TA-14 AUTHORITY GOVERNANCE INSTITUTION

From Owner Intention to Admissible Execution and Verified Outcomes

A proposed municipal Clean Air Sanctuary demonstration

TECHNICAL & FUNDING PROSPECTUS | VERSION 3.0 | 16 NOVEMBER 2026

Prepared by Greggory Don Butler, Founder, TA-14 Authority Governance Institution LLC.

PURPOSE	STATUS
For technical review with ALN, ONUMA, UNIC / Energime and prospective municipal and nonprofit partners.	Concept and evaluation specification. No confirmed municipal commitment, funded pilot, partner endorsement, or award.

Core proposition: an AI recommendation is not permission to act. Public benefit requires attributable evidence, legitimate authority, established standing, bounded execution, and independently verified outcomes.

01 / Executive case for public benefit

During wildfire smoke and other outdoor air-quality episodes, residents may need accessible indoor spaces with demonstrably better environmental conditions. A library or civic meeting room could be evaluated as a temporary clean-air refuge, but a designation of “safe” cannot rest on one pollutant or a dashboard reading.

The proposed intervention

Test one bounded municipal use case: can a building owner define a public-benefit objective; can building information and frontier AI interpret evolving evidence; can an independent execution governor refuse unauthorized or unsupported interventions; and can independent evaluators establish whether the intended benefit was achieved?

Why this is different

Traditional automation can optimize operational variables. AI can interpret and recommend. Neither alone demonstrates that a particular physical action is legitimate at the instant of execution. TA-14 proposes an Admissible Execution Architecture (AEA) decision boundary: Admissible Evidence + Applicable Authority + Established Standing.

PUBLIC PROBLEM	TESTABLE RESPONSE
Uncertain indoor refuge quality	Measured baseline, calibrated instruments and documented uncertainty
AI recommendation mistaken for authorization	Independent ALLOW / HOLD / DENY / ESCALATE gate
Outcome asserted without proof	Pre-registered metrics and independent assessment

02 / Owner intention to verified outcome

A single auditable chain of responsibility

1. COMMUNITY NEED

Identify users, accessibility and intended benefit

2. OWNER INTENTION

Approve objective, boundaries, decision owner and delegation

3. BUILDING CONTEXT

Represent site, systems, capabilities and constraints

4. EVIDENCE + FRONTIER AI

Assess measured conditions and generate a bounded recommendation

5. AEA EXECUTION GATE

Check admissible evidence, applicable authority and established standing

6. CONTROLLED ACTION

Only approved actions through qualified operators and existing safeguards

7. OUTCOME VERIFICATION

Measure actual conditions, trade-offs, service availability and exceptions

Critical separation: the model can recommend; the governor evaluates permission; the building control system and qualified personnel execute only within authorized limits.

03 / The moment a building must decide

Illustrative test case: a smoke forecast indicates elevated outdoor PM2.5. A library is considered for temporary refuge use. A frontier-AI component compares forecast, building context and indoor/outdoor measurements and recommends a reviewed filtration or ventilation mode.

Negative case: HOLD

One required indoor sensor has an expired calibration record. The recommendation may be plausible, but its supporting evidence does not satisfy the owner-approved policy. AEA records HOLD, the missing requirement, policy version, evidence snapshot, timestamp and escalation route. The physical command is not issued.

Resolution path

A qualified operator verifies or replaces the measurement source. The evidence package is re-evaluated. Only if evidence, authority, standing and equipment safety constraints are all satisfied may the bounded action be considered for ALLOW. No automatic extension of prior authorization is permitted.

DECISION	MEANING
ALLOW	Required conditions met; bounded action may proceed under approved controls
HOLD	Required evidence, authority or standing missing, stale or unresolved
DENY	Prohibition or disqualifying condition established
ESCALATE	Authorized human or institutional review required

This is a proposed evaluation scenario, not evidence that a Markham building or live AEA deployment has completed the test.

04 / Minimum evidence and records

The demonstration should establish evidence admissibility before assessing performance. Each field must have an accountable owner, retention rule, validation method and revision history.

RECORD	MINIMUM CONTENT
Owner objective	Signed outcome statement, beneficiaries, decision owner, delegation, risk limits
Asset context	Zone and equipment IDs, control points, operating envelope, inspection record
Environmental	Indoor/outdoor PM2.5 where appropriate, CO2 and thermal context, sensor ID, location, units, time, calibration and uncertainty
AI recommendation	Model/version, relevant inputs, configuration, output, rationale, uncertainty and review status
AEA decision	Policy version, evidence snapshot, standing and authority checks, decision and reasons
Execution	Authorized command, operator/system identity, time, control acknowledgment and exceptions
Outcome	Comparison window, target results, adverse effects, accessibility and evaluator sign-off

TA-14 Environmental Integrity Records / AIR concepts may support provenance and continuity; cryptographic sealing and interoperability must be specified and validated for the actual pilot rather than assumed.

05 / Evaluation protocol and acceptance tests

Before any live deployment, preregister a protocol, test with simulation or shadow mode, obtain qualified engineering and public-health review, and specify when the pilot must stop.

DIMENSION	PROPOSED EVALUATION
Governance fidelity	Independently adjudicate ALLOW/HOLD/DENY/ESCALATE across positive and negative test cases
Unauthorized commands	Target zero unauthorized physical commands within the defined test boundary
Evidence integrity	Audit provenance, timestamp continuity, calibration, uncertainty and policy trace
Environmental response	Compare defined indoor/outdoor particle indicators over matched observation periods
Safety trade-offs	Monitor ventilation adequacy, thermal comfort, equipment constraints, energy and noise
Public benefit	Measure usable refuge hours, accessibility, communications and community feedback
Independent review	Report failures, overrides, HOLD cases, missing data and limitations

Thresholds, baseline duration, sample size and acceptance criteria are to be set by qualified partners after site assessment. No health protection guarantee or certified “safe air” claim is made here.

06 / Meaningful frontier AI, bounded by governance

The Rockefeller–OpenAI Cities Deliver announcement calls for a meaningful frontier-AI component. The proposal should specify a substantive, testable AI task rather than treating AI as a cosmetic interface.

Candidate AI task

Interpret multimodal building documents, operating constraints, environmental measurements and smoke forecasts; identify conflicting evidence; compare plausible operating scenarios; and produce an explainable recommendation with a traceable input/output record.

What AI must not do

The model must not independently grant itself authority, change municipal policy, override building safety controls, or treat model confidence as proof of admissibility. AEA remains a separately evaluated authorization boundary.

Proposed technical work packages

WORK PACKAGE	VALIDATION
Data integration	Confirm permissions, asset schema, timestamps, sensor quality and interoperability
AI evaluation	Benchmark accuracy, abstention, conflicting evidence handling and explanation quality
Governance engine	Test policy checks, negative cases, overrides and fail-closed behavior
Building integration	Stage commands in simulation/shadow mode before any approved actuation
Cybersecurity & privacy	Threat model, role-based access, incident response and minimal personal data

07 / Proposed partner and approval structure

Roles below are functional proposals only. No organization is committed by being named in this document.

FUNCTION	PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY
Municipal owner / community	Define need, approve objective, site access, risk limits and public accountability
Eligible nonprofit lead	Submit application, manage funding, reporting and charitable-purpose compliance
ALN / coordination	Facilitate relationships and owner-intent / outcome-verification framing
ONUMA / building context	Represent building assets, spaces, system relationships and scenarios
TA-14 / governance	Specify AEA checks, execution decisions and attributable decision trace
UNIC / community design	Support community-centered design and technology sovereignty exploration
Licensed / qualified specialists	Approve engineering, environmental methods, operating envelopes and safety
Independent evaluator	Pre-register measures, adjudicate tests and publish balanced findings

All site approvals, community consent, engineering sign-offs, data agreements, grant eligibility and logo/name usage require explicit confirmation.

08 / Illustrative implementation roadmap

PHASE	PROPOSED OUTPUT / GATE
0 | Eligibility and partnerships	Confirm lead applicant, city collaborator, site, approvals and legal arrangements
1 | Discovery and baseline	Owner objective, stakeholder requirements, site audit and baseline protocol
2 | Architecture and integration	Asset representation, sensors, data model, AI evaluation and AEA policy mapping
3 | Controlled validation	Synthetic, simulation and shadow-mode negative testing; independent review
4 | Authorized limited pilot	Only after engineering and municipal approval, conduct bounded site operations
5 | Evaluation and transfer	Report verified outcomes, failures, cost, replicability and community feedback

Stage-gate principle

Each phase must end in a documented GO / HOLD / STOP decision. A grant award does not itself authorize physical modifications, human-subject data collection or building-system interventions.

Replicability

If the pilot succeeds, publish a reusable owner-intent template, evidence schema, AEA test suite, technical integration pattern and independent evaluation protocol. The goal is a transferable method, not a claim that one installation proves every building or community context.

09 / Illustrative $2 million planning envelope

This is a scenario budget for discussion, not a quotation, approved consortium allocation, or representation of allowable grant costs. Amounts require partner validation and compliance review.

COST CATEGORY	ILLUSTRATIVE USD
Program management and eligible applicant administration	$240,000
Municipal/community engagement and accessibility	$180,000
Site engineering, controls and instrumentation	$390,000
Frontier-AI integration and evaluation	$340,000
TA-14 governance integration and test suite	$260,000
Independent evaluation and public-health methods	$220,000
Cybersecurity, privacy and data governance	$130,000
Training, dissemination and replication toolkit	$100,000
Contingency (subject to grant rules)	$140,000
TOTAL	$2,000,000

Budget control questions

Which expenses are eligible? Which partner contracts are permitted? What indirect-cost rules apply? What equipment can be purchased? What municipal contributions or in-kind resources are required? What is the proposed period of performance? These must be answered from the full application guidance.

10 / Grant eligibility and immediate actions

The Rockefeller Foundation and OpenAI Foundation announced Cities Deliver: AI Solutions for Public Services on 14 October 2026, with grants of $500,000-$2 million and an initial deadline of 29 November 2026. The public announcement identifies an eligible nonprofit or civil-society lead, a collaborating city government, a charitable purpose and meaningful frontier AI.

Submission-critical gates

- Verify full program rules and geographic eligibility; identify the legal applicant.
- Secure written city-government collaboration and confirm whether Markham is willing to participate.
- Select one site and one bounded demonstration; establish technical and legal feasibility.
- Define measurable public benefit, AI task, project team, timeline and budget.
- Obtain explicit permission for organizational names, claims of partnership and logos.

Proposed schedule

DATE	ACTION
17 November	Working meeting: select one demonstration and assign applicant/city/technical owners
18-21 November	Eligibility review, municipal outreach, site assumptions, work packages and draft budget
22-26 November	Draft application, obtain confirmations and conduct independent technical review
27-29 November	Authorized sign-off and submission before official deadline

11 / Open issues, nonclaims and source control

Unresolved

• No city of Markham commitment, selected site, applicant, partner contract or funded deployment has been confirmed.

• The PAE Building is referenced in Michael Bordenaro’s correspondence, but its technical evidence has not been independently assessed here.

• Lloyd Helferty’s 16-page BIMStorm draft and the complete session transcript have not been cross-checked in this prospectus.

• No independent certification, measured refuge benefit or real-world Markham AEA deployment is claimed.

• Association names in the correspondence do not establish endorsement of this proposal.

Source basis

Michael Bordenaro, email of 15 November 2026; Lloyd Helferty, email of 16 November 2026; TA-14 seven-page technical brief dated 16 November 2026; The Rockefeller Foundation, “Rockefeller Foundation, OpenAI Foundation Announce $50 Million Partnership To Help Cities Improve Public Services Through AI,” 14 October 2026.

Official source

https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/rockefeller-openai-50-million-partnership-cities-improve-public-services-ai/

Prepared for technical examination. The strongest next step is to validate the assumptions with the intended applicant, city, engineers and independent evaluators - then convert this prospectus into the funder’s actual application format.

12 / Decision brief for the November 17 working meeting

This page converts the prospectus into specific institutional decisions. It does not imply that any participant has approved the project.

Decisions required before a funding submission

Decision	Required confirmation / accountable owner
Lead applicant	Identify an eligible legal applicant and confirm program and geographic eligibility.
Municipal collaborator	Obtain documented interest and authorized contact; Markham is a proposed location, not a commitment.
Bounded pilot	Select one site, one environmental event scenario and one owner-approved objective.
AI and AEA scope	Define the substantive frontier-AI task, execution policy, integration interfaces and negative tests.
Evaluation	Name qualified engineering, public-health and independent evaluation reviewers.
Funding	Validate the $2 million planning envelope against allowable costs, quotations and partner roles.

Proposed evidence package for reviewers

A signed owner-intent statement; bounded site and equipment description; evidence admissibility specification; AI model evaluation plan; AEA ALLOW / HOLD / DENY / ESCALATE test matrix; safety and escalation protocol; independently registered outcome metrics; and a costed, stage-gated implementation plan.

Submission discipline

Use the funder's actual application requirements as controlling. Obtain explicit approval before representing any organization as a committed partner. The proposed pilot remains subject to municipal, engineering, community, legal and financial review.