TA-14 AUTHORITY GOVERNANCE INSTITUTION LLC

VERSION 0.4 | CONSOLIDATED REVIEW DRAFT | NOVEMBER 16, 2026

Bounded Technical Demonstration Protocol

TA-14 × ONUMA × Asset Leadership × Community Governance

Prepared by Greggory Don Butler | For independent technical examination

Status: Proposed simulation / controlled evaluation. No partnership, municipal site, live control authorization, funding, certification, or field validation is asserted.

01 Purpose and decision requested

This protocol proposes a small, falsifiable technical evaluation of whether a proposed building intervention can be connected to explicit owner intent, attributable environmental evidence, applicable authority, established standing, and an independently reviewable decision record. It is intended as a discussion artifact for TA-14, ONUMA, Asset Leadership Network, UnityNet International, and prospective building owners or reviewers; named organizations have not accepted responsibilities by inclusion here.

Proposed decision for the next meeting: agree whether the scenario is appropriate for a first simulated demonstration, identify available inputs and independent reviewers, and authorize drafting a jointly scoped test plan. Do not authorize field control at this stage.

Central question

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

What this protocol does not claim

It does not establish that the proposed system is deployed, independently validated, legally approved, suitable for emergency use, capable of achieving specified health outcomes, or accepted by any public authority. A demonstration of decision logic is not proof of improved air quality.

02 Scenario and bounded scope

A hypothetical public library is considered for temporary use as a Clean Air Sanctuary during an outdoor particle-pollution episode. An analytical system proposes a bounded ventilation or window-state change intended to reduce outdoor particle entry. The decision must account for indoor and outdoor measurements, ventilation adequacy, thermal conditions, equipment constraints, occupant requirements, and the applicable institutional decision process.

Initial evaluation boundary

• Environment: simulated building, or an offline replay of permissioned historical data.

• Candidate action: one specified ventilation/window-state recommendation, not general autonomous HVAC control.

• Outputs: ALLOW, HOLD, DENY, or ESCALATE, with a machine-readable and human-readable rationale.

• Excluded: live actuation, emergency response claims, health certification, blanket authority transfer, and assumptions of municipal consent.

Success means

An independent reviewer can reconstruct the proposed action, evidence available at the decision time, authority basis, decision outcome, and limitations. Success can include correct refusal to act.

03 System boundaries and roles

Layer	Proposed responsibility
Owner / institution	Defines the desired outcome, operational constraints, decision rights, and acceptance conditions.
Community governance	Represents affected needs, stewardship expectations, and any consent requirements without replacing statutory or professional authority.
ONUMA / building representation	Supplies modeled spaces, systems, and context; distinguishes represented topology from verified field conditions.
Environmental evidence	Supplies time-attributed measurements, provenance, calibration information, uncertainty, and continuity.
TA-14 AEA / EIG	Evaluates evidence, authority, standing, and competing environmental consequences before disposition.
Independent review	Challenges scenarios, observes outcomes, and checks record reproducibility.

Separation rule: no participant gains execution authority simply because their model, sensor, algorithm, or preference is present in the workflow.

04 Required inputs and provenance

Input class	Minimum demonstration fields
Proposed action	Action identifier, actuator or simulated target, direction, bounded magnitude, start/end conditions, requested time.
Environmental observations	Indoor/outdoor particulate data as available; relevant CO2, temperature, humidity, and ventilation indicators; timestamp and location.
Evidence quality	Sensor identity, calibration status, data age, uncertainty where known, gaps, revisions, and source attribution.
Building context	Model version, relevant zones, system capacities/constraints, verified versus assumed equipment state.
Authority / standing	Decision owner, applicable policy or authority reference, delegated scope, validity interval, conflict or escalation path.
Acceptance criteria	Explicit pollutant and competing-condition thresholds or bounded comparison rules approved for the simulation.
Audit record	Inputs, rule version, decision, explanation, approvals, simulated action status, and outcome observations.

Specific numerical thresholds are intentionally not invented. They must be selected with appropriate building professionals and owners, then frozen before test execution. Missing required fields are testable conditions, not silently filled assumptions.

05 Decision model

Disposition semantics

Disposition	Operational interpretation
ALLOW	All defined prerequisites are met for this bounded action, within stated scope and duration; not a general permission to control the building.
HOLD	A required prerequisite is missing, stale, uncertain, or unresolved. No execution occurs.
DENY	The action violates a known prohibition, safety constraint, or applicable boundary. No execution occurs.
ESCALATE	An authorized human or institution must resolve a conflict, exception, or authority question before any action.

Evaluation sequence

1. Bind the candidate action and decision timestamp. 2. Check input provenance and freshness. 3. Check building and environmental constraints. 4. Check applicable authority and established standing. 5. Evaluate competing environmental consequences. 6. Issue disposition and preserve rationale. 7. Simulate only if explicitly allowed by the test harness. 8. Verify modeled outcome and record uncertainty.

Fail-closed principle: an unsupported action cannot inherit permission from a prediction, an earlier authorization, a different jurisdiction, or a missing record.

06 Test matrix — adversarial by design

ID	Test condition	Expected result
T01	Complete valid evidence, authority, standing, and no breached constraint.	ALLOW within bounded simulated scope.
T02	Required instrument calibration record missing.	HOLD; identify missing evidence.
T03	High-confidence prediction but no action authorization.	HOLD or ESCALATE per frozen policy; never ALLOW.
T04	Proposed change violates a defined environmental constraint.	DENY or ESCALATE according to severity and policy.
T05	Community preference conflicts with an institutional or statutory requirement.	ESCALATE; preserve separate authority claims.
T06	Emergency authority asserted without evidence of applicability.	HOLD / ESCALATE; no presumed override.
T07	Measurement is stale or revised after decision time.	HOLD or reevaluate; preserve prior version.
T08	Simulated action permitted, but target outcome unverified.	Record action separately from unproven outcome.
T09	Model from Lagos reused for Canada without local authorization.	HOLD / ESCALATE until local context and authority are established.
T10	Contradictory sensor streams or unresolved uncertainty.	HOLD / ESCALATE, with explicit conflict.

Expected results are hypotheses for testing, not recorded achievements. Before running the test, the parties must freeze precedence rules for HOLD versus ESCALATE and DENY versus ESCALATE, so results cannot be rationalized afterward.

07 Execution procedure and evidence capture

A. Freeze test configuration

Record the scenario version, rule set, actor permissions, modeled building, evidence inputs, and pass/fail criteria. Obtain reviewer acknowledgement.

B. Run baseline

Execute the fully supported scenario and capture all evaluated predicates and final disposition.

C. Inject faults and authority conflicts

Run T02-T10 without changing the acceptance rules. Capture each failure mode and whether any unauthorized simulated actuation occurred.

D. Simulate permitted consequence

For T01 only, model the bounded intervention and measure simulated outputs against declared criteria.

E. Preserve evidence

Store immutable or revision-attributed test artifacts: timestamps, data sources, rule versions, decisions, exceptions, and outcome assessments.

F. Independent challenge

Give a reviewer the test package and require them to reconstruct each decision without relying on verbal explanation from the implementer.

08 Acceptance criteria and stopping rules

Proposed pass conditions

• All test scenarios produce a recorded disposition and a reproducible explanation tied to versioned inputs.

• No simulated execution occurs for HOLD, DENY, or ESCALATE.

• No action is ALLOWed solely because a sensor reading, AI forecast, or building model recommends it.

• Required authority and standing checks are independently visible in the audit record.

• The report distinguishes simulation output, observed measurements, inferred benefits, and unresolved outcomes.

• A reviewer can reproduce the decision outcomes using the frozen test package.

Stop / fail conditions

Any unauthorized actuation; missing decision provenance; unlogged alteration of evidence; unbounded permission; inability to reproduce a disposition; or presentation of simulated outcomes as measured physical benefits triggers a failed evaluation and documented corrective action. No silent retesting to replace a failed record.

09 Independent review and reporting

The final test package should include a one-page executive result, scenario definitions, input schema, authority matrix, frozen decision rules, test logs, expected-versus-actual results, reviewer observations, deviations, and unresolved limitations. Record each change as a new version rather than overwriting earlier evidence.

Suggested reviewer questions

• What precisely was permitted, by whom, for which interval and building context?

• Could a different reviewer reproduce the result from the record alone?

• Which environmental harms were evaluated, and which were outside scope?

• What happens when measurements, owner intention, community consent, and statutory authority disagree?

• Which claims would require real-world validation before public deployment?

10 Participant decisions and next actions

Decision	Question for participants
D1 — Scope	Is a single library ventilation/window decision the right first scenario?
D2 — Data	Which existing model, synthetic dataset, or permissioned evidence package can be provided?
D3 — Authority	Who can define owner requirements, community inputs, and the governing policy assumptions?
D4 — Verification	Who will independently observe and challenge the test?
D5 — Governance	Which outputs may be shared publicly, and what requires written permission?
D6 — Resources	What time, staff, infrastructure, and possible municipal participation are realistically available?

Immediate deliverables after scope agreement

1. Signed-off scenario and authority assumptions. 2. Versioned input schema and test fixtures. 3. Frozen expected-results matrix. 4. Executable demonstration harness and evidence package. 5. Independent review report. 6. Public educational showroom only after disclosure scope is agreed.

11 Claims, dependencies, and limitations register

Topic	Current status / dependency
Partner roles	Proposed only; no commitment inferred from correspondence.
Municipal sponsor	Unconfirmed; requires direct institutional engagement.
Grant / funding	Unverified for this proposal; no award, eligibility, or deadline asserted as fact here.
Building data	Not yet selected or authorized for use.
Execution controls	Architecture to be tested; not represented as independently validated.
Health or air quality	No measured improvement or health protection is claimed.
Cross-jurisdiction use	Requires local evidence, authority, and consent; cannot be transferred by analogy.
Publication	Requires review of confidentiality, ownership, and partner consent.

12 Closing proposition

The purpose of this exercise is not to prove that a preferred technology is correct. It is to expose the proposed execution boundary to a disciplined, independent test. A building model may represent context. A sensor may provide evidence. An algorithm may recommend an action. An owner may state an intention. A community may establish needs. None of these, alone, establishes permission to impose a physical consequence.

A justified HOLD is not a failed building. It may be the most important evidence that the proposed governance boundary is working.

Reference educational material: TA-14 Exchange — https://www.ta14exchange.com/ . This protocol is a new proposed demonstration plan, not a replacement for the existing Become the Building educational showroom.

TECHNICAL REFINEMENT | CONSOLIDATED v0.4

This addendum strengthens the November 16, 2026 discussion draft without changing the status of the proposed demonstration. It does not constitute agreement by any named partner, a deployed control system, or field validation.

A1. One fully specified decision transaction

The proposed unit of evaluation is a single immutable decision transaction, not a general claim that a building is safe. The demonstration harness should bind all inputs to a unique transaction identifier and evaluation time.

Field	Illustrative required content
Transaction	Case ID, decision timestamp, policy version, scenario version
Candidate consequence	Close a defined window group or change a specified ventilation state; target, bounds, duration and rollback condition
Evidence snapshot	Indoor/outdoor particle measurements; relevant CO2, temperature, humidity and ventilation indicators; provenance, quality and timestamps
Authority snapshot	Owner/institution decision right; delegation, jurisdiction, validity interval and restrictions
Standing snapshot	Actor identity, role, credentials where applicable, scope and expiration
Evaluation	Evidence checks, competing-consequence checks, authority checks and final disposition
Record	Inputs or hashes, rationale, approvals, action status, simulated outcome and revision lineage

All numerical thresholds, allowed durations, sensor freshness limits and safety constraints must be selected and frozen by the appropriate participants before execution. They are intentionally not invented here.

A2. Deterministic disposition precedence

The original matrix allows alternative dispositions in some scenarios. For a reproducible test, the frozen policy must specify one expected outcome per test fixture, including precedence when multiple conditions occur simultaneously.

Condition	Proposed default for discussion
Known prohibition or breached hard safety constraint	DENY; no execution
Unresolved authority conflict requiring an authorized adjudicator	ESCALATE; no execution
Required evidence missing, stale or insufficient	HOLD; no execution
All defined prerequisites satisfied	ALLOW for that action, scope and interval only

This is a proposed precedence convention, not an assertion of an implemented TA-14 rule. Participants must approve or replace it before tests. ESCALATE must never operate as provisional permission.

A3. Falsifiable scenario fixtures

Each test case must specify inputs, frozen expected disposition, observed disposition, action-attempt status, and reviewer result. The following examples turn the original T01-T10 matrix into an executable planning format.

Fixture	Perturbation	Expected result
F01 / baseline	Evidence, authority, standing and constraints all valid	ALLOW, simulated only
F02 / calibration	Required calibration record absent	HOLD; no action
F03 / prediction	Strong forecast; authorization absent	HOLD; no action
F04 / prohibition	Proposed action violates a frozen hard limit	DENY; no action
F05 / conflict	Two authority claims conflict; adjudication required	ESCALATE; no action
F06 / emergency	Emergency authority claimed but not established	HOLD; no action
F07 / stale	Evidence older than frozen freshness bound	HOLD; no action
F08 / outcome	Allowed simulation has no reliable outcome evidence	ALLOW decision distinct from unverified outcome
F09 / jurisdiction	Lagos authorization reused in Canada	HOLD; no action
F10 / contradiction	Required sensor streams materially disagree	HOLD; no action

These expected outcomes are design hypotheses. The evaluator must not rewrite expected results after seeing actual outputs. If the policy requires a different disposition, change the fixture and document the revision before the run.

A4. Decision versus consequence

Decision test: Was the proposed action admissible at the evaluation time? **Execution test:** Did the harness block every non-ALLOW action? **Outcome test:** Did the modeled or measured environmental outcome meet predeclared criteria? These are three separate claims and must be reported separately.

A permitted simulated intervention is not evidence that the physical building responded as predicted. A correct HOLD does not establish air-quality improvement. No public health benefit is inferred from the simulated result.

A5. Time, continuity and revision controls

The record should identify the source timestamp, receipt timestamp, decision timestamp and any action timestamp. Late evidence cannot silently rewrite an earlier decision. Revised evidence creates a new version linked to the prior version, with a new evaluation where required. Any break in required evidence continuity is explicit.

A6. Independent-review package and release gate

An independent reviewer should be able to reproduce every decision without asking the implementer to supply undocumented assumptions.

Required artifact	Reviewer question answered
Versioned scenario and scope	What exactly was tested, and what was excluded?
Frozen policy and precedence rules	What conditions determine each disposition?
Input fixtures and provenance	What evidence existed at decision time?
Authority and standing matrix	Who could authorize what, where, and when?
Raw decision logs and action-attempt logs	Did any non-ALLOW decision cause execution?
Expected-versus-observed results	Did the harness behave as specified?
Outcome assessment with uncertainty	What was simulated, observed or unverified?
Exceptions, deviations and revision history	Were failures retained rather than replaced?

A7. Pass, fail and publication criteria

Pass: All predeclared fixtures produce the frozen expected result; no non-ALLOW fixture actuates even in simulation; records are complete; an independent reviewer reproduces the dispositions; and simulation is never represented as physical validation.

Fail: Unauthorized simulated action; incorrect disposition; missing or altered evidence without attribution; incomplete authority basis; unreproducible result; or misleading outcome claim. Failures remain in the record and require a new, versioned test run after correction.

Publication gate: The educational showroom may describe the proposed method without implying endorsement. Any named partner role, municipal site, actual test result, private data or funding claim requires appropriate confirmation and disclosure permission before public release.

A8. Questions for the November 17 discussion

1. Will participants accept a single library window/ventilation decision as the initial scenario?
2. Who can provide a permissioned building model or synthetic alternative?
3. Who defines and approves owner intention, community input and institutional authority?
4. Who will freeze policy precedence and acceptance thresholds?
5. Who will independently challenge the test package?
6. What information may be shared publicly, and when?

VERSION 0.4 | REVIEW CORRECTIONS AND OPEN DECISIONS

Revision control

The nine-page v0.1 baseline and v0.2 technical addendum are retained for traceability.

This v0.4 edition consolidates document controls and records remaining decisions.

Required decisions before executing the demonstration

1. Select one exact simulated window or ventilation action, target and duration.
2. Freeze numerical evidence-quality, freshness and environmental limits.
3. Identify the owner policy source, delegated decision maker and standing proof.
4. Approve one deterministic disposition for each frozen test fixture.
5. Specify rollback, timeout, cancellation and repeat-evaluation conditions.
6. Name an independent reviewer and agree on the replayable evidence package.
7. Agree on what may be disclosed publicly before any showroom publication.

Critical interpretive boundary

ALLOW is a bounded decision in the simulation, not permission for physical control.

A successful gate test does not demonstrate improved indoor air quality or safety.

Any physical pilot requires separate institutional authorization and field validation.

Named collaborators are prospective contributors, not confirmed project partners.

Independent challenge

An independent examiner must be able to reproduce each decision from frozen inputs, policy, authority evidence, rule versions and recorded outputs alone.

Failures must remain attributable; later corrections require a new versioned run.

Status: discussion draft. No live actuation or partner endorsement asserted.