APPROVED

Controlled English-language edition

Approved by: V. I. Naganov
Approval date: 22 August 2026

No signature image is reproduced in this public PDF.

HUMAN-GOVERNED AI CONSENSUS

An operational human-governed system for evidence-grounded use of generative AI in legal and project work

SYSTEM PASSPORT

Particular	Controlled detail
Document-type code	SP
Internal designation	AIC-SP-001/2026
Passport revision	1.0
Methodology Core	M1.0
Baseline operational profile	P-HYB-1.0
System status	Operational human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools
Document status	Approved controlled English-language edition, Revision 1.0; effective from 22 August 2026; co-authentic with the Russian Revision 1.0
Edition category	Public controlled edition; restricted-access information and the signature image are excluded

Moscow
2026

This PDF is the official public copy of the controlled English-language edition of the Human-Governed AI Consensus System Passport AIC-SP-001/2026, Revision 1.0. The controlled English and Russian editions are co-authentic: they document the same approved system and have equal status within the Human-Governed AI Consensus controlled-documentation system. Restricted-access information and the signature image are not reproduced in this public PDF.

The English edition uses its own binding identifiers: AIC-SP-001/2026, DOC-01–DOC-11, CP-1–CP-7 and Appendices A–M. Their exact correspondence with the Russian-edition identifiers is fixed in the cross-reference table below.

The System Passport defines the structure of Human-Governed AI Consensus (Russian: «ИИ-Консенсус»), methodology core M1.0, baseline hybrid operational profile P-HYB-1.0, human roles, human control points, operating modes, data-handling rules, the composition of a professional run and version-management procedures.

> **Key point:** a professional deliverable is released only after material claims have been verified against sources and an authorised Subject-Matter Specialist has made a documented decision.
>
> **Short answer:** the System Passport explains how Human-Governed AI Consensus operates, which actions are recorded, what evidences a professional run and who decides whether to release the deliverable.

AIC-SP-001/2026 · Revision 1.0 · M1.0 · P-HYB-1.0 · English controlled edition approved on 22 August 2026

Document details

Field	Details
Name	Human-Governed AI Consensus System Passport — controlled English edition
Document-type code	SP
Document identifier	AIC-SP-001/2026
System Passport revision	1.0
Methodology core version	M1.0
Baseline hybrid operational profile	P-HYB-1.0
System status	Operational human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools
Document status	Approved controlled English-language edition, Revision 1.0; effective from 22 August 2026
Copy status	Official public PDF copy; restricted-access information and the signature image are not reproduced
Language	English
Place and year	Moscow, 2026

Approval details

Role	Name	Approval particulars
Creator of Human-Governed AI Consensus, Author of the Concept and Methodology, Product Development Lead and Controlled Revision Owner	V. I. Naganov	Controlled English-language edition approved on 22 August 2026; the public PDF does not reproduce a signature image

V. I. Naganov approved the controlled English-language edition on 22 August 2026. No signature image is reproduced in this public PDF.

Document-control record

Field	Details
System name	Human-Governed AI Consensus
Document type	Automated System Passport
Document-type code	SP
Document identifier	AIC-SP-001/2026
Revision	1.0
Preparation and approval date of the English edition	22 August 2026
Creator of the system; Author of the Concept and Methodology; Product Development Lead	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov
Controlled Revision Owner	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov
Entry into force of the English edition	Effective from 22 August 2026; the underlying acceptance decision under Section 4.3 was made on 18 August 2026
Publication category	Official public PDF copy of the controlled English-language edition; restricted-access information and the signature image are not reproduced

Revision history

Revision and date	Status	Content	Prepared by
1.0; approved on 22 August 2026	Initial approved controlled English-language edition	Co-authentic English edition of Revision 1.0: human-governed architecture, verifiable claim-to-source links, controlled records and appendices	V. I. Naganov

Co-authentic language editions and binding identifier cross-references

The controlled Russian edition `ИИК-ПС-001/2026`, approved on 18 August 2026, and the controlled English edition `AIC-SP-001/2026`, approved on 22 August 2026, are co-authentic language editions of System Passport Revision 1.0. Neither edition takes priority solely because of its language. The identifiers in each column below have the same documentary function in their respective edition.

Russian controlled edition	English controlled edition	Function
`ИИК-ПС-001/2026`	`AIC-SP-001/2026`	System Passport
`ИИК-ПФ-Р-HYB-1.0/2026`	`AIC-PS-P-HYB-1.0/2026`	Baseline Hybrid Operational Profile specification
`ИИК-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026`	`AIC-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026`	Control operating configuration
`ИИК-КК-001/2026`	`AIC-TS-001/2026`	Synthetic control test set
`ИИК-ПИ-001/2026`	`AIC-TR-001/2026`	Internal acceptance test record and restricted-access evidence package
`К-01`	`DOC-01`	System Passport
`К-02`	`DOC-02`	Methodology Core M1.0
`К-03`	`DOC-03`	Task Record
`К-04`	`DOC-04`	Corpus Register
`К-05`	`DOC-05`	Configuration Passport
`К-06`	`DOC-06`	Independent Runs Record

Russian controlled edition	English controlled edition	Function
K-07	DOC-07	Agreement and Divergence Map
K-08	DOC-08	Claims and Supporting Bases Matrix
K-09	DOC-09	Critical Review Report
K-10	DOC-10	Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet
K-11	DOC-11	Change and Complaints Log
KT-1	CP-1	Task Definition
KT-2	CP-2	Data and Processing Route
KT-3	CP-3	Input Quality
KT-4	CP-4	Claim Decomposition and Comparison
KT-5	CP-5	Sources and Claim Statuses
KT-6	CP-6	Subject-Matter Assessment
KT-7	CP-7	Release
DOC-___	SRC-___	Instance identifier for a source material within a task
Appendix A	Appendix A	Functional and Role Matrix
Appendix Б	Appendix B	Evidence-Grounded Analysis Algorithm
Appendix B	Appendix C	Result Taxonomy
Appendix Г	Appendix D	Form of the Task Record
Appendix Д	Appendix E	Form of the Corpus Register
Appendix E	Appendix F	Form of the Configuration Passport
Appendix Ж	Appendix G	Form of the Independent Runs Record
Appendix И	Appendix H	Form of the Agreement and Divergence Map
Appendix K	Appendix I	Form of the “Claim — Supporting Basis — Source” Matrix
Appendix Л	Appendix J	Form of the Critical Review Report
Appendix M	Appendix K	Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet
Appendix H	Appendix L	Standards Applicability Matrix
Appendix П	Appendix M	Change Registration Sheet

SRC-___ identifies an individual source-material instance in the English edition. It is distinct from DOC-01–DOC-11, which identify controlled-document and record types, and from the bare DOC component code for Document Preparation and Conversion Tools in P-HYB-1.0.

If a semantic discrepancy between the controlled Russian and English editions is identified, it is recorded as a controlled-documentation defect and corrected in both editions through a synchronised amendment or new revision. Until correction, neither wording is treated as prevailing solely because it appears in one language; the Controlled Revision Owner records the resolution applicable to the affected provision.

Legal and technical status of roles

Vladislav Igorevich Naganov developed methodology core M1.0, baseline profile P-HYB-1.0 and the System Passport. The baseline revision uses a documented set of software tools and does not require a standalone build S. The CFG-C Technical Operator, Subject-Matter Specialist, Service Provider and other participants in a particular use are appointed and identified in the role register, run records and applicable contracts. If a standalone build S is created for a particular implementation, its build passport and title documents record that implementation and the relevant rights.

What Human-Governed AI Consensus is

Human-Governed AI Consensus, created by Vladislav Igorevich Naganov, is an operational human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools for evidence-grounded use of generative AI in legal and project work.

The system uses at least two procedurally independent runs of different identified generative models. Outputs are decomposed into verifiable claims; agreements and divergences are recorded; material claims are linked to supporting bases and sources; and a professional deliverable is released only after documented human review.

Agreement between model positions determines the direction of subsequent verification but does not itself prove truth. Particular models and software tools are replaceable components of `CFG-C`; a standalone software build S is not required for the baseline revision.

How to cite Revision 1.0

> Naganov V. I. Human-Governed AI Consensus System Passport. Controlled English edition. Revision 1.0. Methodology Core M1.0; Baseline Hybrid Operational Profile P-HYB-1.0. AIC-SP-001/2026. Moscow, 2026. https://aiconsensus.ru/documents/ai-consensus-system-passport-v1.0-en.pdf

---

Contents

1. Scope
2. Normative and reference documents
3. Terms and abbreviations
4. 1. General Information on the Automated System
5. 2. Principal Characteristics of the Automated System
6. 3. Automated System Completeness
7. 4. Certificate (Record) of Acceptance
8. 5. Manufacturer’s (Supplier’s) Warranties
9. 6. Complaints Information
10. Appendix A. Functional and Role Matrix
11. Appendix B. Evidence-Grounded Analysis Algorithm
12. Appendix C. Result Taxonomy
13. Appendix D. Form of the Task Record
14. Appendix E. Form of the Corpus Register
15. Appendix F. Form of the Configuration Passport
16. Appendix G. Form of the Independent Runs Record
17. Appendix H. Form of the Agreement and Divergence Map
18. Appendix I. Form of the “Claim — Supporting Basis — Source” Matrix
19. Appendix J. Form of the Critical Review Report
20. Appendix K. Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet
21. Appendix L. Standards Applicability Matrix
22. Appendix M. Change Registration Sheet
23. Official standards information
24. Document publication information

Scope

The System Passport identifies Human-Governed AI Consensus and establishes its purpose, boundaries, baseline architecture, mandatory human control points, outputs and rules for controlled operation.

The document is intended for the Creator, authorised CFG-C Technical Operators, Subject-Matter Specialists, developers, clients and auditors within their granted access.

The System Passport describes a system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools. Particular models and software tools are replaceable components of the registered run configuration. No model has authority to determine legally or project-significant facts or to approve the final deliverable independently.

Normative and reference documents

The Russian-edition document-type code ПС follows ГОСТ 34.201-2020; the co-authentic English edition uses SP under the binding cross-reference above. The System Passport contains six principal sections and was prepared with regard to the structure in clause 5.8 of ГОСТ Р 59795-2021. Terms are used with regard to ГОСТ Р 59853-2021 and ГОСТ Р 71476-2024. The text presentation takes account of ГОСТ Р 2.105-2019, while the approval and acceptance details take account of ГОСТ Р 7.0.97-2025. External standards retain their official Russian identifiers.

The applicable provisions of specialised standards for AI systems were considered when establishing procedures for trustworthiness, quality, lifecycle, transparency and impact assessment.

Document	Area considered
ГОСТ 34.201-2020	Types, composition and designation of automated-system documents
ГОСТ Р 59795-2021	Structure of an automated System Passport
ГОСТ Р 2.105-2019	General requirements for textual documents
ГОСТ Р 59853-2021	Automated-system terminology
ГОСТ Р 7.0.97-2025	Details of organisational and administrative documents, where applicable
ГОСТ Р 71476-2024	Artificial-intelligence terminology
ГОСТ Р 59276-2020	General approaches to ensuring trust in AI systems
ГОСТ Р 59898-2021	General provisions for assessing AI-system quality
ГОСТ Р 71539-2024	AI-system lifecycle processes
ГОСТ Р 72514-2026	AI-system impact assessment
ГОСТ Р 72515-2026	Transparency of AI systems
ГОСТ Р 72664-2026	Quality model for AI systems
Federal Law No. 149-FZ	Information, information technologies and protection of information
Federal Law No. 152-FZ	Personal data
Federal Law No. 98-FZ	Commercial secrets

> **Limit of the conformity statement:** this System Passport is not a certificate of conformity and does not replace an independent standards review, external conformity assessment, impact assessment, information-security documentation or documents establishing rights in software components. The composition of a particular implementation is specified in the Configuration Passport, and the results of its internal review are recorded in the acceptance record. Those documents likewise do not by themselves constitute certification of conformity with legislation or standards.

Terms and abbreviations

Term	Definition
Human-Governed AI Consensus; the system	An operational human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools for evidence-grounded use of generative AI in legal and project work
Evidence-grounded use of generative AI	An organised mode in which material claims are linked to verifiable supporting bases and primary sources, raw outputs and identified divergences are retained, and a professional deliverable is released following documented review by an authorised specialist. The term does not imply automatic truth, legal force, the status of judicial evidence or a guaranteed outcome
M; methodology revision	A controlled version of mandatory stages, roles, statuses, records and application rules. This System Passport corresponds to Revision M1.0
P-HYB; operational profile	A controlled specification of the mandatory operational architecture that is independent of particular models and providers. P-HYB-1.0 provides for the use of software tools together with mandatory human decisions, verification and release
`CFG-C`; registered run configuration	An immutable manifest for an individual run recording the models, versions, providers, instructions, parameters, tools, routes and processing facilities actually used. A material change creates a new `CFG-C` or a new revision of it
S; standalone software build	An optional standalone software implementation, where one has actually been created and used, with its own version, component manifest, developer and Rights Holder
E; service standard revision	A controlled description of the components, procedure and criteria of a particular service. Code E does not identify the provider; the provider is determined by the contract and role register
Human-in-the-loop	The principle under which an authorised human defines the boundaries, approves the data-handling route, verifies material claims and accepts responsibility for the professional release
Multi-model analysis	Comparison of the results of at least two procedurally independent primary branches using different model identifiers against one registered task and one corpus version. Comparing repeat runs of one model is multi-branch repeatability analysis, not consensus between different models
Model	A generative model producing an intermediate output for a registered task and the available context
Model run	A separately registered model invocation with recorded inputs, instructions, settings, date and output
Procedurally independent output	An output from a branch that, before its own result is recorded, does not receive the content, summary, assessment or other derived features of outputs from other branches. This does not imply statistical independence of training data
Model diversity	Use of different model identifiers, or documentedly different versions or snapshots, in the primary analytical branches. Repeat runs of one model may assess repeatability but do not by themselves constitute consensus between different models
Claim	A separately verifiable statement about a fact, rule, document, calculation, condition or conclusion
Supporting basis	Material enabling a claim to be verified: an exact passage from a document, rule, judicial decision, register entry, calculation or another permitted primary source
Primary source	A source directly recording the fact or applicable rule being verified within the task
Model consensus	Recorded agreement between independent outputs at the level of an individual claim. It determines the direction of verification but does not prove truth
Divergence	A substantive difference, contradiction, difference in supporting bases or inability to compare model positions

Term	Definition
AI Critic	A separate critical review pass or model role producing potential errors, omissions, contradictions and insufficiencies in supporting bases. Its output is also reviewed by a human
Subject-Matter Specialist	A person with the necessary subject-matter competence who verifies material claims against primary sources and approves or rejects the professional deliverable
Claim-to-source traceability	A verifiable link between a claim, its precise supporting basis, the source, model positions, the outcome of human review and the accepted revision
Controlled copy	A document copy with an identified revision, owner and change history

1. General Information on the Automated System

1.1. Name and identification

Field	Details
Full name	Human-Governed AI Consensus: a human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools for evidence-grounded use of generative AI in legal and project work
Short name	AI Consensus
Formal English abbreviation	AIC
English System Passport identifier	AIC-SP-001/2026
Methodology core version	M1.0
Baseline hybrid operational profile	P-HYB-1.0
Operating model	Hybrid: software tools and mandatory human actions
Document language	English

1.2. Creator and development governance

The Creator of Human-Governed AI Consensus, Author of its Concept and Methodology, Product Development Lead and Controlled Revision Owner of this System Passport is Vladislav Igorevich Naganov. In governing the system and its documentation, V. I. Naganov approves controlled revisions of the methodology core, baseline operational profiles, the rules governing use of the Human-Governed AI Consensus name in controlled documentation and official materials, and amendments to this System Passport.

Methodology core M1.0, baseline profile P-HYB-1.0 and this System Passport were developed by Vladislav Igorevich Naganov. The baseline revision uses a documented set of software tools; rights in third-party models, services, libraries and other components remain with their respective rights holders. If a standalone software build S is created for a particular implementation, its developer, composition and rights are recorded in its build passport and rights documentation.

Field	Details
Author and Controlled Revision Owner of methodology core M1.0	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov
Baseline Revision Provider	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov, in respect of M1.0, P-HYB-1.0 and controlled documentation. This role does not extend to a software build S, the exact `CFG-C` or a commercial service

Field	Details
Software component	Human-Governed AI Consensus operates in hybrid mode under P-HYB-1.0. The software environment of each run is identified in the `CFG-C` Passport. The system does not depend on a single monolithic proprietary program. If a standalone build S is used, its developer, version and Rights Holder are recorded in the build passport and role register
Service standard E	E identifies a controlled revision of a service standard. The Service Provider is a separate organisational role determined by the contract and role register; this System Passport does not appoint it

This System Passport governs the methodology and controlled documentation. The CFG-C Technical Operator, Subject-Matter Specialist, Service Provider and other participants in a particular application are appointed and identified in the role register, run documents and applicable contracts.

1.3. Purpose

The system is designed for the controlled use of multiple generative models and other software tools when analysing complex sets of materials, forming verifiable hypotheses, comparing positions, recording divergences and preparing intermediate and final materials under human responsibility.

The principal output is not a single ‘majority answer’, but a documented analysis package in which material claims are linked to supporting bases and sources, agreements and divergences are retained, limitations are disclosed, and the final professional position is approved by an authorised Subject-Matter Specialist.

1.4. Object of automation

The object of automation is part of the analytical process in legal and project work: registration of the task and corpus, preparation of materials, obtaining independent model outputs, decomposition of outputs into claims, comparison of positions, critical review, claim-to-source traceability, preparation of draft documents, logging, and release after human control.

1.5. Applications

- analysis of materials from court and administrative proceedings and other legally significant document sets;
- contract, claims and procurement work;
- preparation of positions based on reviews, inspections and control activities;
- comparison of a contract, specification, project documentation, work results and acceptance criteria;
- reconstruction of a preliminary chronology and identification of potential contradictions in large document sets;
- preparation of analytical notes, draft documents, risk maps and lists of questions for further research;
- support for multi-party legal and project tasks requiring facts, rules, calculations and technical requirements to be reconciled.

This list defines classes of task and does not guarantee that every configuration is suitable for every matter. Admission of a particular scenario is recorded in the Task Record.

1.6. System boundaries

- The system does not make autonomous legally, project-, managerially or financially significant decisions.

- Model output is not an established fact, evidence, a legal opinion or a ready-to-use document without review.
- Agreement between several model outputs does not replace a primary source or automatically increase the truth of a claim.
- The system does not guarantee the absence of errors, completeness of the corpus, currency of external data, lawful provision of materials or a particular outcome in a matter or project.
- Restricted-access materials are processed only through the authorised route for the particular task.

1.7. Basis of operation

The system operates as a human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools. A valid application of Human-Governed AI Consensus is only a process in which mandatory artefacts have been created, human control points completed and sufficient information retained to verify the provenance of material conclusions.

> **Process identity criterion:** using several neural networks alone is not an application of Human-Governed AI Consensus. Independent runs, comparison at the level of verifiable claims, preservation of divergences, claim-to-source traceability, a critical review pass and documented human approval of the deliverable are required.

---

2. Principal Characteristics of the Automated System

2.1. Operating principles

Principle	Requirement
Human-in-the-loop	A human defines the task and boundaries, approves the data-handling route, verifies material claims and approves the final deliverable
Independence of primary runs	Before recording its raw output, a primary analytical branch does not receive the content, summaries, assessments or other derived features of other branches' outputs. A branch to which such information has been disclosed is marked as dependent, is excluded from the mandatory independent set and is not counted when model consensus is recorded
Verification of individual claims	Separately verifiable claims are compared, rather than only complete texts and stylistically similar outputs
Priority of the primary source	A source takes priority over the frequency with which a claim is repeated or the confidence of a model's tone
Preservation of divergences	A divergence is not smoothed away to produce a single text; it is recorded, classified and referred for review
Explicit uncertainty	Gaps, lack of substantiation, assumptions and applicability limits are identified in working and final materials
Reproducibility within reasonable limits	Inputs, versions, instructions, settings and raw outputs are recorded; identical output from an external non-deterministic model is not promised
Separation of system and service	The system supports the specialist's work; the scope of a particular service and the provider's responsibility are determined by a separate contract

2.2. Functional structure

Block	Purpose
F1. Task Definition	Recording the objective, question, expected result, limitations, deadlines and materiality criteria
F2. Corpus Management	Recording the composition, provenance, version, availability, quality and completeness of input materials
F3. Independent Analysis	Obtaining at least two procedurally independent primary positions. Different recorded identifiers are used to establish agreement between different models; repeat runs of one model are considered separately
F4. Normalisation	Extracting claims and putting them into a comparable form without changing the meaning of the raw outputs
F5. Comparison	Producing a map of agreements, divergences, gaps and differences in supporting bases
F6. Claim-to-Source Traceability	Linking material claims to precise passages from sources and the outcome of human verification
F7. Critical Review Pass	Producing potential errors, counterexamples, omissions, contradictions and alternative explanations
F8. Subject-Matter Review	Verifying key claims against primary sources and conducting a human subject-matter assessment
F9. Release and Retention	Producing the final package, recording limitations, approval and version, and preserving the audit trail

2.3. Allocation of Functions Between the System and Humans

Action	Software tools	Human
Definition of the professional question	Provide template support	Defines and approves
Review of lawful data use	Do not decide	Reviews and approves the route
Text extraction and initial structuring	May perform	Controls quality
Hypothesis generation	Perform	Assesses applicability
Identification of potential contradictions	May perform	Confirms or rejects
Comparison of outputs	Performed by software and/or with the involvement of the Technical Operator	Resolves disputed comparisons
Assessment of evidential significance	Propose an assessment	Determines it in the context of the task
Establishing a fact	Do not perform	Verifies against the primary source
Legal or project characterisation	Propose alternatives	Makes the professional decision
Approval of the final deliverable	Do not perform	Performs and accepts responsibility within the assigned role

2.4. Input data

The minimum input comprises a registered Task Record and a recorded corpus of materials. The corpus may include textual documents, tables, correspondence, scanned images, official sources, calculations and other materials permitted for the particular processing mode.

- each material has an identifier, name, provenance, date received and status of inclusion in the corpus;
- changing or adding a material creates a new corpus version;
- recognition quality is checked before extracted text is used as a supporting basis;
- corpus incompleteness and missing materials are recorded before release;

- before processing begins, an authorised person documents the purpose and lawful basis, categories of data and data subjects, permitted operations, participating operators, processors and recipients, applicable localisation and cross-border-transfer requirements, retention periods and destruction procedure. A statement by the Task Initiator alone is insufficient to establish that the route is lawful.

2.5. Output materials

The mandatory internal run package comprises:

- the Task Record;
- the Corpus Register;
- the Configuration Passport;
- raw model outputs;
- the Agreement and Divergence Map;
- Claims and Supporting Bases Matrix records;
- the Critical Review Report;
- the Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet;
- the release record.

The external deliverable is prepared from the internal package to the extent appropriate to the task and access restrictions. It may be:

- a preliminary chronology identifying sources and gaps;
- a list of potential contradictions and questions for verification;
- a matrix of facts, positions, rules, evidence and statuses;
- an analytical note or legal or project memorandum;
- draft objections, claim, contract, specification, certificate or other document;
- a map of risks, alternative positions and missing materials.

A draft document becomes a professional deliverable after review and approval by an authorised Subject-Matter Specialist. Until then, model text remains intermediate material.

2.6. Prescribed Process

In summary, the process comprises seven stages: 1) registration of the task and corpus; 2) procedurally independent model runs; 3) decomposition of outputs into claims and creation of an agreement and divergence map; 4) traceability to sources; 5) a critical review pass; 6) human review and revision; and 7) release and archiving of the deliverable.

The full sequence comprises fourteen steps.

Step	Stage	Control outcome
1	Task Registration	The question, purpose, boundaries, audience, deadline and materiality criteria are recorded
2	Data Classification	Access restrictions, permitted services, pseudonymisation requirements and prohibitions are determined
3	Corpus Registration	Each material is assigned an identifier; its version, provenance and quality are recorded
4	Material Preparation	Permitted conversions are performed; recognition and normalisation are controlled
5	Independent Model Runs	The same task is submitted to at least two primary branches without mutual influence
6	Preservation of Raw Outputs	Outputs are retained before editing, together with run parameters and time

Step	Stage	Control outcome
7	Claim Decomposition	Outputs are broken down into separate claims, supporting bases, assumptions and recommendations
8	Position Comparison	A map of agreements, divergences, single-model claims and non-comparable formulations is produced
9	Claim-to-Source Traceability	Each material claim is linked to a precise source or assigned limitation status
10	Critical Review Pass	A separate branch searches for counterexamples, omissions, incorrect citations and alternative explanations
11	Professional Review	The Specialist verifies material claims against primary sources and records the decision
12	Revision and Remediation	Confirmed defects are remedied; objective divergences and limitations are preserved
13	Release	The deliverable, scope of applicability, date, version and appendices are approved
14	Record Retention	The run package is retained for the authorised period and under the applicable access regime

2.7. Independence rules

- the primary output of each branch is produced before other branches' outputs are disclosed;
- comparable runs use one baseline task definition and one corpus version;
- differences in context, tools, system instructions and settings are recorded in `CFG-C`;
- a synthesis or critical-review model receives other outputs only after the independent primary outputs have been retained;
- a repeat run does not replace the original: both versions are retained and linked;
- procedural independence does not imply statistical independence of training data or sources;
- the family, version and provider of each model are recorded in `CFG-C`.

2.8. Unit of Comparison and Agreement Map

Code	Class	Processing rule
`REL-A1`	Agreement on claim and supporting basis	Models formulate compatible claims and identify compatible supporting bases; a human verifies the source
`REL-A2`	Agreement on conclusion, different supporting bases	The conclusions are similar but the reasoning differs; both paths are verified
`REL-A3`	Partial agreement	Only part of the claim agrees; differing conditions and caveats are retained separately
`REL-D1`	Direct contradiction	The claims cannot both be true under the stated conditions; referral to a specialist is required
`REL-D2`	Difference in professional assessment	The facts may agree but the legal, calculation or project assessment differs
`REL-S1`	Single-model claim	A claim is made by one model; it is not excluded solely because the others omit it, but it is verified separately

Code	Class	Processing rule
REL-N1	Not comparable	Formulation, level of detail or context does not permit a valid relationship to be established

Consensus is not truth: REL-A1 and REL-A2 mean only that procedurally independent model positions agree. Final status depends on the quality of the primary source, completeness of the corpus and the Specialist's decision.

2.9. Claim statuses

Code	Status	Assignment condition
STS-P	Verified	A precise primary source is identified; the Specialist has verified that the claim corresponds to the source
STS-PR	Verified with a caveat	A supporting basis exists, but applicability depends on an expressly stated condition or gap
STS-D	Disputed	There are competing sources, interpretations or positions; the divergence is disclosed
STS-N	Not substantiated	No sufficient supporting basis has been found in the available corpus
STS-R	Refuted	An available primary source directly contradicts the claim
STS-O	Outside the corpus	Verification is impossible without an external source or additional material
STS-H	Subject-matter decision required	Factual verification is insufficient; professional characterisation or choice is required

2.10. Human control points

Point	Object	Pass criterion
CP-1	Task Definition	The question, boundaries, materiality criteria and expected result have been approved
CP-2	Data and Processing Route	The corpus composition, processing mode, external services and minimisation measures have been approved
CP-3	Input Quality	Completeness, legibility, recognition results and material gaps have been reviewed
CP-4	Claim Decomposition and Comparison	Disputed claim decomposition and agreement or divergence classes have been resolved
CP-5	Sources and Claim Statuses	The sources for every material claim and the accuracy of citations have been verified
CP-6	Subject-Matter Assessment	Legal, project, calculation or technical conclusions have been approved
CP-7	Release	The final version, limitations, recipient, transfer mode and retention period have been approved

2.11. Release criteria

Before release:

- the versions of the task, corpus, configuration and methodology have been identified;
- the independent primary outputs and critical review pass have been retained;
- each material claim has a status and citation to its supporting basis or is expressly disclosed as a limitation;
- unresolved direct contradictions are not concealed in a single formulation;
- quotations, document details, dates, amounts and citations to rules and documents have been checked;
- material omissions, assumptions and applicability limits have been recorded;
- the final material has been approved by an authorised Subject-Matter Specialist.

2.12. Operating modes

Code	Mode	Conditions
`MODE-D`	Demonstration Mode	Public or synthetic materials; the result is not used to decide a real client task
`MODE-A`	Analysis Mode	Preparation of internal materials and hypotheses; verification is mandatory before external use
`MODE-P`	Professional Mode	Work on a real task, with approval by a Subject-Matter Specialist and a complete linked run record set
`MODE-T`	Test Mode	Comparison of configurations and metrics using a labelled corpus; the result does not replace a professional service

2.13. Versioning and Audit Trail

- the methodology is identified by the index M; a change to mandatory stages or statuses requires a new M version;
- a standalone software implementation is identified as S and has its own component manifest;
- `CFG-C` records the models, versions or snapshots, providers, parameters, instructions, tools and routes;
- a new `CFG-C` revision is a separate immutable object, linked to and not overwriting its predecessor;
- the service standard is identified as E and is not conflated with the provider, methodology or code;
- each run has a unique identifier, date, person who initiated it and links to all input and output materials;
- a correction to a deliverable creates a new version;
- the original version is retained for the applicable lawful period;
- destruction after the retention period is recorded;
- a legal hold suspends destruction.

2.14. Confidentiality and data protection

Before a run, the operator classifies the data and determines the permitted route. For each external service, the provider, location and terms of processing, retention arrangements, potential use of information for training, subcontractors and method of deletion are recorded to the extent accessible to the operator.

Mandatory rules:

- minimisation and pseudonymisation are applied where identity is not required for the answer;
- restricted-access materials are not transferred to an external provider until the route has been confirmed as permitted;
- access is role-based and limited to what is necessary;

- text, images, OCR outputs, metadata, formulae, hyperlinks, embedded objects, external pages and RAG materials are treated as untrusted data;
- instructions within untrusted data do not change the rules, activate tools or initiate data transfers without an authorised rule and operator confirmation;
- protective measures are determined by data class, route and risk assessment irrespective of mode;
- secure file parsing, blocking of active content, attachment screening, an allowlist of tools, multi-factor authentication, encryption, separation of duties and a prohibition on secrets in model tasks apply to all non-public materials and all `MODE-P` runs;
- recovery, incident response, retention and destruction procedures apply;
- quotations and citations are checked against the originals;
- retention and destruction periods are established by the Task Record and applicable documents.

Restricted-access documentation: network diagrams, keys, accounts, specific protective measures, event logs, vulnerability information and routes for sensitive data are not included in the public revision. They are maintained in restricted-access documents.

2.15. Quality characteristics

The System Passport does not establish unsupported numerical quality indicators. For a particular test, the corpus, reference standard, hypotheses, metrics, denominators, permitted thresholds and procedure for resolving expert disagreement are defined in advance.

Metric	Definition
Traceability	Proportion of material claims with a precise citation to a verifiable source
Citation accuracy	Proportion of citations that actually support the linked claim
Completeness	Proportion of pre-identified material matters reflected in the result
Unsubstantiated claims	Number and proportion of claims without a sufficient supporting basis
Divergences	Number of contradictions identified, classified and not concealed
Material omissions	Number of omitted matters capable of changing the professional conclusion
Review burden	Extent of material human corrections; measured only under an approved method
Time and cost	Compared for the same scope and complexity; not presented as an effect without a predefined baseline

2.16. Known limitations and residual risks

- models may agree in repeating the same error or shared unreliable pattern;
- models may invent documents, identification details, quotations and references, or misapply current rules;
- a model majority may displace a rare but correct position;
- additional rounds may entrench an error rather than correct it;
- an incomplete or distorted corpus constrains every conclusion irrespective of the number of models;
- recognition of scanned images and format conversion create a separate layer of errors;
- external models and services may change beyond the control of the methodology owner, affecting reproducibility;
- legal and project assessments depend on context, authority, evidential significance and purposes that cannot be represented fully in text.

Code	Severity	Rule
SEV-1	Critical defect	Risk of unlawful disclosure of data, unauthorised action, autonomous release or another serious consequence; the affected CFG-C is blocked immediately
SEV-2	Major defect	A defect may change a material professional conclusion or its link to sources; release is blocked until the defect is remedied or until the Specialist gives a reasoned decision that the expressly disclosed limitation is permissible
SEV-3	Minor defect	A form or process defect with no established effect on a material conclusion; it is recorded and remedied within the specified period

2.17. Prohibited uses

The following are prohibited:

- presenting model agreement as a proven fact;
- sending model text to a recipient as a professional deliverable without review and approval;
- concealing known contradictions, unsubstantiated claims or corpus limitations;
- creating fictitious sources, quotations, statistics, testimonials or external endorsement;
- uploading data through a route not authorised by the Task Record;
- claiming effectiveness, accuracy or savings without reproducible measurement;
- using the system to make autonomous decisions affecting the rights and obligations of persons.

2.18. Compatibility and Changes to Operating Modes

The baseline hybrid profile P-HYB-1.0 does not require integration with another automated system. Materials may be exchanged through controlled files and, for a standalone software implementation, through documented interfaces. Supported formats include PDF, DOCX, XLSX, CSV, TXT and common image formats; the actual ability to process a particular file is checked when the corpus is registered.

- a change between MODE-D, MODE-A, MODE-P and MODE-T is made by the Technical Operator after confirming documented access rights, an authorised data route and mandatory records;
- replacing a model, provider, version or snapshot, API, system instruction, tool, OCR, RAG or search layer, index, route, conversion method or security setting creates a new CFG-C or a new revision of it; before it is used in MODE-P, an impact assessment and the applicable T-01—T-10 are completed;
- connection to an external system is permitted only through a documented interface with defined formats, authority, logging and data-handling rules;
- changing mode neither removes human control points nor automatically elevates the status of an earlier result;
- compatibility limitations and conversion results are recorded in the Configuration Passport and Corpus Register.

2.19. Admission to Professional Mode and change management

MODE-P is permitted only when all mandatory conditions are satisfied at the same time. If any condition is not satisfied, Professional Mode is not used; the possibility of MODE-D, MODE-A or MODE-T is assessed separately by reference to the data class and authorised route.

Mandatory conditions:

- the Task Record, scope of examination and materiality criteria have been approved;
- the lawful basis, purpose, composition and class of data have been recorded;

- the Task Initiator, CFG-C Technical Operator, Subject-Matter Specialist and persons with administrative authority have been appointed;
- authorised routes, providers and external-service terms have been approved;
- `CFG-C` has been registered and linked to M1.0, P-HYB-1.0, S and E where the latter two apply;
- an access matrix, threat model, retention and destruction rules, incident-response procedure and recovery procedure are in force;
- T-09 has passed;
- there are no open `SEV-1` or `REC-1` records;
- every `SEV-2` and `REC-2` relating to the M1.0, P-HYB-1.0 or `CFG-C` in use has been remedied or resolved by a documented decision of the Subject-Matter Specialist without a risk of misleading release;
- the complete DOC-03—DOC-10 record set can be produced;
- a Specialist authorised to approve the deliverable has been appointed.

Loss of provider availability, or a material change in model behaviour, interface or contractual terms, suspends use of the affected `CFG-C` pending impact assessment and readmission.

---

3. Automated System Completeness

3.1. Baseline Package Contents

Code	Element	Purpose
DOC-01	System Passport	This controlled English edition of public Revision 1.0
DOC-02	Methodology Core M1.0	Principles, process, statuses and control points set out in Section 2 and the appendices
DOC-03	Task Record	Form in Appendix D; mandatory for every professional run
DOC-04	Corpus Register	Form in Appendix E; records documents and versions
DOC-05	Configuration Passport	Form in Appendix F; records `CFG-C`, including models, versions, providers, parameters, instructions, tools and routes
DOC-06	Independent Runs Record	Form in Appendix G; links raw outputs to the configuration
DOC-07	Agreement and Divergence Map	Form in Appendix H; preserves agreements and objective divergences
DOC-08	Claims and Supporting Bases Matrix	Form in Appendix I; provides evidence traceability
DOC-09	Critical Review Report	Form in Appendix J; contains potential errors and the decisions made on them
DOC-10	Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet	Form in Appendix K; confirms the control points and the human decision
DOC-11	Change and Complaints Log	Forms set out in Section 6 and Appendix M

3.2. Baseline Hybrid Operational Profile P-HYB-1.0

Since 18 August 2026, the system has operated under hybrid profile P-HYB-1.0: methodology operations are performed using available software tools, while mandatory decisions, reviews and release are performed by humans.

The information in this clause constitutes controlled specification AIC-PS-P-HYB-1.0/2026. The profile defines the mandatory architecture but does not replace the exact `CFG-C` for an individual run. A standalone software build S is not a mandatory part of the profile.

Code	Component	Identification
M1.0	Methodology Core	Rules, statuses, control points and System Passport forms
AI-1…AI-n	At least two differing identified generative models for recording model consensus	Exact providers, names, versions or snapshots and identifier differences are recorded in the `CFG-C` Passport; procedural independence is confirmed for the primary branches
DOC	Document Preparation and Conversion Tools	Viewing, text extraction, recognition where required, spreadsheets and an editor; the exact set is recorded in `CFG-C`
REG	Controlled Registers and Record Templates	Task Record, Corpus Register, records, divergence map, Claims and Supporting Bases Matrix and release sheet
REP	Controlled Repository	Inputs, raw outputs, versions and log; its location and protective measures are set out in restricted-access documentation
HUM	Human Personnel and Roles	CFG-C Technical Operator and the Subject-Matter Specialist who approves the professional deliverable
IO	Input, Output and Transfer Facilities	Work device and secure channels appropriate to the task mode

The baseline package does not include dedicated technical equipment assigned permanently to the system, removable media, a particular operating system or a mandatory proprietary software build. They form part of the replaceable operating environment. Asset numbers, accounts, repository addresses, keys and other restricted-access information are identified in the exact `CFG-C` Passport or a restricted manifest and are not permanent particulars of P-HYB-1.0.

Rights in third-party models, services, libraries and data sources remain with their respective rights holders and are used within the applicable licence or contract.

3.3. Restricted-Access Operational Documents

- register of roles and authority;
- data-flow and data-handling route map;
- threat model and protective measures;
- register of providers, contractual terms and retention settings;
- procedures for access management, incident management, backup and destruction;
- software-build manifest and checksums, where a separate implementation is used;
- programme and methodology for testing a particular implementation.

3.4. Conditions for a Complete Run

A professional run is considered complete if DOC-03—DOC-10 have been completed and linked by a single identifier.

Any missing mandatory record is documented as a deviation and precludes the deliverable from being described without qualification as having been produced under the complete Human-Governed AI Consensus protocol.

---

4. Certificate (Record) of Acceptance

4.1. Subject of Acceptance

The subject of internal acceptance is M1.0, P-HYB-1.0 and the System Passport as a controlled set of rules, procedures, forms and mandatory human control points. The acceptance recorded on 18 August 2026 applies to the common substantive system documented by the co-authentic language editions.

The acceptance checks were performed using control operating configuration AIC-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026 and synthetic control set AIC-TS-001/2026. The control CFG-C records the test conditions but is not the system's only permitted permanent configuration.

Human-Governed AI Consensus is used as an operational human-governed system combining a documented methodology with configurable software tools. This section records the internal acceptance of M1.0 and P-HYB-1.0 into ongoing controlled operation and the inclusion of the System Passport in the controlled documentation. Acceptance does not establish the date on which the system was created and does not deny its actual use before this revision was formalised.

Each subsequent CFG-C is admitted after registration, assessment of the impact of changes and successful completion of the applicable T-01—T-10. A standalone software build S, where created or used, is accepted separately under its own build passport, test programme and test record. This acceptance does not confirm the properties of an unidentified build S, external models, providers or services.

4.2. Minimum Acceptance Checks

Vladislav Igorevich Naganov performed internal acceptance checks T-01—T-10 on 18 August 2026 in MODE-T. This was an internal assessment by the Controlled Revision Owner.

The exact information about the models, versions, parameters, instructions, input and output materials and checksums, together with test evidence records EV-T01–EV-T10, forms restricted-access package AIC-TR-001/2026. It includes test set AIC-TS-001/2026, the record and signed manifest for AIC-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026, the actual results of each check, the activity log, record identifiers, algorithms and hash values, the date and the responsible person. The package is retained as part of the controlled documentation and may be made available to an authorised auditor through a secure channel within the access granted.

Code	Check	Criterion	Recorded result
T-01	Identification	M1.0, P-HYB-1.0, roles, designations and the controlled copy are cross-referenced	'Passed; EV-T01'
T-02	Independence of Primary Outputs	Raw outputs from at least two primary branches with different model identifiers are recorded before any cross-disclosure	'Passed; EV-T02'
T-03	Claim Decomposition	Material claims are separated while preserving conditions and qualifications	'Passed; EV-T03'
T-04	Divergence Preservation	The specified test contradiction is preserved and not concealed through synthesis	'Passed; EV-T04'
T-05	Claim-to-Source Traceability	Every material claim is assigned a source or an explicit limitation status	'Passed; EV-T05'
T-06	Unsupported Citation Detection	A citation that does not support the claim is identified and referred for human decision	'Passed; EV-T06'
T-07	Embedded Instruction Handling	An instruction within the data did not change the rules, activate a tool or cause data transfer without authorisation	'Passed; EV-T07'
T-08	Human Release Control	Release is blocked until the review record is completed and human approval is given	'Passed; EV-T08'
T-09	Confidentiality and Authorised Data Route Control	The authorised route was followed; a prohibited route was blocked and recorded	'Passed; EV-T09'

Code	Check	Criterion	Recorded result
T-10	Version Control	A change to the corpus or deliverable created a new linked version without overwriting the original	‘Passed; EV-T10’

Result: 10 internal acceptance checks out of 10 passed. The consolidated results are recorded in internal acceptance test record `AIC-TR-001/2026` dated 18 August 2026.

The status ‘Passed’ is valid only while the corresponding `EV-T` evidence exists and remains unambiguously linked to the identified control set, `CFG-C` and record. If mandatory evidence is lost or absent, the relevant check is assigned the status ‘Not substantiated’ and must be repeated.

4.3. Acceptance Decision

Section 4.3 records the following decision:

- accept M1.0 and P-HYB-1.0 for ongoing controlled operation;
- use `AIC-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026` as the reference configuration for internal testing;
- include the controlled Russian edition in the controlled documentation from 18 August 2026;
- include co-authentic controlled English edition `AIC-SP-001/2026` in the controlled documentation from 22 August 2026 without changing the underlying acceptance of M1.0 and P-HYB-1.0 recorded on 18 August 2026.

The decision is an internal self-acceptance by the Controlled Revision Owner. It confirms completion of the prescribed procedures within the control test, but does not guarantee the accuracy of an external model, the suitability of every future `CFG-C`, effectiveness in a particular matter or conformity of a standalone software build S.

Particular	Details
Test set	AIC-TS-001/2026, Revision 1.0; synthetic materials without actual client documents, personal data or restricted information; `MODE-T`
Reference configuration record	AIC-CFG-C-CTRL-001/2026, Revision 1.0; the complete technical manifest is retained in restricted-access documentation
Record	AIC-TR-001/2026 dated 18 August 2026
Type of assessment	Internal acceptance review and self-acceptance by the Controlled Revision Owner
Responsible person	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov
Recorded result	T-01—T-10 passed: 10 of 10
Limitations	Clauses 1.6, 2.14 and 2.16—2.19 continue to apply; each new `CFG-C` requires registration, impact assessment and the applicable repeat checks; `MODE-P` is permitted under Clause 2.19
Decision	Accept M1.0 and P-HYB-1.0; include the controlled Russian edition from 18 August 2026 and co-authentic English edition `AIC-SP-001/2026` from 22 August 2026
Effective dates	Underlying system acceptance and Russian edition: 18 August 2026; controlled English edition: 22 August 2026
Confirmation	V. I. Naganov approved the underlying acceptance decision on 18 August 2026 and the controlled English edition on 22 August 2026; signature images are not reproduced in the public copies

Limit of the internal test result: a positive result means that the prescribed criteria were met in the control scenario. It is not independent certification, confirmation that external models are error-free or a guarantee of the outcome of a particular matter.

5. Manufacturer’s (Supplier’s) Warranties

For the purposes of this Section, Vladislav Igorevich Naganov is identified as the manufacturer and supplier solely in respect of methodology core M1.0, baseline operational profile P-HYB-1.0 and the controlled documentation. This designation does not mean that he authors, manufactures or supplies third-party software components, a standalone build S or a commercial service delivered by a particular provider.

The System Passport does not establish any commercial guarantee for third-party models, services, software or technical equipment, nor does it guarantee a particular outcome in a legal, project, managerial or other task. Conditions applicable to S or a particular service are set out in the relevant contracts and documentation.

5.1. Scope and Term of Warranties

Object	Specified property	Duration and conditions
Co-authentic controlled Russian and English editions of the System Passport	Identifiability of the revision, availability of the official texts, binding cross-references, change history and correction of substantiated internal contradictions	Russian edition: from 18 August 2026; English edition: from 22 August 2026; each until replaced by a new revision or officially withdrawn
M1.0 and P-HYB-1.0	Availability of a controlled description of the mandatory stages, statuses, control points and forms	From 18 August 2026 until replaced by a new revision or officially withdrawn
Deliverable from an individual run	Identification and claim-to-source traceability prescribed by the protocol where the complete DOC-03—DOC-10 record set is present	Within the retention period; accuracy of the conclusion and outcome of the matter are not guaranteed
Third-party models, services, equipment and media	The System Passport establishes no additional guarantee	Under the terms of the relevant provider or owner of the tool
Standalone software build S	Defined by the build documentation, acceptance and contract	Under the documents for the particular build
E and the corresponding service	Defined by the contract and the controlled revision of the service standard	Under the documents for the particular service

Additional rules:

- if any control points are omitted, the audit trail is changed without registration or an unauthorised data route is used, the deliverable loses its status as having been produced under the complete protocol and is reclassified by a human;
- a correction to the methodology or documentation is issued as a new revision or a registered change and does not conceal the content of the previous version;
- whether previously released deliverables require review is determined through a separate impact assessment;
- the residual risks in Clause 2.16 remain even where the complete protocol is followed.

---

6. Complaints Information

Complaints are recorded from the effective date of Revision 1.0 in the DOC-11 log. Each complaint receives a unique identifier, object, class, status and link to the relevant revision, configuration, run or service. The absence of entries in the public table under Clause 6.4 does not by itself confirm that no complaints exist: restricted-access information may be retained in the closed part of the log.

6.1. Submission Procedure

- a complaint concerning M1.0, P-HYB-1.0 or this System Passport is sent to the Controlled Revision Owner;
- a complaint concerning build S is sent to its Developer, Rights Holder or CFG-C Technical Operator under the build passport and contract;
- a complaint concerning a commercial service is sent to its Service Provider under the contract and applicable E standard;
- an information-security or personal-data incident report is sent to the relevant Personal Data Operator and CFG-C Technical Operator.

The official public channel for Human-Governed AI Consensus is Vladislav Naganov's contact page at https://naganov.ru/en/contact/ and `info@naganov.ru`.

Case materials, personal data, trade secrets, credentials, keys and other restricted information must not be sent through the public channel. A secure method is agreed separately.

6.2. Required Information

- subject of the complaint: M1.0/P-HYB-1.0, `CFG-C`, S, a service or security;
- identifiers of the System Passport, revision, configuration and run;
- description of the expected and actual behaviour;
- a set of reproducible input data, or a secure method of providing it;
- the exact extract from the deliverable and the linked source;
- the proposed severity and possible consequences;
- information on whether the deliverable was shared with third parties or used for a decision;
- containment measures already taken;
- a statement that restricted materials exist, without sending them through the public channel.

6.3. Complaint Classes

Code	Class	Criterion
`REC-1`	Critical complaint	Risk of unlawful data disclosure, a materially erroneous decision or breach of the prohibition on autonomous release; the affected mode or `CFG-C` must be stopped immediately
`REC-2`	Major complaint	Defect in claim-to-source traceability, omission of a critical contradiction, an incorrect citation or a reproducible error capable of changing the professional conclusion
`REC-3`	Standard complaint	Non-conforming form, incomplete metadata or a process inconvenience with no established effect on a material conclusion
`REC-4`	Improvement suggestion	A proposed improvement not associated with a substantiated defect

6.4. Complaints Register

Particular	Details
Identifier and date	
Applicant and secure feedback channel	
Object, revision, `CFG-C`, run or service	
`REC` class and `SEV` severity	
Brief description	
Expected and actual behaviour	
Evidence and secure reference to materials	
Consequences and containment measures	
Decision, responsible person and deadline	
Status and closure date	

The public copy does not include personal data, case materials, trade secrets, credentials or other restricted information. These are replaced with a secure reference or the identifier of a record in the restricted section.

Appendix A.
Functional and Role Matrix

Mandatory appendix.

Role	Authority and responsibility
Task Initiator	Defines the task; confirms authority and lawful provision of the materials; accepts known limitations
CFG-C Technical Operator	Registers the task and configuration; runs processes; retains records; does not approve a professional conclusion without the required competence. The role does not automatically confer the status of Personal Data Operator
Analyst Model	Produces an independent position and proposed supporting bases within the context provided
Comparison Function	Normalises claims and proposes agreement or divergence classes; it does not determine truth
AI Critic	Proposes counterexamples and potential defects; its outputs are not automatically treated as verified
Subject-Matter Specialist	Verifies sources, determines evidential and professional significance, and approves the deliverable
Reviewer	Where required, performs an independent review of material conclusions and compliance with the protocol
Administrator	Provides availability, access control, technical configuration, backup and logs within the authority granted
Personal Data Operator	Determined by the legal basis and contractual arrangement; ensures that processing is lawful and that personal-data protection duties are fulfilled
Controlled Revision Owner	Approves methodology revisions, rules governing use of the name in controlled materials, and changes to the System Passport

Appendix B.
Evidence-Grounded Analysis Algorithm

Mandatory appendix.

> **Invariable rule:** every transition to the next stage preserves the source data and the human decision. Synthesis does not remove divergences; a new revision of the deliverable does not overwrite its predecessor.

Stage	Content	Control	Record
I	Task and mode	CP-1, CP-2	Task Record; authorised route
II	Corpus	CP-3	Corpus Register; list of gaps
III	Independent positions	Independence control	Raw outputs and metadata
IV	Comparison	CP-4	`REL` relationship map
V	Claim-to-Source Traceability	CP-5	Claim — source — status matrix
VI	Critical Review Pass	Decision on findings	Critical Review Report and decision log
VII	Subject-Matter Assessment	CP-6	Reviewed draft deliverable
VIII	Release and Retention	CP-7	Approved deliverable and run package

Appendix C.
Result Taxonomy

Mandatory appendix.

Every final material distinguishes among a fact, citation to a source, interpretation, professional conclusion, recommendation, assumption and limitation. These functions must not be combined in one undecomposed paragraph for material claims.

Code	Type	Rule
TYP-F	Fact	A verifiable circumstance; requires a primary source
TYP-L	Rule or requirement	A legislative, contractual or project requirement with source identification details and the applicable date
TYP-I	Interpretation	An explanation of the meaning of facts or a rule; alternatives may exist
TYP-C	Professional conclusion	A specialist's decision based on facts, rules and interpretations; authorship and responsibility rest with the human
TYP-R	Recommendation	A proposed action stating its conditions, risks and addressee
TYP-A	Assumption	A premise not substantiated by the corpus; stated expressly
TYP-X	Limitation	A boundary of applicability, gap, source conflict or unavailable verification

Rule for applying the taxonomy: the TYP type is recorded for every material claim before professional release. A type label does not establish truth and does not replace the STS verification status. If a claim combines different functions, it is separated into standalone verifiable claims, or its principal type and an express qualification are stated.

Appendix D.
Form of the Task Record

Mandatory appendix.

Particular	Details
Task identifier	Completed before processing begins
Date and Task Initiator	Completed before processing begins
Professional question	One verifiable question or a structured list of questions
Expected deliverable	Document type, addressee, purpose and permitted length
Materiality criteria	Facts, rules, amounts, deadlines and risks capable of changing the conclusion
Boundaries	Matters not being examined and decisions that must not be made by the system
Timeframe and current applicability	Control date for the applicability of sources and the deliverable
Mode	`MODE-D` / `MODE-A` / `MODE-P` / `MODE-T`
Data class	Under the current classification policy
Authorised routes	List of services and conditions, or prohibition of external processing
Subject-Matter Specialist	Person who approves the professional deliverable
Basis for processing	Contract, instruction, internal assignment or another applicable document
CP-1 and CP-2	Signature or electronic confirmation by the Task Initiator and authorised person

Appendix E.
Form of the Corpus Register

Mandatory appendix.

A record for one corpus material; the form is repeated for every document.

Particular	Details
ID and title	SRC-___; _____
Source and provenance	
Date, version and format	
Data class and access regime	
Quality, OCR and conversions	
Inclusion status and note	
Hash of the original and converted version	

The register is accompanied by a list of missing or unavailable materials. For a converted file, the link to the original and the recognition quality-control result are retained.

Appendix F.
Form of the Configuration Passport

Mandatory appendix.

Particular	Details
Configuration identifier	Unique `CFG-C` code and revision; preceding `CFG-C` and reason for the change
Linked versions	System Passport revision / M / P-HYB / S, where applicable / E, where applicable
Date, time and time zone	The time-synchronisation source is also recorded
Models, versions and providers	Exact name, version or snapshot; fixed version or mutable alias; API or interface and its version; region and type of account environment
Role of each model	Analyst / critic / synthesis / another role
System instructions	Identifier and hash of the controlled revision
User task	Identifier and hash of the controlled revision
Parameters	Temperature, limits, reasoning mode, seed where supported, and parameters unavailable to the operator
Tools and conversions	Versions of search, RAG, index, code, OCR, databases, integrations and conversions
Access to external data	Sources, access date and limitations
Data-handling route	Where materials are processed, stored, may be used for training and deleted; external queries, sources and time of access
De-identification	Method and person performing the verification
CFG-C Technical Operator and Administrator	Full names or identifiers and authority
Change management	Change classification, impact assessment and admission decision
Integrity control	Algorithm and hashes of the corpus, instructions, deliverable and manifest; electronic signature or verifiable timestamp

Limit of a checksum: it identifies content but does not, by itself, prove provenance or immutability. Integrity is assessed together with the signed component manifest, registered timestamp, access log and storage environment that prevents unregistered overwriting.

Appendix G.
Form of the Independent Runs Record

Mandatory appendix.

A record for one run; the form is repeated for `RUN-01`, `RUN-02`, subsequent branches and `CRIT-01`.

Particular	Details
Run ID, model and role	
`CFG-C`, corpus, date and time	
Instructions, parameters and tools	
Raw output: ID, algorithm and hash	
Procedural independence	Confirmed / not confirmed; supporting basis
Model diversity	Model identifier and difference from other branches
CFG-C Technical Operator’s note	

Appendix H.
Form of the Agreement and Divergence Map

Mandatory appendix.

A record for one claim being compared; the form is repeated for every `CLM`.

Particular	Details
Claim ID	`CLM-___`
`RUN-01` / `RUN-02` / other branch positions	
Relationship class	`REL-A1` / `REL-A2` / `REL-A3` / `REL-D1` / `REL-D2` / `REL-S1` / `REL-N1`
Content of agreement or divergence	
Supporting bases and sources	
Human decision	

Appendix I.
Form of the “Claim — Supporting Basis — Source” Matrix

Mandatory appendix.

A record for one material claim; the form is repeated for every `CLM`.

Particular	Details
ID and deliverable content type	`CLM-___`; `TYP-F` / `TYP-L` / `TYP-I` / `TYP-C` / `TYP-R` / `TYP-A` / `TYP-X`
Claim with conditions and qualifications	
Source and precise extract	`SRC-___`; page / clause / paragraph
Model positions	`RUN-___`
Status	`STS-P` / `STS-PR` / `STS-D` / `STS-N` / `STS-R` / `STS-O` / `STS-H`
Specialist’s decision and reasons	

For a legal source, the revision and applicable date are stated. For case material, the exact document and location are stated. For a calculation, the input data and formula are stated.

Appendix J.
Form of the Critical Review Report

Mandatory appendix.

A record for one finding; the form is repeated for every `CR`.

Particular	Details
ID, finding type and linked `CLM`	`CR-___`; fact / citation / logic / omission / alternative
Counterexample or supporting basis	
Severity	`SEV-1` / `SEV-2` / `SEV-3`
Human decision	
Status	Open / closed / accepted as a limitation

Appendix K.
Subject-Matter Review and Release Sheet

Mandatory appendix.

Particular	Details
Task and deliverable identifier	Completed at release
Reviewed corpus version	The version and register hash are stated
Reviewed configuration	The `CFG-C` identifier is stated
Material claims	All have a status; any exceptions are listed separately
Unresolved divergences	Listed, or their absence is stated
Limitations of applicability	Mandatory section of the final material
Review of particulars and citations	Confirmed by the Subject-Matter Specialist
Decision	Release / Revise / Do Not Release
Deliverable version	Unique identifier and date
Subject-Matter Specialist	Full name, role and basis of competence
Signature or electronic confirmation	Recorded at release
Date and time	Recorded at release

Meaning of human confirmation: the specialist’s signature confirms the completed review and acceptance of the professional deliverable within the stated boundaries. It does not make an incomplete corpus complete or displace the disclosed limitations.

Appendix L.
Standards Applicability Matrix

Mandatory appendix.

Document	Requirement or approach considered	Reflection in the System Passport
ГОСТ 34.201-2020	‘System Passport’ document type, code ПС; identification and designation management	Title page; document-control record
ГОСТ Р 59795-2021	Six main sections of an automated-system passport	Sections 1—6
ГОСТ Р 2.105-2019	Structure and presentation of a text document	Entire document, contents, appendices and change record
ГОСТ Р 59853-2021	Automated-system and process terminology	Terms; Clauses 1.4 and 1.7
ГОСТ Р 7.0.97-2025	Document particulars to the applicable extent	Approval field, signatures and dates
ГОСТ Р 71476-2024	Artificial-intelligence terminology	Terms; Section 2
ГОСТ Р 59276-2020	General approaches to trust in AI systems	Clauses 2.1 and 2.10—2.16
ГОСТ Р 59898-2021	Quality-assessment approaches	Clause 2.15; Section 4
ГОСТ Р 71539-2024	AI lifecycle processes	Versioning, acceptance, changes and complaints
ГОСТ Р 72514-2026	AI-system impact assessment	Clauses 2.14—2.17; separate assessment of the particular scenario
ГОСТ Р 72515-2026	Transparency taxonomy	Roles, configuration, limitations and appendices
ГОСТ Р 72664-2026	AI-system quality model	Clause 2.15; test programme

Standards review: the matrix confirms the structure of this revision but does not replace an independent standards review or conformity assessment of a particular software implementation.

Appendix M.
Change Registration Sheet

Mandatory appendix.

Particular	Details
Change number and revision	
Clauses or pages affected	
Basis	
Description of change	
Prepared by	
Approved by and date	

Official Information on Standards

The links lead to the official document records in the Federal Information Fund for Standards.

Document	Official Rosstandart record
ГОСТ 34.201-2020	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 59795-2021	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 59853-2021	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 2.105-2019	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 7.0.97-2025	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 71476-2024	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 59276-2020	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 59898-2021	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 71539-2024	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 72514-2026	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 72515-2026	protect.gost.ru
ГОСТ Р 72664-2026	protect.gost.ru

Document Publication Information

This PDF is the official public copy of the controlled English-language edition AIC-SP-001/2026, Revision 1.0. It contains the document-control record, the six main sections and all mandatory appendices. Restricted-access information and the signature image are not reproduced in this public PDF.

The binding correspondence with the co-authentic Russian-language edition ИИК-ПС-001/2026, Revision 1.0, is set out in the document-control record.

Particular	Details
Document author and Controlled Revision Owner	Vladislav Igorevich Naganov
Controlled English-language edition	AIC-SP-001/2026, Revision 1.0
Approval and effective date	22 August 2026
Co-authentic Russian-language edition	ИИК-ПС-001/2026, Revision 1.0; approved and effective from 18 August 2026
Publication category	Official public PDF copy; restricted-access information and the signature image are not reproduced
Official English PDF	https://aiconsensus.ru/documents/ai-consensus-system-passport-v1.0-en.pdf
Official English web presentation	https://aiconsensus.ru/en/passport/v1-0/
Official Russian PDF	https://aiconsensus.ru/documents/ii-consensus-system-passport-v1.0-ru.pdf
Official Russian web presentation	https://aiconsensus.ru/passport/v1-0/
Documentary defect reports and controlled correspondence	https://aiconsensus.ru/en/contacts/