OUTCOME TRUST PATHWAY

Examination Edition 2.0 | One building element. One proposed consequence. Verifiable claims.

19 November 2026 | Independently developed TA-14 working reference | Not an operational pilot

Purpose

Define what a legitimate building owner intends to achieve (Alpha), what independent evidence would establish success (Omega), and work backward to the minimum requirements, measurements, decision authority and records. The proposed example is read-only and uses a single outdoor-air damper serving a hypothetical occupied room during wildfire smoke.

The six-stage pathway

Stage	Examiner question
1. Applicable requirements	Which binding obligations apply, and which public-health notices are advisory?
2. Alpha: owner + community	What service, limits, accessibility and measurable criteria are authorized?
3. Evidence + proposed action	What is known about outdoor/indoor air, ventilation, equipment and uncertainty?
4. Execution boundary	Is this specific action admissible under evidence, authority, standing and safety rules?
5. Omega: independent proof	Which of authorization, physical response, environmental change and service outcome can actually be established?
6. Stewardship	Who monitors, reassesses, records exceptions and may suspend the service?

Non-negotiable distinction: An AQHI notice or forecast can inform a protective objective; it cannot by itself authorize a ventilation command. A recorded ALLOW is not proof of cleaner air or occupant safety.

1 | Requirements and owner-defined Alpha

The jurisdiction, facility, owner, building-code obligations, ventilation minima, smoke-control requirements and applicable local public-health directives are not yet selected or verified. A requirements register must identify each source, legal status, jurisdiction, effective version, applicability reviewer and unresolved issue. Ontario wildfire-smoke guidance, Canada AQHI and FireSmoke.ca are candidate context sources, not substitute legal determinations.

Draft owner-intent statement (not approved): Provide an accessible, time-bounded cleaner-air respite service during outdoor smoke conditions while respecting required ventilation, safe occupancy, life-safety functions and accountable operations.

Alpha field	Proposed specification / approval needed
Public-service objective	Cleaner-air respite for identified users; no claim of an emergency shelter
Acceptance criteria	Owner to specify baseline, averaging period, pollutant/comfort metrics, capacity, access and allowable uncertainty
Safety invariants	Binding ventilation and fire/life-safety functions cannot be overridden
Operating scope	One room; one outdoor-air damper; one time-bounded discretionary proposal
Community review	Accessibility, consent and community needs reviewed separately from owner/operator authority

2 | One action, clearly bounded

Case OTP-01: A hypothetical AI/analyst proposes a time-limited change to the outdoor-air damper position serving one occupied room in response to smoke. No actual building, damper interface, operating thresholds or qualified operator is identified. The simulation does not actuate equipment. A real change could worsen ventilation or other conditions; the example is not operating guidance.

Minimum evidence envelope: indoor/outdoor PM2.5 where relevant; CO2, temperature and humidity; airflow/ventilation minimum and equipment status; filter condition; occupancy; damper state; independent life-safety state; instrument identity, location, calibration/qualification, timestamps, missingness, uncertainty and provenance. Required fields depend on owner-approved policy and applicable law.

3 | Actor authority and standing

Role	Boundary / responsibility
Facility owner	Sets lawful intent, policy, acceptance criteria and delegation; owner not yet identified
Qualified operator / engineer	Verifies equipment constraints and whether a particular intervention is permitted
Community contributor (UNIC / Lloyd)	Proposed public-service needs and stewardship review; cannot approve building operation
TA-14 gate	Evaluates proposed action against AE, AA, ES and constraints; does not create authority
AI / analyst	May recommend; recommendation is not authorization
Independent examiner	Challenges evidence and claims; does not silently edit original records

Established standing (ES) refers to the actor or system identity, valid delegation, scope, expiry and revocation status. Occupancy, CO2 and equipment constraints are operating evidence, not standing.

4 | Worked synthetic HOLD case

Field	Synthetic test fixture - not measured data
Request	OT P-01 / change damper setting for a proposed 60-minute period
Evidence state	Indoor PM2.5 record absent; minimum outdoor-air requirement not verified
Authority state	Owner policy and operator delegation not verified
Safety state	Independent life-safety systems remain outside discretionary gate
Expected decision	HOLD; do not issue actuation command
Reason	Mandatory evidence and authorization prerequisites are unresolved
Next step	Obtain valid evidence and verified delegation, then perform a new evaluation

Decision trace requirement: Preserve request ID, synthetic flag, UTC evaluation time, rule-set version, input record IDs and hashes where available, evidence status, authority basis, standing check, applicable constraints, decision, reason, and evaluator version. This page specifies an expected result; no software execution or independent test result is asserted.

Four outcomes to examine

Outcome	Illustrative condition
ALLOW	All required evidence, applicable authority, standing and safeguards are verified for the bounded action
HOLD	Mandatory evidence missing, stale or unverified; no discretionary actuation
DENY	Known binding prohibition or established constraint rules out the requested action
ESCALATE	A designated human must resolve a contested authority or safety issue under policy

For an implemented rule set, precedence when multiple conditions coexist must be formally specified and tested. A resolved HOLD does not automatically become ALLOW. No gate result overrides emergency or life-safety systems.

5 | Omega: what is actually proven?

Claim	Required proof	Available now
Authorization	Reproducible decision trace and valid rules	Specification only
Equipment response	Actual state change with attributable timestamps	Not possible in read-only simulation
Environmental change	Comparable qualified before/after readings, confounders and uncertainty	Not established
Owner service outcome	Predeclared acceptance criteria, adverse effects, access and duration	Not established

A read-only prototype can test decision logic; historical data may support observational analysis if access and quality are established; causal performance or live command verification would require a separately approved field protocol. Never collapse these into one claim.

Independent examiner acceptance protocol

An examiner should receive: (A) frozen scenario and owner-intent assumptions; (B) requirements register with unresolved items; (C) synthetic evidence fixture and source metadata; (D) versioned decision rules with explicit precedence; (E) expected results for ALLOW/HOLD/DENY/ESCALATE; (F) generated decision traces when a prototype exists; and (G) an Omega verification plan. They should be able to rerun the same fixture, challenge a missing or expired input, inspect denial/hold behavior, and report any discrepancy without changing the original evidence.

Acceptance is conditional: No unsupported ALLOW; no discretionary command on HOLD/DENY/ESCALATE; traceable input-to-rule-to-decision; honest synthetic labeling; and no claim of real environmental benefit from simulation.

6 | Reverse engineer only what is needed

Start at the outcome	Work backward to a requirement
Owner wants a bounded respite service	Specify target users, access, operating period and acceptance criteria
Owner wants confidence in ventilation safety	Identify applicable minima, equipment limits and qualified reviewers
Owner wants to know what AI may do	Define one request, actor delegation, rules and fail-closed behavior
Owner wants independently verifiable results	Identify baseline, calibrated sensors, logs, comparison and examiner
Owner wants ongoing accountability	Assign re-evaluation, exception handling, rollback and record retention

Candidate information paths and decision gates

Toronto: Publicly available cleaner-air-space and wildfire-strategy information may ground a Canadian comparison; it does not provide a selected owner or control access. PAE: Michael Bordenaro has proposed asking about potential read-only CO2, outdoor air-quality and window-sensor information only after the group settles Alpha and Omega. Availability and participation are unconfirmed. ONUMA integration remains a later technical-scoping question.

Working-group decisions needed: confirm one owner-outcome statement; choose one room/damper example; freeze the required evidence and authority checks; approve independent success/failure criteria; select a candidate read-only data path; and confirm which external roles may be named. These are planning decisions, not permission for live intervention.

Sources, correspondence and limits

This edition follows the November 18-19, 2026 email exchange: Mike requested regulations before owner intent, one building element, an Alpha/Omega definition and later reverse engineering; Lloyd requested explicit community review, distinct owner authority, proper standing terminology, a read-only bounded examination and independently verifiable outcomes. No organization is represented as having endorsed or deployed this example.

Public starting points (jurisdiction and applicability to be verified):

https://www.ontario.ca/page/wildfire-smoke-and-air-quality-health-reference-document

https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/air-quality-health-index.html

https://www.toronto.ca/community-people/health-wellness-care/health-programs-advice/air-quality/wildfire-air-quality-strategy/

https://firesmoke.ca/forecasts/current/

Publication status: Independently developed TA-14 examination specification. Not a legal determination, operating instruction, funded program, municipal approval, PAE/ONUMA/ALN/UNIC endorsement, implemented gate or verified health outcome.