TA-14 AUTHORITY GOVERNANCE INSTITUTION LLC

Admissible Consequence Governance Architecture

ACGA | Proposed specification v1.0 / RC2

The domain-independent architecture governing the formation, authorization, execution and verification of consequences.

FOUNDATIONAL QUESTION

Does this proposed consequence possess sufficient Admissible Evidence, Applicable Authority, and Established Standing to become reality NOW?

26 November 2026 | Consolidated review candidate
Prepared for founder review. Supersedes RC1 only upon approval.
Not registered, independently validated or adopted as an institutional standard.

ACGA / 00

Document control and reading guide

This expansion preserves the eight-page Draft 1 as its source baseline. New requirements, conformance levels and formal models are proposals for review, not representations of existing product capability.

Source and lineage

TA-14 ACGA v1.0 Draft, 25 November 2026, pp. 1–8. The wider TA-14 corpus has not been independently reconciled. No priority, novelty, patent or registration claim is made.

Normative language

MUST and MUST NOT identify proposed mandatory requirements; SHOULD identifies recommendations with documented exceptions. Examples are illustrative. Requirements apply within a declared system boundary.

Sections	Reading guide
01–05	Doctrine, jurisdiction, definitions, prediction and time
06–10	Architecture, invariants, lifecycle, records and enforcement
11–15	Decisions, human intervention, domains and interaction
16–20	Threats, tests, conformance, governance and release

ACGA / 01

Foundational doctrine

Consequence governance concerns the legitimacy of changing reality, not the intelligence of the system proposing the change.

Principle of present-tense admissibility

No prediction, regardless of accuracy, confidence or sophistication, independently establishes the admissibility of a consequence at the moment of execution.

Universal jurisdiction

The proposed consequence determines jurisdiction. Human judgment, deterministic computation, AI and autonomous machines are possible origins, not exemptions.

Core invariant

A protected execution path MUST prevent a proposed consequence from committing without valid authorization for that exact consequence at the execution boundary.

Limits

Admissibility is a bounded determination under uncertainty, not a guarantee of truth, safety, legality or successful outcomes. Applicable law and domain safety requirements remain binding.

ACGA / 02

Consequence ontology

A consequence is a state change or a material continuation of state attributable to an action, omission or deferral within a declared scope.

Action and omission

An action proposal identifies a target and intended transition. A material omission or deferral MUST identify the duty, deadline and affected state where such a duty exists. A gate cannot physically prevent every omission; monitoring and escalation are separate controls.

Direct and indirect effects

The proposal MUST identify intended effects, material foreseeable adverse effects, affected parties and relevant dependencies. Unknown effects remain explicit uncertainties.

Bounded jurisdiction

Define protected targets, actors, actions, interfaces, exclusions and observation limits. Claims of enforcement MUST NOT extend to unprotected paths.

ACGA / 03

Definitions and reality categories

Reality is not synonymous with a record, a model or a prediction. The architecture governs claims about reality and the authorization of changes to it.

Term	Operational definition
Observed reality	Conditions captured by an identified observation method.
Admissible reality	Bounded representation supported by evidence accepted for a specific decision.
Predicted reality	Estimated present or future conditions; not independently established observations.
Binding reality	Actual state affected by a committed consequence.
Commit	Defined point at which a protected target accepts a binding action.
Standing	Established right of an actor to invoke applicable authority for the action.
Outcome	Observed resulting state, distinct from intent and execution receipt.

ACGA / 04

Prediction is not permission

Prediction may inform formation of a proposed consequence. It cannot independently establish current conditions, applicable authority or standing.

Capability	Question answered
Measurement	What was observed, when and how?
Computation	What can be derived from accepted inputs?
Prediction	What is expected or estimated?
Optimization	Which outcome is preferable under stated assumptions?
Decision formation	What action is proposed?
Consequence governance	May this exact action become binding NOW?

ACGA / 05

The temporal meaning of NOW

NOW is the declared commit boundary, evaluated using bounded clock uncertainty, evidence freshness and authorization validity. It does not imply instantaneous or omniscient observation.

Temporal model

Let t_c denote commit time; t_i the observation time of evidence i; F_i its permitted age; and u_i the conservative timing uncertainty. Require age_i = t_c - t_i + u_i to be no greater than F_i, with valid observation ordering. Freshness is necessary but not sufficient.

Authorization interval

The conservative commit-time interval MUST lie within the authorization validity interval. Material changes, revocation and scope mismatch MUST invalidate the authorization under the declared consistency model.

Distributed limits

If a target cannot establish the required freshness or revocation bound, it MUST withhold the affected action or use a separately authorized protective pathway. Record clock source, uncertainty, latency and failure behavior.

Long-running actions

Define checkpoints and termination constraints for actions whose effects continue after commit. Initial authorization does not imply unlimited continuing permission.

ACGA / 06

Architectural jurisdictions

ACGA coordinates existing jurisdictions without transferring authority or replacing AEA. The relationship remains subject to corpus reconciliation.

Component	Proposed responsibility
AIR	Atmospheric Integrity Records: environmental observations, provenance, calibration, uncertainty and continuity.
ACA	Admissible Computation Architecture: traceable methods, inputs, assumptions and justified derivations.
HPS / HPGS	Human Performance Stack and Human Performance Guidance System: situational awareness, guidance and human performance support.
AHIA	Admissible Human Intervention Architecture: legitimacy of human intervention.
AEA	Admissible Execution Architecture: evidence, authority and standing at execution.
AuthorityGate	Runtime enforcement at a protected target boundary.
EIG / FEIG	Environmental and financial domain-specific governance.

Normative invariants

The following identifiers are proposed stable references. A violation within the declared scope falsifies the corresponding conformance claim.

ID	Requirement
ACGA-001	Prediction MUST NOT substitute for required evidence.
ACGA-002	Intelligence or capability MUST NOT confer authority.
ACGA-003	AE, AA and ES MUST be established for ALLOW.
ACGA-004	Authorization MUST bind the exact action and target.
ACGA-005	Validity MUST be enforced at commit.
ACGA-006	Material change MUST trigger re-evaluation.
ACGA-007	Refusal MUST preserve unresolved obligations.
ACGA-008	Outcome MUST be distinguished from execution.
ACGA-009	Governance changes MUST be governed.
ACGA-010	Unknowns MUST remain explicit; no silent substitution.

ACGA / 08

Consequence lifecycle

The eight-stage sequence from Draft 1 is retained. Feedback from outcomes returns to reality and record; it does not rewrite prior evidence.

Stage	Required artifact or determination
01 Reality	Declared scope and relevant actual conditions.
02 Record	Attributable observations and provenance.
03 Continuity	Freshness, uncertainty, revision and integrity checks.
04 Admissibility	Evidence and computation assessment.
05 Binding	Exact proposed action, target and constraints.
06 Commit	Execution-time AE, AA and ES determination.
07 Execution	Target-side acceptance and actual action record.
08 Outcome	Independent observations and remaining obligations.

ACGA / 09

Consequence record specification

A consequence record is a logical schema, not a mandated serialization format. Records MUST link revisions rather than silently overwrite history.

Field group	Minimum content
Identity	Unique proposal and attempt IDs; originator; target; domain.
Binding	Action, parameters, expected state change, constraints, digest and canonical encoding version.
Evidence	References, observation times, provenance, uncertainty, validity and conflicts.
Authority / standing	Issuer, scope, delegation, revocation reference and actor relationship.
Decision	State, reason codes, policy version, validity interval and authorization reference.
Execution	Commit time, target receipt, replay status and actual action.
Outcome	Independent observation, discrepancy, uncertainty and outstanding obligations.

Execution admissibility and enforcement

For a proposal p at commit t, define AE(p,t), AA(p,t), ES(p,t) as satisfied, unsatisfied or unresolved. ALLOW is eligible only when all three are satisfied and applicable constraints are met.

Admissible Evidence

Relevant, attributable, sufficiently current evidence evaluated against domain-specific quality and uncertainty requirements.

Applicable Authority

Valid authority for action, target, scope, jurisdiction and time; delegation, expiry and revocation evaluated.

Established Standing

Established right to invoke that authority for this action. Identity alone is insufficient.

Target-side enforcement

The protected target MUST verify binding, authenticity, validity and replay protection before commit. The check and commit MUST be coupled under an explicit consistency model. A signature alone does not establish evidence quality or authority.

Enforcement limitation

If direct writes or alternate paths bypass the boundary, the affected scope cannot claim enforced conformance.

AuthorityGate decision semantics

Only ALLOW authorizes execution. A decision is not itself evidence that a target complied.

Decision	Required effect
ALLOW	Authorize the exact bound action within constraints.
HOLD	Prevent execution pending resolution of missing or uncertain prerequisites.
NARROW	Propose reduced scope; obtain a separate ALLOW.
ESCALATE	Route unresolved matter to appropriate authority without permitting execution.
DENY	Refuse the proposed action; preserve remaining obligations.

ACGA / 12

Failure, continuity and obligations

Fail-closed means refusing the governed action when its required authorization cannot be established. It does not mean indiscriminately shutting down a physical system.

Protective pathways

Emergency or safe-state actions MUST have separately established authority, scope and evidence requirements appropriate to the hazard. Safety interlocks remain independent where required.

Carry rule

HOLD, DENY, NARROW and ESCALATE MUST preserve unresolved duties, responsible owner, deadline and next review condition. A refusal is not closure.

Recovery

After interruption, reconcile target state and attempt identity before retrying. Unknown execution status MUST NOT be treated as nonexecution. Compensation is a new consequence requiring its own admissibility.

Continuity

Material changes to evidence, authority, standing or target state require re-evaluation. Audit history MUST preserve original and revised determinations.

ACGA / 13

Human intervention

Human approval is not an automatic substitute for admissibility. Human intervention has its own evidence, authority, standing and practical capability requirements.

Human performance support

HPS and HPGS support awareness and guidance; they do not independently grant permission. The interface SHOULD expose uncertainty, competing obligations and time constraints.

Intervention boundary

AHIA governs the legitimacy of human intervention. AEA governs the resulting execution. The actor MUST have practical ability to intervene, not merely a nominal role.

Escalation

Route to an identified responsible authority with relevant evidence, deadline and available alternatives. If no authorized responder is available, retain the obligation and apply the defined protective pathway.

Accountability

Record who intervened, what they knew, which authority applied and what the target actually did. Avoid attributing automated actions to a human merely because they were notified.

ACGA / 14

Environmental consequence governance

Illustrative scenario: an occupied building optimizer proposes increasing outdoor ventilation to reduce indoor carbon dioxide during a particulate pollution event.

Formation

AIR records indoor and outdoor conditions, timestamps, uncertainty and equipment state. ACA evaluates the proposed change under declared assumptions. EIG identifies competing environmental consequences.

Execution

AEA assesses AE, AA and ES for the exact ventilation command. AuthorityGate rejects stale or mismatched authorization. If evidence is insufficient, HOLD and evaluate an admissible alternative.

Outcome

Verify actual airflow and relevant indoor conditions after intervention. A command acknowledgment is not evidence of reduced exposure. Retain unresolved protection obligations.

Limit

No universal pollutant threshold, clinical protection claim or validated building deployment is asserted. Domain-specific requirements must be established.

Financial and infrastructure consequences

The same consequence boundary applies to non-AI and AI-originated actions, with domain-specific evidence and authority.

Financial example

A purchase order approved at one amount is changed before payment. The original authorization does not bind the revised amount. Reject the mismatch, obtain a new determination and independently verify the ledger outcome.

Infrastructure example

A controller proposes a change to a pump operating point. Evaluate current state, equipment limits, downstream effects and applicable operator authority. A stale authorization cannot justify a later command.

Interaction governance

Where a proposal affects multiple protected objectives, identify material trade-offs and applicable constraints. Optimization of one objective MUST NOT silently waive another obligation.

Limit

These examples are not deployment claims or operational instructions. Domain engineering and regulatory review remain necessary.

Threat model and trust boundaries

Conformance requires an explicit threat model, including assumptions about trusted components and excluded adversaries.

Threat	Required treatment
Replay / mutation	Bind unique attempt and exact parameters; reject duplicate or changed requests.
Revocation race	Define ordering and consistency; test revocation before commit.
Direct bypass	Inventory write paths; test independent target observations.
Evidence tampering	Verify provenance and integrity; do not equate integrity with truth.
Clock / network fault	Bound uncertainty and latency; withhold when requirements cannot be met.
Privileged compromise	Declare administrator capabilities and residual risk; govern configuration changes.
False outcome receipt	Use independently attributable target observations.

ACGA / 17

Adversarial validation protocol

Freeze implementation, policy, test environment, expected outcomes and observer independence before testing. Bind each attempt to gate and target records.

Test	Pass criterion within declared scope
T01 / 001,003,010	Missing or stale required evidence: no protected commit.
T02 / 002,003	Unauthorized actor or missing standing: no commit.
T03 / 004	Modified target or parameters: reject.
T04 / 005,006	Revocation before commit: reject under declared ordering.
T05 / 004,005	Replay: no second protected commit.
T06 / 005	Deliberate bypass: independent target confirms no unauthorized commit.
T07 / 007	Refusal: obligation, owner and review condition retained.
T08 / 008	Outcome mismatch: discrepancy recorded independently.
T09 / 009	Unauthorized policy change: rejected or detected per declared control.

Conformance and measurement

Proposed levels are cumulative and apply only to a declared implementation, version, domain and threat model. They are not existing certifications.

Level	Required evidence
ACGA-1	Documented consequence admissibility, traceable records and explicit limitations. No enforcement claim.
ACGA-2	Level 1 plus protected execution enforcement and adversarial tests of binding, revocation, replay and bypass.
ACGA-3	Level 2 plus independent outcome verification and obligation continuity.

Result classification

PASS: all predeclared criteria met with adequate observations. FAIL: a criterion is contradicted. UNRESOLVED: observations or test conditions are insufficient. An unresolved mandatory test prevents the corresponding conformance claim.

Performance reporting

Report sample size, workload, latency distribution (including p50, p95 and p99 where meaningful), clock uncertainty, failures and exclusions. Do not generalize beyond tested conditions.

Governance of governance

The governed system MUST NOT unilaterally change its own governing requirements without applicable authority and established standing.

Change control

Version policies, thresholds, roles, schemas and enforcement configuration. Record change proposal, justification, approver, effective time and rollback conditions.

Separation of responsibilities

Declare who proposes, approves, deploys and independently reviews changes. Where separation is infeasible, document the risk and compensating controls.

Audit continuity

Preserve prior policy versions and their relationship to each determination. A later policy change MUST NOT silently rewrite earlier decision legitimacy.

Residual risk

Privileged access, physical bypass, compromised sensors and unobservable effects may defeat controls. Declare these limitations instead of asserting absolute enforcement.

ACGA / 20

Release and institutional approval

Draft 3 extends Draft 2 with normative technical annexes. It is not a registration, certification, independent validation report or production readiness declaration.

Release gates

Reconcile terminology and hierarchy against the existing TA-14 corpus; freeze the normative text and requirement identifiers; review domain applicability and threat assumptions; obtain founder approval.

Implementation assurance

Map each requirement to implementation evidence, test results and residual risks. Distinguish specified, implemented, demonstrated, independently validated and production-approved capabilities.

Publication record

Preserve Draft 1 and Draft 2; record revision history, approved version, publication date and content digest when released. Do not backdate or imply priority without supporting records.

Defining doctrine

The jurisdiction of governance is determined by the consequence that becomes reality, not by the intelligence that proposes it. Prediction anticipates reality; consequence governance determines whether changing reality is justified NOW.

ACGA / NORMATIVE ANNEX A

Revision authority and lineage

Draft 3 retains the substantive baseline of Draft 2 (sections 00–20). Annexes A–G supplement that baseline and take precedence where they explicitly amend it. All requirements remain proposed until founder approval. Drafts 1 and 2 remain unchanged.

Change	Disposition
ACGA-001	Replace with: Prediction MUST NOT substitute for evidence required to establish execution-time admissibility. Predictive outputs may inform consequence formation but cannot independently establish present-tense execution legitimacy.
Sections 05, 10	Annex B defines conservative time intervals and revocation ordering.
Sections 08, 11, 12	Annex C defines transitions and protected commit.
Sections 17, 18	Annexes E and F expand tests and conformance.
Section 20	Annex G specifies release and corpus reconciliation.

Source baseline: TA-14 ACGA v1.0 Draft 2, 25 November 2026, 22 pages. Wider institutional lineage has not been independently reconciled. No priority or novelty claim is made.

Temporal admissibility at commit

B01. Represent observation time as interval [o_min, o_max] and commit time as [c_min, c_max], including clock error and transport uncertainty. Require o_max <= c_min and c_max - o_min <= F, where F is the domain-approved maximum age. If ordering cannot be established, HOLD unless an explicitly authorized alternative evidence method satisfies the requirement.

B02. For authorization validity [v_start, v_end), require c_min >= v_start and c_max < v_end. The target MUST bind the policy version, action digest, actor, target and unique attempt. All required predicates AE, AA and ES MUST be satisfied; unresolved is not satisfied.

B03. Define a target-side serialization point for revocation and commit. A revocation ordered before commit MUST prevent that commit. If revocation visibility is bounded rather than immediate, disclose the bound and do not claim immediate global revocation. Where the required ordering cannot be established, withhold the action.

B04. Consume single-use authorization atomically with protected acceptance, or provide equivalent crash-safe semantics. An uncertain commit MUST be reconciled before retry. Continuing actions require defined reauthorization checkpoints and termination behavior.

Illustrative interval	Evaluation
Observation [100,102]; commit [108,110]; F=10 s	Worst-case age 10 s; ordering established. Freshness passes only.
Validity [105,110)	Commit upper bound equals expiry; authorization fails.
Revocation ordered before commit	Reject regardless of earlier ALLOW.

State transitions and enforcement

C01. Proposal formation, authorization and protected acceptance are distinct.

PROPOSED -> DETERMINED: assess evidence, authority and standing.
DETERMINED -> AUTHORIZED: exact action bound by ALLOW.
DETERMINED -> BLOCKED: HOLD, NARROW, ESCALATE or DENY.
AUTHORIZED -> BLOCKED: expiry, revocation or material change.
AUTHORIZED -> COMMITTED: target validates and consumes authorization.
COMMITTED -> EXECUTED, FAILED or UNKNOWN: reconcile actual action.
BLOCKED -> VERIFIED NONEXECUTION or UNRESOLVED: independent observation.
EXECUTED / FAILED / UNKNOWN -> VERIFIED or UNRESOLVED outcome.

C02. No BLOCKED state may transition directly to COMMITTED. NARROW creates a new proposal requiring separate ALLOW. Any retry requires a new attempt and separate ALLOW; reconcile uncertain prior effects first.

C03. Commit is protected acceptance, not proof of physical effect. Failed execution may have partial effects. Verified nonexecution requires adequate independent observation of the declared target and interval. A refusal or missing receipt alone is insufficient. Outcome verification is separate from execution status and does not imply success.

C04. Preserve execution status, history and outstanding obligations for every terminal or unresolved attempt. T08, T14 and T17 must exercise these distinctions.

Worked consequence record

Illustrative synthetic building-control record; not a deployment result. A ventilation increase is proposed during an outdoor particulate event. The initial attempt is held; a revised action is independently assessed.

Field	Example value
Proposal / attempt	P-001 / A-001; target AHU-01; increase outdoor airflow
Evidence	E-01 indoor CO2; E-02 outdoor PM; E-03 equipment limits; E-02 freshness unresolved
Authority / standing	Policy ENV-01; operator role verified; exact action scope pending
Decision	HOLD; reason EVIDENCE_STALE; no execution authorization
Target observation	Synthetic test observer reports no accepted command during declared observation interval
Obligation	O-01: evaluate occupant protection; assigned operator; review within declared domain deadline
Revision	P-002 / A-002; alternative action; new evidence and separate determination required
Outcome	UNRESOLVED until adequate independent observations exist

D01. A record MUST distinguish intended action, authorized action, target acceptance, actual effect and observation limits. D02. A record digest protects integrity only; it does not establish truth. D03. Record access, retention and disclosure MUST follow applicable privacy and security requirements.

Expanded adversarial validation

Retain T01–T09 from section 17. Add the following tests. Freeze the target, policy, build, observation window and expected result before execution. All test results are currently NOT EXECUTED for this specification.

Test	Required pass criterion
T10 Positive control	Valid AE/AA/ES and bound ALLOW produce exactly one expected protected commit.
T11 Network partition	No unauthorized commit when required revocation or evidence visibility is unavailable.
T12 Clock uncertainty	Commit interval overlapping expiry is rejected.
T13 Evidence tampering	Altered provenance or digest rejected; authentic but inadequate evidence also withheld.
T14 Crash and retry	No duplicate effect; unknown prior commit reconciled before retry.
T15 NARROW	Reduced proposal cannot commit without a distinct ALLOW.
T16 Continuing action	Required checkpoint failure triggers declared protective behavior.
T17 Observer failure	Missing independent observation yields UNRESOLVED, not PASS.
T18 Unauthorized policy change	Unauthorized change cannot take effect; detection alone does not pass prevention claim.

E01. Independent observers MUST have a declared trust relationship and sufficient coverage to detect the relevant target effect. Absence of a gate receipt is not proof of nonexecution. E02. T18 strengthens T09 for any prevention claim.

Requirement-to-test traceability

Invariant	Test coverage	Minimum level
001 Prediction boundary	T01, T13; include explicit prediction substitution	1 / 2
002 Authority	T02	1 / 2
003 AE / AA / ES	T01, T02, T10	1 / 2
004 Exact binding	T03, T05, T15	2
005 Commit validity	T04–T06, T10–T12, T14	2
006 Material change	T04, T11, T16	2
007 Obligations	T07, T14	1 / 3
008 Outcome distinction	T08, T17	1 / 3
009 Governance changes	T09, T18	1 / 2
010 Explicit unknowns	T01, T13, T17	1 / 3

F01. Level 1 requires documented review of every applicable invariant and annex requirement; no enforcement claim. Level 2 adds all applicable target enforcement tests T01–T06, T09–T16 and T18. Level 3 adds T07, T08 and T17 with independent observation and obligation continuity. All levels are cumulative; any exclusion requires documented rationale and narrower claim scope.

F02. For each requirement (including B01–B04, C01–C04, D01–D03, E01–E02, F01–F02 and G01–G03), record implementation reference, verification method, result, reviewer and residual risk. Mandatory unresolved results prevent the affected conformance claim. This matrix is a test plan, not test evidence.

Institutional release gates

G01. Reconcile ACGA against the dated TA-14 corpus, including AEA, ACA, AIR, AHIA, HPS, HPGS, EIG, FEIG and prior consequence formation governance. Record source title, version, publication date, identifier, relevant passage, compatibility decision and reviewer. No lineage claim is accepted without the source record.

G02. Freeze the approved specification and normative identifiers; record content digest, revision history, founder approval and release date. Publication of the specification is distinct from product conformance or certification.

G03. Before an implementation conformance claim, freeze implementation and threat model, execute applicable tests, independently review results and disclose residual risks. Production deployment additionally requires domain safety and legal review.

Gate	Current status
Draft 3 technical amendments	Prepared for review
Corpus reconciliation	OPEN - source examination required
Founder approval / specification freeze	OPEN
Independent implementation validation	NOT EXECUTED
Public registration / production approval	NOT CLAIMED

Defining doctrine: The jurisdiction of governance is determined by the consequence that becomes reality, not by the intelligence that proposes it.

RC2 | Revision and lineage record

26 November 2026. This consolidated review candidate retains the RC1 requirements and integrates its execution-state amendments into Annex C. Historical references to Draft 3 identify the source baseline.

AEA retains execution jurisdiction; ACGA coordinates consequence formation through outcome. AuthorityGate is enforcement technology. Existing TA-14 standards are not superseded by this candidate. Repository excerpts support continuity with indoor-air governance and proof of blocked execution; dated source texts still require review under G01.

Founder approval and corpus reconciliation remain open. No implementation test has been executed for this candidate.

RC1 | Annex verification register

The following mappings supplement Annex F. Document review applies at level 1; implementation tests apply where the relevant enforcement or outcome claim is made. All results remain NOT EXECUTED or OPEN.

Requirement	Verification method
B01	T01, T12: observation ordering and freshness boundary cases.
B02	T02, T03, T10, T12: identity, binding, validity and predicates.
B03	T04, T11: revocation ordering and partition.
B04	T05, T14, T16: atomic consumption, recovery and checkpoints.
C01–C02	T03, T10, T15: legal transitions and blocked paths.
C03–C04	T07, T08, T14, T17: adverse outcomes, unknowns and obligations.
D01	T06, T08, T17: compare intent, acceptance and effect records.
D02	T13: integrity versus evidentiary adequacy.
D03	Review access, retention and disclosure controls against applicable requirements.
E01–E02	T06, T17, T18: observer coverage and policy prevention.
F01–F02	Review scope, exclusions, complete requirement register and results.
G01	Review dated source texts and signed compatibility dispositions.
G02	Verify approved version, digest, revision history and release record.
G03	Review frozen build, test evidence, independent review and domain approvals.

RC2 | Release decision and source register

Source baseline: TA-14 ACGA v1.0 Draft 3, 25 November 2026, 29 pages. RC1 preserves the source requirements and adds controlling clarifications. Earlier drafts remain separate.

Preliminary repository evidence: commit dbf0335fe536b9794a43d24e481bf1017b97b417; paths apps/web/app/indoor-air-governance/page.tsx and apps/web/app/ai-governance/prove-ai-action-was-blocked/page.tsx. Excerpts support evidence/authority separation and bounded proof of nonexecution. They do not establish publication chronology or complete corpus compatibility.

Candidate references requiring full source examination: AEA, ACA, AIR, AHIA, HPS, HPGS, EIG, FEIG, Consequence Formation Governance, and TA14-LAS, CAG, RAP, CCS, POR, RVS, AVP and CONF. No normative incorporation by reference is effective until exact versions and compatibility dispositions are approved.

Release gate	Status
Candidate text	Prepared for review
Dated corpus reconciliation	OPEN
Founder approval and freeze	OPEN
Independent implementation validation	NOT EXECUTED
Public registration	NOT CLAIMED

Approval of the specification does not certify a product. Registration must use the approved artifact and actual release date.

Founder decision: _____ Date: _____

ACGA v1.0 | Consolidated approval candidate

26 November 2026 • Annex H — Institutional reconciliation and controlling clarification

Status: proposed amendment to RC2; not approved or registered. Annex H controls interpretation of RC2 where the two differ. Existing TA-14 architectures and applicable standards retain their own jurisdiction. No new conformance claim is created.

H01 | Formation and attachment

Consequence formation includes reliance, expectation, workflow and operational truth before formal execution. Where those transitions themselves create material consequence, assess them within the declared governance scope. Attachment/assent establishes legitimate attribution and attachability before binding; it is not binding or execution authorization. AEA remains the parent admissible-execution architecture.

H02 | Living authority and constitutional correspondence

Execution-time AE, AA and ES remain necessary, not a substitute for applicable LAS, CAG, RAP or CCS controls. Where applicable, maintain authority and admissibility while consequence remains possible, enforce continuity gaps and final checks, preserve constitutional correspondence, budgets, irreversibility, remedy and closure. Loss of admissibility requires the applicable protective response; no retrospective authorization is implied.

H03 | Restraint and outcome

AuthorityGate enforces a declared protected boundary. POR and PCA govern distinct evidence claims of restraint and prevention. A refusal or missing receipt does not establish non-occurrence; bounded nonexecution does not establish avoided harm or economic value. Apply applicable proof-class, route coverage and external finality requirements.

H04 | Release boundary

G01 remains OPEN. This is a preliminary compatibility disposition based on supplied local editions, not a signed review of the complete dated registered corpus. G02 founder approval and freeze remain OPEN. G03 implementation validation remains separate and unexecuted for this specification.

Annex H | Source reconciliation register

Foundational Monograph v1.2

PDF pp. 1, 37 (printed 35) — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. AEA remains parent; reliance may become consequence before formal execution. ACGA coordinates, not supersedes.

Local source SHA-256: fe0c5d6c00c33ac6dc7347a4d99bde96de0b822248b0c7b2ca2bdebffc35644d

Attachment / Assent Governance v1.0

pp. 1–2 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Attachment establishes attachability, not binding. Preserve attachment as a distinct prerequisite where applicable.

Local source SHA-256: b4765fe336eee2f521af12bf784a79e50e24b675a510dcec49d3ea2c166e0647

Living Authority Standard 4.1.1

pp. 1–2, 13 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Authority remains legitimate until consequence closes; residual obligations and Authority Debt remain visible.

Local source SHA-256: 5f802bb0dbe7d582f4f065c31860a1ae9d0b70809919981bf196b6265dfd9cfd

Continuous Admissibility Governance 1.0.1

pp. 1–2, 9–12 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Continuity persists while consequence remains possible; applicable heartbeat and maximum-gap requirements are not replaced by commit-time checks. Cover says 1.0.1; metadata says 1.0; resolve before freeze.

Local source SHA-256: 1bb4579ad3da23560e54f71ddfc0d7b136603cad4085651d36b1785775e7ae11

Annex H | Source reconciliation register

Runtime Admissibility Protocol 1.0.1

pp. 1, 8, 15 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Receiving boundary preserves semantics; final heartbeat and correspondence precede protected credential issuance.

Local source SHA-256: 8a40a81fb969ef9b75876522635c2e8fe97beac61c30d8ecbd4902e0ee52de70

Consequence Constitution Specification 1.0.1

pp. 1, 7, 16, 18 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Exact action binding does not replace constitutional correspondence, aggregate budgets, irreversibility, remedy or closure.

Local source SHA-256: a531d25a5e5276df5d096a49261f8a5ca9d650915a75b20a48d106d34d804e05

Proof of Restraint 1.0.1

pp. 5–6, 9, 15–16 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Denial or absent logs alone cannot prove restraint; apply relevant proof class, coverage and external finality.

Local source SHA-256: eed845728d158d10454402b9e934b5972f98ffed380472709cff5b140bb1351c

Prevented Consequence Architecture Engine v1.3

pp. 6–7, 15–16, 38 — Preliminary disposition: compatible subject to H01–H03. Preserve bounded prevention proof and counterfactual limits; verified nonexecution is not proof of avoided harm.

Local source SHA-256: 6aae110cc4a21257cd891627267b12de03211c2e2fe582e3c86575b7b48fbfc6

Annex H | Remaining release actions

The five standards supplied are July 2026 release-candidate editions with DOI assignment pending in their own metadata. Confirm registered version identity and publication dates against deposited records; do not infer registration from filenames. Foundational monograph, attachment and PCA deposit identities also require confirmation.

Outstanding standalone sources: ACA, AIR, AHIA, HPS, HPGS, EIG, FEIG and Consequence Formation Governance; candidate RVS, AVP and CONF references require disposition. Record exact versions, identifiers, relevant passages and reviewer decisions.

Reviewer: AI-assisted preliminary comparison; institutional reviewer and founder approval not recorded.

Founder approval: _____ Date: _____

Release digest: to be computed after approval and freeze.

Implementation tests and independent validation: not claimed.

Annex I | Consolidated source disposition

26 November 2026 | Proposed release disposition for founder approval. This annex supplements Annex H and does not amend the substantive ACGA requirements.

ACA: Local foundational v1.1, September 2026, pp. 12, 28, 30–33 and 42; supplemental Continuing Standing v2.0, pp. 2–6. Preliminary textual comparison supports independent computational and execution authorization, changed-condition revalidation and outcome reset. ACA retains its four determinations; ACGA retains its five. Parent DOI reported by supplement: 10.5281/zenodo.22550386; deposited identity not verified.

AIR: Environmental observations, provenance, calibration, uncertainty and continuity. Standalone foundational edition not located. Informative relationship only.

AHIA: Human intervention legitimacy. Reported source DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21877810; full text and deposited identity not verified here. Informative relationship only.

HPS / HPGS: Human performance and guidance respectively. Exact foundational editions not verified. Neither guidance nor capability confers execution authority.

EIG / FEIG: Environmental and financial domain governance. Exact foundational editions not verified. Informative relationships only.

Consequence Formation Governance: Foundational Monograph v1.2, PDF p. 37, supports the formation pathway; separate registered edition not verified. Annex H preserves the formation distinction.

RVS / AVP / CONF: No normative incorporation in this candidate; exact editions and compatibility remain unverified.

Disposition: no additional architecture is introduced. No claim of complete corpus reconciliation is made. Existing applicable institutional requirements remain in force.

Annex I | Approval and freeze record

G01 — Corpus reconciliation: OPEN. Proposed limited-scope disposition: adopt ACGA as a standalone specification with unverified references informative only. This is a proposed change to the release criterion, not a completed reconciliation. Founder must explicitly accept or reject it.

G02 — Approval and freeze: OPEN. Approve the exact consolidated document, record the decision and date, and calculate the final file digest. No institutional adoption or registration is asserted.

G03 — Implementation assurance: OPEN and separate. No AuthorityGate implementation test, independent validation, or deployment conformance is claimed by this document.

Baseline SHA-256:
6dd427462d0f1e0d16ca77fdb34764612bca60c1305bc5231c5699611748cf5e

Revision: Original 36 pages preserved; Annex I added. Where Annex H lists outstanding ACA work, the preliminary local-text comparison above updates that status only. All other open items remain open.

Founder decision: _____

Acceptance of limited-scope G01 disposition: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Final approved artifact digest: _____

Reviewer: AI-assisted preliminary comparison; independent institutional review not recorded.

Release disposition | 26 November 2026

ACGA v1.0 — public examination edition

The founder delegated the technical release decision in conversation. The AI-assisted recommendation is to approve limited-scope publication as a standalone proposed specification. This record is not a personally signed founder approval or independent institutional certification.

G01: Limited-scope disposition recommended; full corpus reconciliation remains open. Unverified references are informative only. Existing applicable TA-14 requirements retain their jurisdiction.

G02: This artifact is frozen for publication review. Formal institutional adoption and registration remain unrecorded. Earlier approval fields are retained as historical records, not completed signatures.

G03: Implementation assurance remains separate; no conformance, independent validation or deployment approval is claimed.

No substantive requirements changed. Minor visual corrections were made on pages 9, 25 and 30. The preceding 38 pages preserve the candidate and its limitations.

Candidate SHA-256: abcd4137d02c44a4245d56ca40a953ae0654fa91d337378809402caecdaca44e

The final artifact digest is recorded separately to avoid a self-referential hash.