EXAMINATION EDITION 1.0 / 26 NOVEMBER 2026

Governing One Intake Damper

One asset. One decision. One consequence.

A TA-14 consequence governance showroom and independent examination guide, prepared for discussion with Michael Bordenaro and Lloyd Helferty.

The question is not merely whether the building intelligence can recommend an action. It is whether the proposed action is justified at the moment it would change reality.

Scope

One occupied building, one primary outdoor-air intake, one motorized damper. No secondary intake or alternative filtration path. The demonstration follows a proposed increase in outdoor-air ventilation as conditions change.

Status

Proposed educational simulation. No physical deployment, validated control sequence, certification, or partner endorsement is asserted.

Greggory Don Butler | Founder
TA-14 Authority Governance Institution LLC
www.ta14exchange.com

EXHIBIT 01 / 08

The asset

Establish the asset and its authorized operating envelope.

Scenario

The building has one outdoor-air intake damper, initially at a simulated 20% position. The owner and qualified engineers define permissible states, required ventilation, interlocks, fallback and delegated roles. Position is not a measurement of airflow.

Examination criterion

Identify the asset, owner policy, permitted action and actor standing before proposing a change.

Narration

Before we govern an action, we must know the asset and who may act.

Companion image brief

One occupied building and a single labeled intake damper; no second intake.

EXHIBIT 02 / 08

Reality changes

Capture conditions before interpretation.

Scenario

Indoor CO2 rises to a simulated 1,400 ppm. Outdoor PM2.5 is initially 12 micrograms per cubic meter. AIR preserves sensor identity, time, calibration status, uncertainty and continuity. CO2 is a ventilation indicator, not a complete measure of air quality.

Examination criterion

Reject missing, stale or invalid evidence; distinguish measurement from inference.

Narration

Reality is changing. The record must remain attributable to reality.

Companion image brief

Same building, occupants and indoor/outdoor measurement records.

EXHIBIT 03 / 08

Intelligence proposes

Separate recommendation from permission.

Scenario

ACA evaluates evidence admissibility before intelligence interprets it. The intelligence proposes increasing the damper from 20% to 50%. The proposal identifies asset, target, reason, evidence references and policy version. It does not authorize movement.

Examination criterion

Show that a recommendation cannot itself issue an actuator command.

Narration

Intelligence can propose an action. A proposal is not permission.

Companion image brief

Same damper, dashboard and proposed 50% target; no movement yet.

EXHIBIT 04 / 08

The world does not wait

Expose the gap between decision and execution.

Scenario

Before execution, simulated outdoor PM2.5 rises to 85 micrograms per cubic meter. The original proposal still exists, but its environmental assumptions have changed. The latest record must be considered at the execution boundary.

Examination criterion

Demonstrate that the earlier favorable reading cannot authorize the pending action.

Narration

The world may change before the command reaches the asset.

Companion image brief

Same building exterior with smoke haze; timestamped change in outdoor evidence.

EXHIBIT 05 / 08

The execution boundary

Independently inspect the proposed consequence.

Scenario

AEA evaluates Admissible Evidence, Applicable Authority and Established Standing at execution. AuthorityGate is the proposed software enforcement boundary. The new evidence conflicts with the modeled operating policy; the increase is not authorized.

Examination criterion

Record ESCALATE for conflicting conditions, HOLD for missing evidence, DENY for absent authority or standing, and ALLOW only when all applicable checks pass.

Narration

The proposed consequence must pass an independent execution boundary.

Companion image brief

Same damper and independent gate between recommendation and actuator.

EXHIBIT 06 / 08

Governed intervention

Prevent the unjustified increase without defeating safety.

Scenario

The simulated damper remains at its prior permitted state while an authorized operator receives the conflict. This is not an instruction to close the damper or reduce required ventilation. If the prior state is unsafe, the approved safety fallback takes precedence.

Examination criterion

Verify no additional opening occurred; preserve required ventilation and independent life-safety controls.

Narration

A refused increase does not mean abandoning ventilation or safety.

Companion image brief

Same damper at prior position, escalation notice and operator review.

EXHIBIT 07 / 08

Renewed justification

Require a new decision when conditions change again.

Scenario

Outdoor PM2.5 returns to a simulated 12 micrograms per cubic meter. Indoor CO2 remains elevated. Fresh evidence, current policy and actor standing are evaluated again. A new bounded authorization permits the simulated 50% target if all checks pass.

Examination criterion

Reject reuse of earlier authorization; verify a new action-specific decision before movement.

Narration

A new action requires new justification.

Companion image brief

Same building in clearer conditions, one damper moving toward its authorized target.

EXHIBIT 08 / 08

Proof of outcome

Distinguish authorization, execution and verified outcome.

Scenario

Simulated actuator feedback reports the target position. Separate airflow and environmental observations are required to establish ventilation response. If feedback is missing or inconsistent, record outcome as unverified and escalate under the approved policy.

Examination criterion

Preserve the decision, command, feedback and environmental observations; never claim cleaner air from position alone.

Narration

An authorized command is not proof of a successful outcome.

Companion image brief

Same damper, position feedback, airflow measurement and outcome record.

TECHNICAL EXAMINATION / 01

The governance chain

Reality → record → continuity → admissibility → binding → commit → execution → outcome

AIR / Atmospheric Integrity Records

Attributable environmental observations with timestamps, instrument metadata, uncertainty and continuity.

ACA / Admissible Computation Architecture

Evaluate evidence eligibility before intelligence interprets it; preserve rejected evidence and reasons.

Intelligence

Generate a proposed intervention, not an execution authorization.

AEA / Admissible Execution Architecture

Independently evaluate evidence, applicable authority and established standing at the point of consequence.

AuthorityGate

Proposed enforcement interface: bind an authorization to the asset, action, policy, evidence and validity interval; recheck at execution and prevent replay.

Outcome

Record command and independent feedback; distinguish position, airflow and environmental response.

TECHNICAL EXAMINATION / 02

Decision and test matrix

Illustrative acceptance criteria for a future implementation. These tests have not been executed. The thresholds are scenario inputs, not health standards or operational setpoints.

Test condition	Expected result
Current evidence; policy permits; standing valid	ALLOW; one bounded simulated command
Stale or missing required evidence	HOLD; no new command
Authority absent or revoked	DENY; no new command
Actor standing absent	DENY; no new command
Outdoor pollution changes before commit	ESCALATE; no new increase
Replay or changed target after authorization	DENY; require new evaluation
Authorized command; feedback missing	Outcome unverified; escalate
Second intervention after conditions change	Fresh independent evaluation required
Safety interlock or required ventilation conflict	Preserve approved safety path; no unsafe override

TECHNICAL EXAMINATION / 03

Evidence and review

Minimum examination record

Asset ID; proposal ID; actor and delegated standing; policy version; evidence IDs, observation and receipt times; admissibility findings; decision and reasons; authorization scope and expiry; command ID; actuator feedback; airflow and environmental observations; exceptions and reviewer identity.

Independent review

A reviewer should be able to reconstruct why the proposal was permitted or refused, verify that unauthorized commands did not reach the simulated actuator, and distinguish a successful command from a verified environmental outcome. Real deployment requires qualified engineering, applicable codes, commissioned sensors and validated safety controls.

Source and provenance

Lloyd Helferty, *ALN / TA-14 - Consequence Governance and the One Damper Scenario*, 25 November 2026, draft for speaker review, executive summary and transcript extracts at 17:00, 18:46, 21:10, 22:00 and 44:20. Meeting recording. Transcript was automated and not audio-verified. Michael Bordenaro, email of 25 November 2026, expresses interest in the showroom and independent testing/certification.

Design choices

The eight exhibits, example readings, damper positions, decision mapping and test matrix are proposed educational design choices, not approved engineering specifications. Original artwork and production implementation are subsequent deliverables.

Prediction can propose a consequence. It cannot independently establish permission to execute now.