOS-21 v0.2 (functional endpoint/reference alignment only); AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.11/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.10; source matrix v0.11; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated baseline entries remain history.

Historical status notice - AOS-21 allocation - 7 October 2026: AOS-21 v0.1 drafted at Mark's request: scoped organisation/subsidiary profiles; external/operational/constitutional corpus; sourced artefact catalogue and criteria; delegated human stewardship; explicit approved precedent; currency, coverage, material correction and independent review; own DEC-086 research remit. 48 proposed REQs, eight CON views and 30 planned cases, none executed. DEC-090/091 applied; no new DEC or IF. Next AOS-23 using permitted corroboration with documentary quality, claim support and practice evidence separate. Functional drafting complete; wording/whole-document review and implementation/commissioning dependencies remain. AOS-00/Map v0.27, DEC-001-091; AOS-21 v0.1; AOS-01-05 v0.8, AOS-14 v0.4, AOS-20 v0.3, AOS-30 v0.3; Shared v0.10/Core v0.6/Exchange Register v0.9; source matrix v0.10; template v0.4; Control Coordination v0.2/Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.1. No build/activation/readiness approval. Earlier dated baseline notes remain history.

Historical status notice - AOS-30 alignment - 7 October 2026: functional drafting and consistency alignment complete under Mark’s instruction. 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. Earlier dated baseline/adoption/next-step entries are history. CR30-01-03 are closed at the functional-document level; implementation/commissioning evidence remains separate. No new DEC/REQ/VER/IF identifier or operating power is introduced.

Historical status notice - AOS-30 disposition: DEC-087-089 approved 6 October; AOS-30 v0.2 incorporates Mark’s Q01 role/approval qualification and agreed Q02/Q03. See the approved-direction disposition at the end; earlier pending-choice notes are dated history.

## DEC-104 current protected-finding interpretation - 29 October 2026

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.

Protected Reporting and Recovery v0.2 §5 defines KX-19 protected_finding v0.3: its existing class/profile and route/dependency evidence now explicitly includes technical failure, implicated recipient/release/custody control, approved conflict disposition and appropriately independent authorised alternative. The original v0.2 adoption records above are historical for this view; recovery v0.2, KX-26 v0.2 and other distinct subviews retain their separate revisions. Profiles/wire mappings, accepted exact old/new semantic compatibility and actual endpoint/control evidence must be approved before affected reliance; old consumers are not silently upgraded.