TA-14 / FGAI • EDUCATIONAL SHOWROOM

Fully Governed Autonomy Institute

The architecture of accountable autonomy

Eight exhibits | Version 1.0 | November 26, 2026

Justified Autonomy. Accountable Execution. Verifiable Consequences.

This educational guide expands the founding charter into eight lessons, narration scripts and illustrative governance challenges. The charter is appended in its original draft form. Examples are instructional, not operational authorizations.

Exhibit index

01 The birth of FGAI

02 The evolution of autonomy

03 Justified autonomy

04 The architecture of governance

05 TA-14 AuthorityGate

06 Institutional accountability

07 Consequence governance across industries

08 The future of fully governed autonomy

EXHIBIT 01 / 08

The birth of FGAI

Learning objective

Distinguish autonomous capability from justified execution.

Samantha | narration script

Founded as an initiative of TA-14 Authority Governance Institution LLC, FGAI advances Justified Autonomy, Consequence Governance and Institutional Accountability. The founding charter dated November 26, 2026 remains a draft pending adoption.

Interactive governance challenge

A building operator installs an autonomous controller. Does installation alone authorize every action the controller can propose?

Expected determination and rationale

No. Capability is not permission. Establish the applicable authority and conditions for each consequential action.

EXHIBIT 02 / 08

The evolution of autonomy

Learning objective

Understand the proposed distinction between levels 4 and 5.

Samantha | narration script

Level 0: No Connectivity; Level 1: Connected; Level 2: Described; Level 3: Interoperable; Level 4: Autonomy-Ready; Level 5: Fully Governed Autonomy. Level 5 is TA-14’s proposal, not an adopted industry standard. It adds an enforceable execution boundary rather than merely more automation.

Interactive governance challenge

An interoperable system can autonomously adjust ventilation. Is it necessarily Level 5?

Expected determination and rationale

No. Demonstrate that consequential commands are independently governed at execution.

EXHIBIT 03 / 08

Justified autonomy

Learning objective

Separate prediction from present justification.

Samantha | narration script

Prediction can inform a decision but cannot independently establish permission now. Evidence must remain admissible, authority applicable and standing established when execution occurs. A forecast is not proof that these conditions currently hold.

Interactive governance challenge

A forecast predicts clean outdoor air, but the current outdoor sensor record is stale. Should an automated damper open on that forecast alone?

Expected determination and rationale

HOLD the proposed action pending adequate evidence; follow applicable safety procedures and authorized fallback policies.

EXHIBIT 04 / 08

The architecture of governance

Learning objective

Identify the three prerequisites for admissible execution.

Samantha | narration script

Admissible Evidence concerns attributable, relevant and sufficiently current evidence. Applicable Authority concerns the governing rules and permissions for the action. Established Standing concerns whether the actor is entitled to exercise that authority in context. AEA provides the execution boundary; ACA, AIR and EIG contribute computation, atmospheric evidence and environmental consequence governance respectively.

Interactive governance challenge

A valid sensor reading supports a command, but the requesting actor has no established standing. Is the evidence enough?

Expected determination and rationale

No. All three prerequisites must be established; absent standing, do not authorize the command.

EXHIBIT 05 / 08

TA-14 AuthorityGate

Learning objective

Distinguish a proposed decision from authorized execution.

Samantha | narration script

AuthorityGate is TA-14’s execution-governance software based on AEA. Its canonical dispositions are ALLOW, HOLD, DENY and ESCALATE. ALLOW authorizes a bounded action when prerequisites are satisfied; HOLD withholds pending resolution; DENY refuses an inadmissible action; ESCALATE refers a matter to appropriate authority without granting execution permission. This is an architectural explanation, not a claim of independently verified production readiness.

Interactive governance challenge

A command was authorized earlier, but its authority is revoked before execution. What should happen?

Expected determination and rationale

Do not execute under revoked authority. Reevaluate at the boundary and refuse the invalid authorization.

EXHIBIT 06 / 08

Institutional accountability

Learning objective

Make governance attributable beyond individual leadership.

Samantha | narration script

Accountability requires identifiable authority, documented decisions, auditable evidence and verifiable outcomes. Institutional continuity requires that policies, responsibilities and records survive leadership changes. A founder’s personal approval cannot substitute for a durable governance process.

Interactive governance challenge

A founder leaves and the successor cannot locate the basis for an automated decision. Is accountability established?

Expected determination and rationale

Not adequately. Preserve attributable records, authority assignments and reviewable execution evidence.

EXHIBIT 07 / 08

Consequence governance across industries

Learning objective

Recognize the common boundary across domains.

Samantha | narration script

Consequence governance applies wherever interpretation of data becomes a binding action: buildings, healthcare, finance, insurance, robotics, transport, energy, water and human decisions. Domain-specific laws and safety requirements remain controlling. AIR can support atmospheric evidence; EIG addresses environmental trade-offs without treating energy savings alone as proof of acceptable outcomes.

Interactive governance challenge

A controller saves energy by reducing ventilation, but indoor air evidence indicates a possible harmful consequence. Is energy optimization sufficient justification?

Expected determination and rationale

No. Evaluate applicable environmental and safety constraints, evidence quality and authority before allowing the action.

EXHIBIT 08 / 08

The future of fully governed autonomy

Learning objective

Connect justification, accountability and verification.

Samantha | narration script

FGAI invites independent examination, education and interdisciplinary collaboration. Demonstrated capabilities must be distinguished from proposals and independently verified capabilities. Participation is not certification, accreditation or execution authority. The founding commitment is justification before execution, accountability through governance and verification after consequence.

Interactive governance challenge

A participant claims membership certifies a product as fully governed. Is that claim supported?

Expected determination and rationale

No. Membership does not confer certification. Claims require an appropriate independent basis.

Join the discussion

Official FGAI LinkedIn community | TA-14 Exchange



Fully Governed Autonomy Institute

FOUNDING CHARTER | VERSION 1.0

November 26, 2026 · Founding draft for adoption
An initiative of TA-14 Authority Governance Institution LLC

ARTICLE I — Institutional Purpose

The Fully Governed Autonomy Institute is established to advance Justified Autonomy, Consequence Governance and Institutional Accountability across industries. Its purpose is to establish the distinction between autonomous capability and justified execution.

ARTICLE II — Foundational Doctrine

Autonomous capability does not independently constitute permission. Intelligence does not constitute authority. Prediction does not independently establish present justification. Every consequential action must be evaluated against the conditions that exist at the moment of execution.

ARTICLE III — Execution Prerequisites

The Institute advances three foundational prerequisites for admissible execution:
1. Admissible Evidence
2. Applicable Authority
3. Established Standing

These prerequisites must be established before an authorized consequence becomes binding upon reality.

ARTICLE IV — Level 5: Fully Governed Autonomy

The Institute advances TA-14's proposed Level 5 classification:
Level 0 — No Connectivity
Level 1 — Connected
Level 2 — Described
Level 3 — Interoperable
Level 4 — Autonomy-Ready
Level 5 — Fully Governed Autonomy

Level 4 establishes capability. Level 5 establishes justified permission through an enforceable execution boundary. Level 5 is a proposal, not an adopted industry standard.

ARTICLE V — Architectural Foundation

The Institute draws upon the architectural foundations developed by TA-14:
• Admissible Execution Architecture (AEA)
• Admissible Computation Architecture (ACA)
• Atmospheric Integrity Records (AIR)
• Environmental Integrity Governance (EIG)
• TA-14 AuthorityGate

The Institute recognizes that governance must remain independently enforceable regardless of the intelligence proposing an action.

ARTICLE VI — Institutional Accountability

Accountability must be attributable, transferable, auditable and verifiable. Institutional integrity must not depend exclusively upon individual memory, personal discretion or the continued presence of a founder.

ARTICLE VII — Global Scope

The Institute advances consequence governance across artificial intelligence, buildings and HVAC, healthcare, finance and insurance, transportation, robotics, energy and water, environmental protection, critical infrastructure and human decision-making.

ARTICLE VIII — Research and Education

The Institute promotes independent examination, interdisciplinary collaboration, educational development, transparent demonstrations and evidence-based architectural advancement. Proposed capabilities must remain distinguishable from demonstrated and independently verified capabilities.

ARTICLE IX — Institutional Integrity

Participation does not independently constitute certification, accreditation, endorsement or execution authority. The Institute shall respect applicable laws, established jurisdictional authority, scientific integrity and human safety.

ARTICLE X — Founding Commitment

JUSTIFICATION BEFORE EXECUTION.
ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH GOVERNANCE.
VERIFICATION AFTER CONSEQUENCE.

_____

Greggory Butler
Founder, TA-14 Authority Governance Institution LLC
Signature / adoption date: _____

www.ta14exchange.com
Official community: linkedin.com/groups/42843654/