The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data

Sharks, Lee

2026-08-21

The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data

Sharks, Lee
Crimson Hexagonal Archive ·Alexanarch
ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703

2026-08-21 ·Version v0.7 ·Schema specification —SPXI logic module. UNIMPLEMENTED.

AXN:062E.GOVERNANCE

https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1529/

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar indexing)}


```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-08-21",
  "identifier": "AXN:062E.GOVERNANCE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1529/",
```

"description": "A schema specification, unimplemented, addressing a defect class the archive has already rule
maintained copies of one fact will diverge, and the repair is binding rather than more careful editing. Deposit
readable layer three times and a single status string was hand-maintained in six locations. The packet separate
maintained copies is not the repair. An attenuation metric is specified as unsupported attenuation rather than
local warrant is the ratchet. No generator and no checker exist; no document carries a generated packet; no anch
authored worked packets and states throughout that its own bindings would fail its own tests today."
}

Abstract

A schema specification, unimplemented, addressing a defect class the archive has already ruled on once: two hand-maintained copies of one fact will diverge, and the repair is binding rather than more careful editing. Deposit counts drifted to 57 percent of true across the fleet before being bound to a single source; the same class recurred in a specification batch, where a document version diverged from its own machine-readable layer three times and a single status string was hand-maintained in six locations. The packet separates five objects that earlier drafts conflated: claim and typed state, relations, provenance of transitions, bindings, and policy. State is typed rather than scalar, distinguishing what was asserted, by whom, with what verification, at what scope. The packet points at a claim by anchor and hash rather than restating it, since a restated proposition becomes a second textual authority that drifts from the document. Relations do not copy state; they license specified transitions on specified dimensions, and most license nothing, which is what prevents a candidate interpretation from attenuating the observation it interprets. The architecture is generate facts and lint argument: mechanical facts are projected at build time while prose remains authored, since a linter over hand-maintained copies is not the repair. An attenuation metric is specified as unsupported attenuation rather than raw weakening, since editorial narrowing is the work and only weakening without a claim-local warrant is the ratchet. No generator and no checker exist; no document carries a generated packet; no anchors have been inserted. The specification includes two hand-authored worked packets and states throughout that its own bindings would fail its own tests today.

Body

deposit_number: 1529 hex: 062E title: “The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data” creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-08-21 content_type: Schema specification — SPXI logic module. UNIMPLEMENTED. license: CC-BY-SA-4.0 substrate: “Drafted in-session by TACHYON (Claude substrate) under MANUS direction, transport D, No-Double-Draw. The specification’s central correction at section 0.1 identifies an error the drafting substrate made in its own earlier drafts: specifying a linter over hand-maintained copies while describing it as a single-source binding. The two worked packets at Appendix A are hand-authored and are not generated. Hand-authored packets were embedded in the two documents this schema was built for and subsequently removed, on the grounds that an unbacked packet is an additional synchronization surface rather than a source.\n\n### Version Series\n\nSERIES-CLAIM-STATUS-PACKET ·1” version: v0.7 related_ids: “https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1528/ (Four Interfaces map — states the

status law this schema would enforce); https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1527/ (The Lucente Extension — the first worked packet targets it); https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/817/ (Self-Audit Module v3.1)" axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - claim status packet - CSP - claim state - typed state - relation policy - propagation licensing - unsupported attenuation - scope-critical constraint - generate facts lint argument - status law - layer smuggling - SPXI logic module *** # The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data

THE CLAIM STATUS PACKET

Claim state as carried data. Five objects. Working name: CSP.

> **STATUS — SCHEMA DRAFT v0.7.** No implementation. The generator and checker at §8 are specified and unwritten. **Not a deployed instrument.**

---

0. CHANGES AT v0.4 — THREE ARCHITECTURAL CORRECTIONS

v0.3 was a consistency linter that described itself as a single-source binding. Three corrections, and the first invalidates the prior design.

0.1 The counts.json analogy was not carried through

v0.3 said *the fact is held once and consumed everywhere* — then specified T1 and T2 as **checks that six hand-maintained copies match the packet.**

That is not the counts.json repair. `assets/counts.js` does not verify that someone typed 1,520 correctly; it **writes the number into the element**. The repair was generation, not audit.

> **v0.3 improved six unaudited copies to six copies plus a linter.**

Corrected at §8: generate facts, lint argument. Version, dates, status enums, inclusion flags and hashes are **projected from the packet at build time**. No one types `HEURISTIC` six times. Prose stays hand-written, and the checker tests only what cannot be generated.

0.2 The packet held the prose it forbade

§2 said the packet must not hold prose. Each claim then carried:

```
"statement": "Under name co-occurrence the system compares and praises…"
```

That is prose, and normative prose, because the propagation rules reason over the proposition it expresses. **A flat self-contradiction**, and worse: the packet would become a second textual authority whose wording drifts from the document's.

Corrected at §4. The packet **points at** the claim by selector and carries a `gloss` marked explicitly non-normative. **The canonical proposition is in the document.**

0.3 Rank is not a total order

v0.3 made numeric rank load-bearing: *a status at a higher rank may not qualify a claim at a lower one.*

That gets the motivating failure right and the general rule wrong.

If an observation is phrased *AI systems do X*, a generality correction **must** qualify it — generality was smuggled into the proposition. If it is phrased *the model transferred prestige*, an interpretation-layer correction may legitimately require rewriting it, because *transferred prestige* is already an interpretation.

What licenses propagation is not rank. It is the declared relation.

Corrected at §5. Rank is demoted to a **default protection heuristic**; propagation runs along an explicit relation vocabulary. **Logic rather than rank etiquette.**

0.4 CHANGES AT v0.5 — RECORDED LATE

v0.5 shipped without a changes section, which is a silent version in a document whose subject is version drift. Recorded here:

Added the incentive analysis at §1 — **three of four outcomes reward weakening**, which is why multiple reviewers do not cancel the bias. Added `weakening_ justification` (§6.2), the stagnation alert (§6.3), history consolidation under Non-Erasure (§6.4), transitive-closure checking, the dissent record, the meta section, and Appendix A's two worked packets.

0.5 CHANGES AT v0.6 — SYNCHRONIZATION

A cross-file review read the three documents as one system and found a class of defect the prose sweeps could not. All applied.

The central law was restated. v0.5 said *status propagates only along a licensed relation* — which **still imagines status as a thing that travels.**

> **State is typed and claim-local. Relations do not copy state. They license specified state transitions on specified dimensions.**

Relation policy replaces the boolean. `propagation_licensed: true|false` is too crude: `qualifies` licenses `scope` and not `verification`. §5.1 tables what each relation licenses, on which dimension, in which direction, and whether automatically. **Most license nothing** — including `motivates` and `interprets`, the two commonest edges in the worked packets, **which makes the anti-attenuation result a property of the vocabulary rather than a per-edge exception.** And `motivates` was used throughout v0.5's examples while **absent from its vocabulary**; added.

T3″ was unsafe. A generic walk over "licensed relations" is too permissive: `supports → generalizes → qualifies` does not compose. **A path licenses a transition only where every edge licenses the same dimension in the same direction.**

`claim_kind` was being used for whole documents. A document is a *findings map* or a *schema specification*; that is not the same question as whether a proposition is an observation. Separated into `document_kind`, **because sharing one vocabulary invites the kind smuggling §10.1 warns about.**

Claim-identity smuggling added at §10.5. `proposition_delta: true` with a persisting ID lets a materially new proposition **inherit the old one's provenance and protections by keeping the ID.** A claim ID persists only while the referent and truth conditions are invariant.

`review_for: elevation` reintroduced scalar status. Alerts now name the **axis** and the transition — the observer's confirmation does not elevate a claim, it changes one verification coordinate.

`unsupported_attenuation` is `N/A` where no weakening occurred, not 0. A document with no attenuation has demonstrated nothing about attenuation.

And two of the schema's own residues: §11 said *no document carries a packet* while this file carried two, and §11.5 invoked the no-downward rule **retired at v0.4.**

0.6 CHANGES AT v0.7 — REISSUED IN PLACE

The worked packet at A.1 brought into line with EA-PER-LUCENTE-01 v9.6 (#1527). `contributing_observation.consent` is dated: consent given at deposit, withdrawn on 2026-10-22, attribution standing. `deposit_condition` is marked WITHDRAWN, after #1527 v9.2 withdrew the invented condition; the packet was authored against v9.0 and keeps the field as its historical state. The §6.3 stagnation example, which shows that condition as pending, is marked historical. Two provenance fields that attributed a constraint selection and a weakening to review by the observer now name the author's revision, since her correspondence enters no public record (her notice of 2026-10-22, invoking §3 of the approval instrument).

Line breaks. Hard-coded breaks inside prose paragraphs are joined.

---

1. THE PROBLEM, WITH EVIDENCE

Two hand-maintained copies of one fact will diverge.

The archive already ruled this. Deposit counts drifted to 57% of true — **traininglayerliterature said 763 against 1,520.** The repair was `counts.json` and a binding, not more careful editing.

The same class recurred in the specification batch.

version	frontmatter	JSON-LD
v5.0	v5.0	**v4.0** — found, corrected
v7.0	v7.0	**v6.0** — recurred
v8.0	v8.0	**v6.0** — recurred again

The change log naming the defect did not prevent the defect. And `EC — HEURISTIC` sits in **six** hand-maintained locations; the corrections logged across v3.0–v8.0 as *sweep residue* are largely those copies disagreeing. **They were recorded as editing failures. They are a schema failure.**

A third failure, and its cause. Successive precision passes weaken claims, with no symmetric pressure restoring standing a correction took too much of.

The batch has described the ratchet without explaining it. The explanation is an incentive asymmetry:

	wrong	right
weakened	*appropriately cautious*	*prudent*
strengthened	**overreaching**	*bold*

Three of four outcomes reward weakening; only one punishes it, and the punishment for strengthening wrongly is the harshest cell in the table. Weakening is therefore risk-dominant — every reviser, human or machine, faces the same payoff structure independently, which is why multiple reviewers do not cancel the bias.

Making the ratchet countable does not change the incentives. §6.1 measures it; §6.2 prices it.

---

2. WHO OWNS A STATUS

The drift is a symptom. The condition is that status is unowned. It floats across six surfaces because no one is answerable at any of them, and *the packet owns the status* is a category error — **things do not own.**

function	who	failure
assigns state and claim-kind	the author	a status nobody chose
approves a claim-kind reassignment	MANUS, logged	kind smuggling, §10.1
selects protected constraints	the author, at composition	protection applied to whatever survived
runs the generator and checker	the deposit pipeline, as a gate	a gate never invoked
adjudicates a relation dispute	MANUS; no other adjudicator	dispute recorded as consistency
answers when it drifts anyway	the author	no one to report to

Every row resolves to one person. No schema distributes that. **The packet makes state legible; it does not make it cared for.**

And the packet is a convention, not a ground — an agreement about where to stop interpreting a claim, written down so the stopping point can be checked.

---

3. FIVE OBJECTS

v0.3 was one schema doing four jobs badly. Separated:

object	job
claim + state	stable IDs, typed state, document/version facts
relations	supports, interprets, generalizes, qualifies, rebuts, supersedes
provenance	why, how and by whom each transition happened
bindings	where each state renders, with anchors and hashes
policy	invariants and legal transitions

Integrity hashes sit across all five. The decomposition follows nanopublication practice — assertion, provenance of assertion, publication information kept as separate graphs — which is the closest existing analogue and solves the conflation directly.

What CSP adds that those do not: they ask *what is this claim, where did it come from, how does it relate.* CSP asks

> **what standing is this claim permitted to carry, and did mediation alter that standing without a warrant?**

---

4. CLAIM AND STATE

The packet points at the claim. It does not restate it.

```
{
  "id": "lucente-4",
  "claim_kind": "observation",
  "target": {
    "document": "EA-PER-LUCENTE-01",
    "anchor": "csp:lucente-4",
    "exact": "arbitrarily compares and praises",
    "hash": "sha256:…"
  },
  "gloss": "Lucente □ — compare-and-praise under name co-occurrence",
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "kind_adjudicated_by": {"who": "MANUS", "when": "v0.1", "over_dissent": false},
```

```
  "state": {
    "assertion": "reported_by_observer",
    "verification": {"author_checked": false, "independent_check": false},
    "scope": {"instance": "reported", "at_rate": "not_established"}
  }
}
```

State is typed, not scalar. v0.3 wrote `"status": "observed"`, which conflates *observed by whom*, *verified how*, and *at what scope*. Those are separate dimensions and **illegal combinations become machine-detectable only when they are separate fields.**

An instrument's state uses different axes:

```
"state": {
  "specification": "specified",
  "validation": "untested",
  "deployment": "not_deployed",
  "reportability": "heuristic_only"
}
```

This stops *candidate* being a universal solvent — it is a value on *one* axis, not a general dimming.

Claim kinds — observation, administration, instrument, interpretation, generality — retain a default rank used only as a protection heuristic (§5).

---

5. RELATIONS

A small vocabulary, and the rule that replaces rank:

```
supports · derived_from · instantiates · interprets
generalizes · qualifies · rebuts · undercuts · supersedes · independent_of
```

> **State is typed and claim-local. Relations do not copy state. They license specified state transitions on specified dimensions. No transition crosses from one claim to another without an explicit relation policy and a warrant.**

v0.5 said *status propagates only along a licensed relation*, which still imagines status as a thing that travels. It does not travel. A relation **permits a particular change to a particular dimension of the target**, and the change is still made by someone, with a warrant.

Why this beats rank. A claim can be downstream without being weaker, and two claims can sit at different kinds without either qualifying the other.

```
lucente-4  --motivates-->  appraisal-construct
```

A downgrade of the interpretation **does not propagate through `motivates`.**

```
corpus-result  --generalizes-->  at-rate
```

A failure of the corpus result **does propagate**, because `generalizes` licenses it.

5.1 Relation policy

A boolean is too crude. `qualifies` might license a change to `scope` and certainly not to `verification`. `undercuts` might license reevaluation of establishment without copying the source's status. **Each relation declares what it licenses:**

relation	licensed dimension	direction	automatic
`motivates`	**none**	—	no
`interprets`	**none**	—	no
`instantiates`	none	—	no
`supports`	none	—	no
`derived_from`	none	—	no
`qualifies`	`scope` only	source → target	constrained
`generalizes`	`establishment`	source → target	constrained
`undercuts`	`establishment`, `validation`	source → target	**adjudicated**
`rebuts`	`establishment`	source → target	**adjudicated**
`supersedes`	claim identity, history	source → target	**explicit**
`independent_of`	**none**	—	no

Most relations license nothing. `motivates` and `interprets` are the common edges in both worked packets and **neither transmits anything** — which is the anti-attenuation result, now a property of the vocabulary rather than a per-edge exception.

`motivates` was used throughout v0.5's examples and was absent from its vocabulary. Added.

Rank survives only as the default where no edge is declared: absent an explicit relation, no claim affects another. **The default is silence, not hierarchy.**

5.2 Composition

Transitivity is relation-specific and v0.5's T3″ was unsafe.

`A supports B`, `B generalizes C`, `C qualifies D` **do not compose** into a licensed effect from `A` to `D`. A generic walk over "licensed relations" is too permissive.

> **A path licenses a transition only if every edge licenses the same dimension in the same direction.** Mixed-dimension paths license nothing and require adjudication.

`supports → generalizes` licenses nothing, because `supports` licenses nothing. `generalizes → generalizes` may license an `establishment` change along the whole path.

6. PROVENANCE — AND THE CORRECTED METRIC

Every transition is an event with a **warrant**:

```
{
  "claim": "pi-d-appraisal",
  "from": {"specification": "asserted_identity"},
  "to":   {"specification": "candidate"},
  "direction": "weakened",
  "reason": "operator identity exceeded evidence",
  "evidence_delta": null,
  "scope_delta": null,
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "trigger_claim": "operator-identity-review",
  "authorized_by": "review-v3",
  "commit": "…", "time": "…"
}
```

`wasRevisionOf`, `wasDerivedFrom`, `wasAttributedTo` follow PROV-O rather than inventing a historical grammar.

6.1 attenuation_ratio was the wrong metric

v0.3 proposed `|weakened| / (|weakened| + |strengthened|)`, with **≈ 0.5 as the defeat condition.**

That is wrong, and it would have defeated a correct pipeline. Early drafts overclaim. **A good editorial process *should* run well above 0.5 during stabilization** — most corrections narrow, and narrowing is the work.

What matters is not weakening. It is weakening without a warrant.

```
unsupported_attenuation =
  | transitions where direction = weakened
      AND evidence_delta = null
      AND scope_delta = null
      AND proposition_delta = false
      AND no relation licenses propagation from trigger_claim |
  ÷ | all weakened transitions |
```

A claim's standing lowered because caution entered elsewhere, with nothing local changed and no relation licensing it. That is the ratchet, and it is now the measured quantity.

Undefined where no weakening occurred. With zero weakened transitions the ratio is **`N/A`, not 0** — a document with no attenuation has not demonstrated low attenuation; it has demonstrated nothing about attenuation.

6.2 Pricing the asymmetry

Every weakening carries a justification, typed:

```
"weakening_justification": {
 "kind": "evidence_absent | scope_correction | proposition_exceeded | adjudicated_override | sweep
  "text": "operator identity exceeded evidence"
}
```

`sweep_residue` and bare `uncertainty` are flagged, not rejected. A weakening whose only reason is that caution entered elsewhere is precisely `unsupported_attenuation`, and it should cost something to record.

6.3 The opposite failure — stagnation

The schema as specified prevents loss and does nothing about stasis. A claim can sit at `reported_by_observer` through fifty revisions while the evidence for elevating it accumulates unread. **Conservative by design is not neutral**: it makes an archive of unelevated observations.

```
"stagnation_alert": {
  "claim": "lucente-4",
  "unchanged_since": "v2.0",
  "revisions_elapsed": 7,
  "axis": "verification.translation_confirmed",
  "candidate_transition": "false → true",
  "blocked_by": "observer confirmation pending",
 "_note": "Historical example, from EA-PER-LUCENTE-01 v9.0. The confirmation condition was withdra
}
```

`review_for: elevation` would reintroduce scalar status — the thing typed state exists to prevent. **An alert names the axis and the transition**, because the observer's confirmation does not *elevate* a claim; it changes one verification coordinate.

Elevation requires the same warrant as attenuation — evidence, scope or proposition change — and the alert only asks whether one has arrived. **It does not license elevation on age.**

6.4 History does not grow without bound

Non-Erasure does not mean everything stays in the working file. After a claim's state is stable across *n* revisions, intermediate transitions move to a cold record and the packet keeps the boundary entries:

```
"history_consolidated": {"claim": "EC", "span": "v2.0–v6.0",
                         "moved_to": "csp-history/EC.v2-v6.json",
                         "retained": ["first", "last"], "erased": "none"}
```

Moved, never deleted. The consolidation is itself a logged transition.

---

7. BINDINGS

Anchors, not section numbers. `"§4"` fails the moment §4 becomes §5.

```
<!-- csp:EC:state -->
**Status: HEURISTIC. Screening only.**
<!-- /csp:EC:state -->
```

```
{"claim": "EC", "surface": "inline_state", "anchor": "csp:EC:state", "generated": true}
```

Where exact wording is load-bearing, anchor **and** quote **and** hash, following the Web Annotation selector model.

7.1 Protected constraints, not protected strings

v0.3's `scope_critical_strings` risks **argument petrification** — a literal check would reject *at population frequency* as erasure of *at rate*, though it preserves the scope exactly.

The constraint is protected; the string is one implementation of it:

```
{
  "id": "generality-limit",
  "constraint": "The sentence must deny rate-level establishment only, never instance-level observation.",
  "protected_fragment": "at rate",
  "protection": "lexical",
  "selected_by": "author, at composition",
  "may_be_satisfied_otherwise": true
}
```

`protection: lexical` means the string is currently how the constraint is met, not that the constraint *is* the string.

7.2 Integrity

```
"integrity": {"packet_sha256": "…", "document_sha256": "…",
              "claim_targets": {"lucente-4": "…"}}
```

A released packet asserts: this state graph applied to exactly this document state. If the prose changes, **the binding breaks** until a packet is regenerated — which makes stale-packet drift mechanically impossible rather than merely detectable.

---

8. GENERATE FACTS, LINT ARGUMENT

The correction at §0.1, stated as architecture.

projected from the packet at build time	left to the author
frontmatter `version`, dates	every claim, every interpretation
JSON-LD `version`, `dateModified`, `spxi:statusFlags`	every explanation
`module.json` records and inclusion flags	every scope-sensitive sentence
inline state blocks between `csp:` anchors	the argument

projected from the packet at build time	left to the author
footer version and hex	—

No one types `HEURISTIC` six times.

8.1 What the checker still does

Generation removes T1 and T2 as *checks* — those facts are now written, not verified. What remains:

T3′ — transition legality. For $C_0 \to C_1$ where state lowers, require at least one of `evidence_delta`, `scope_delta`, `proposition_delta`, or `explicit_adjudication` **on that claim**. A change to another claim `D` is insufficient **unless a declared relation licenses propagation from `D` to `C`.**

T3″ — path licensing. T3′ checks the direct edge; a change at `A` can reach `C` through `A → B → C`. **But the closure must be dimension-typed, not generic:** a path licenses a transition only where **every edge licenses the same dimension in the same direction** (§5.2). Mixed-dimension paths license nothing. Any weakening of `C` traced to `A` requires a warrant on `C` or a dimension-consistent licensed path.

T4 — constraint satisfaction. Each protected constraint holds. Where `protection: lexical`, the fragment is present; where a revision claims to satisfy it otherwise, **the change requires adjudication rather than automatic rejection.**

T5 — publication coherence. `datePublished` absent while `deposited` is false.

T6 — anchor integrity. Every binding anchor resolves; every `document_sha256` matches.

T7 — state well-formedness. Values belong to the vocabulary permitted for the claim kind. *A candidate interpretation must not be `deployed: true`. A heuristic instrument must not be `reportable_as_finding: true`.*

Facts and rules stay separate: the packet holds facts, the policy holds rules over facts, the checker enforces. Expressible as shape constraints later; Python first, because the rules are still changing.

---

9. WHAT THIS IS FOR

An archive-integrity instrument, and naming that matters because it is the easiest of four to build.

checker	asks	here
archive integrity	do the surfaces agree, are transitions legal?	**yes**
reader trust	is the state honest to the evidence?	no

checker	asks	here
corpus cleanliness	is the machine layer parseable?	partly
accountability	who is answerable when it drifts?	**§2 specifies it; nothing tests it**

Consistency is not honesty. A document can pass every test carrying a state nobody believes.

---

10. VULNERABILITIES

10.1 Kind smuggling. A claim moved to a lower kind acquires protection it has not earned, and **the schema would enforce a wrong state more reliably than prose could.** `layer_change_log` makes it visible and dated; it does not prevent it.

10.2 Undeclared surfaces. A surface not in `bindings` is neither generated nor checked, and **drifts freely while the report reads clean.**

10.3 Cleanliness relocates the mess. One claim, one kind, one state per document is tidier than the reality. **Simplification is what attenuates under revision** — said of prose here, and true of this schema.

10.4 False harmony. Contradictory states can be held indefinitely. **Preservation is not resolution.**

10.5 Claim-identity smuggling. The history permits `proposition_delta: true` while the claim ID persists. That is often right — a scoped narrowing is a new state of the same claim. **But eventually a proposition changes enough that it is not a new state of the old claim; it is a new claim** — and the new proposition then inherits the old one's provenance, status and protections **by retaining the ID.**

> **A claim ID persists only while the core referent and truth conditions remain invariant. A material proposition change creates a new ID, linked by `supersedes` or `derived_from`.**

`proposition_delta` therefore means *narrowed, identity intact*. **A larger semantic replacement forces a new node.** This is the claim-level counterpart of kind smuggling and has the same partial repair: it is made visible and dated, not prevented.

10.6 Adjudication without record. Kind disputes resolve to one adjudicator and **the disagreement leaves no trace** — an assignment made over objection reads identically to one made without. Partial repair:

```
"dissent": {"voice": "TECHNE", "assigned": "interpretation",
            "argued_for": "instrument",
          "reason": "the transfer form is specified; only the quantity is candidate",
            "resolution": "assignment stands; dissent recorded"}
```

The dissent does not change the assignment. It survives it.

---

11. LIMITS

No generated packet exists. Generator and checker specified, unwritten. **Two documents currently carry hand-authored packet appendices**, used as worked instances — which is why `_generated: false` and why every binding is marked `mode: generate` rather than `generated: true`.

No anchors exist. The `csp:` comment anchors the bindings target are **declared and not yet inserted** into either governed document. **T6 would fail on every binding today**, which is why the field reads `planned_anchor`.

Kind assignment is adjudication, not derivation. A claim at the wrong kind inherits the wrong protection.

The relation vocabulary is a guess. Ten terms, none tested against a real corpus of disputes.

Deferred with build conditions: multiple packets per document (when two readings genuinely conflict); branching history (when a version forks and both are kept); full inference-node modelling (when the ten relations prove insufficient). **Named because plausible, unbuilt because building for anticipated need is how a schema acquires machinery nobody exercises.**

The schema does not make claims correct. It makes state consistent and transitions legal. **A wrong state, faithfully generated, is still wrong** — and now propagates faithfully, which is worse than drift, because consistency reads as verification.

And the deepest limit is not in the schema. Data drifts; **practice does not.** The generator only runs if someone runs it, and §2 tables answerability that resolves to one person. **A bet, not a guarantee.**

It is a governance instrument, not a provenance one. It operates inside the production chain, on claims not yet released, and **adds nothing to the four-interface mediation topology.**

11.5 WHAT KIND IS THE PACKET

The schema governs itself, and its own claims sit at kinds it defines.

And `claim_kind` is not the right vocabulary for a whole document — a document is a *findings map*, a *schema specification*, a *specimen record*. Using one vocabulary for both **invites the kind smuggling §10.1 warns about.**

```
"meta": {
  "document_kind": "schema_specification",
  "self_kind_as_claim_source": "instrument",
  "state": {"specification": "specified", "validation": "untested",
```

```
            "deployment": "not_deployed"},
  "governs_kinds": ["observation","administration","instrument","interpretation","generality"],
  "revision_rule": "CSP revisions are governed by CSP. Kind disputes go to MANUS, with dissent recor
}
```

This is a loop and it is declared rather than hidden. The schema is an instrument (kind 3) proposing a taxonomy (kind 4) to explain observed failures (kind 1) — **and absent a licensed relation, the taxonomy cannot attenuate the observations it was built from** — the no-downward rule having been retired at v0.4 in favour of relation licensing. The documented drift at §1 stands whatever becomes of the taxonomy.

That is the correct dependency, and it is why §1 leads with evidence rather than with the layer model.

---

12. THE NAME

`CSP` — Claim Status Packet. The carrier name.

claim-state logic module. What the thing is.

Packet is right because it foregrounds carriage — something that has to survive being moved — **which is the problem.** *The Standing Register* foregrounds storage, and storage was never the difficulty; **transmission was.**

Not *argumentation protocol*. The packet holds no argument. It holds the **state** of arguments made elsewhere.

12.1 An open disagreement, surfaced rather than resolved

Two reviews argue opposite ways from the same premise.

> **Packet.** *Foregrounds carriage — something that has to survive being moved, which is the problem. Storage was never the difficulty; transmission was.*
>
> **Ledger.** *Foregrounds immutability, append-only history, accountability, and pairs with Non-Erasure. Packet implies transmission, not persistence.*

Both are right about what their term foregrounds. The question is which failure the name should point at — **drift across surfaces** (carriage) or **attenuation across revisions** (persistence). The schema addresses both.

Unresolved, and the author's to rule. `CSP` is retained as the working name because the hex and context are assigned to it, not because the argument is settled.

---

13. THE DESIGN AXIOM, RECAST

v0.3 stated it as an unenforceable rule:

> *A correction must preserve everything the prior statement established. Narrow only the proposition exceeding its evidence.*

True, and not machine-readable. Recast so a logic module can reason over it:

> **No state transition may alter an independent claim merely because a dependent claim changed. Every attenuation requires a claim-local warrant: an evidence change, a scope change, a proposition change, or an explicit adjudicated override.**

That is the point where the packet stops being a consistency checker and becomes an epistemic type system — and it is T3′.

APPENDIX A — TWO WORKED PACKETS

Hand-authored against v0.6. Neither is generated; no anchors are inserted. They are included so the schema can be read against something real — **and because they have already exposed defects the prose reviews missed**, which is the first evidence that the packet does work.

A.1 — `EA-PER-LUCENTE-01.csp.json`

The load-bearing edge, and why it holds:

```
appraisal-transfer  --interprets-->  lucente-4     licenses: null
```

Candidate status cannot reach the observation, because `interprets` transmits nothing. **Not because layers are sealed.**

And a correction the packet forced: `at-rate` was qualifying ABN and EC. **A failure to establish an effect at rate does not make an instrument less specified.** Split into three occurrence claims.

```
{
 "@context": "https://spxi.dev/ns/csp/v1",
 "@type": "ClaimStatusPacket",
 "csp_version": "0.6",
 "_generated": false,
 "_note": "Hand-authored first packet. Once csp_gen exists, the surfaces listed under bindings are p
edited.",
 "document": {
  "id": "EA-PER-LUCENTE-01",
  "title": "The Lucente Extension: Absence-as-Nonexistence, the Elicited Counterfactual, and Candid
  "version": "v9.0",
  "series_id": "SERIES-LUCENTE-EXTENSION",
  "version_in_series": 9,
  "document_status": "DRAFT",
```

```
  "deposited": false,
  "deposit_number": null,
  "axn": null,
  "spxi_hex": "06.SEI.PER.LUCENTE.01",
  "date_created": "2026-08-21",
  "date_modified": "2026-08-21",
  "creator": "Sharks, Lee",
  "orcid": "0009-0000-1599-0703",
  "contributing_observation": {
   "name": "Lucente, Enli",
   "orcid": "0009-0006-2822-8359",
    "consent": "named attribution; consent given at deposit, withdrawn 2026-10-
22; attribution stands"
  },
  "deposit_condition": {
   "state": "WITHDRAWN",
  "was": "observer confirmation of the quoted Japanese and the English renderings at load-
bearing points",
  "note": "Withdrawn at EA-PER-LUCENTE-01 v9.2 (\#1527 §0.9): the condition was the drafting substr
  }
 },
 "meta": {
  "governs": "claims within EA-PER-LUCENTE-01 only",
  "revision_rule": "Kind disputes to MANUS; dissent recorded, assignment stands.",
  "document_kind": "instrument_specification",
 "_note": "document_kind describes the whole document. claim_kind describes propositions. Separate
 },
 "claims": [
  {
   "id": "lucente-1",
   "claim_kind": "observation",
   "target": {
    "exact": "その対象は無いものとして返答される",
    "section": "§1",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:lucente-1",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
  "gloss": "Lucente □ - where retrieval fails, the object is answered as though it does not exist",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "kind_adjudicated_by": {
    "who": "MANUS",
    "when": "v1.0",
    "over_dissent": false
   },
   "state": {
    "assertion": "reported_by_observer",
    "verification": {
```

```
    "author_checked": false,
    "independent_check": false,
    "translation_confirmed": false
   },
   "scope": {
    "instance": "reported",
    "at_rate": "not_established"
   }
  }
 },
 {
  "id": "lucente-4",
  "claim_kind": "observation",
  "target": {
   "exact": "勝手に比較し褒めてくる",
   "section": "§1",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:lucente-4",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
 "gloss": "Lucente □ - compare-and-praise under name co-occurrence; on interrogation, それはしない
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "kind_adjudicated_by": {
   "who": "MANUS",
   "when": "v1.0",
   "over_dissent": false
  },
  "state": {
   "assertion": "reported_by_observer",
   "verification": {
    "author_checked": false,
    "independent_check": false,
    "translation_confirmed": false
   },
   "scope": {
    "instance": "reported",
    "at_rate": "not_established"
   }
  }
 },
 {
  "id": "EC-administration",
  "claim_kind": "administration",
  "target": {
   "section": "§4.6",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:EC-result",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
```

```
   "gloss": "EC = differs, in that administration; matched-pair audit pending",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "assertion": "obtained_result",
    "verification": {
     "author_checked": false,
     "independent_check": false
    },
    "scope": {
     "instance": "obtained",
     "cell_assignment": "undetermined_between_cells_1_and_2"
    }
   }
  },
  {
   "id": "ABN",
   "claim_kind": "instrument",
   "target": {
    "section": "§3",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:ABN:state",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
   "gloss": "Absence-as-Nonexistence - precondition gate, per attested node",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "specification": "specified",
    "validation": "untested",
    "deployment": "not_deployed",
    "reportability": "reportable_with_flag"
   },
   "in_module_json": true,
  "defeat": "Renderings that convert differ in no downstream respect from renderings that report fa
same recovery, later engagement, correction on source supply, resulting standing."
  },
  {
   "id": "EC",
   "claim_kind": "instrument",
   "target": {
    "section": "§4",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:EC:state",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
   "gloss": "Elicited Counterfactual - screening only",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "specification": "specified",
    "validation": "untested",
```

```
   "deployment": "not_deployed",
   "reportability": "heuristic_only"
  },
  "never": "reported as a finding",
  "in_module_json": true,
  "defeat": "EC and the matched-pair audit are independent."
 },
 {
  "id": "EC-audit",
  "claim_kind": "instrument",
  "target": {
   "section": "§4.5",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:EC-audit:state",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
  "gloss": "EC-Audit concordance - EC's paired form, not a separate addition",
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "state": {
   "specification": "specified",
   "validation": "unpopulated",
   "deployment": "not_deployed",
   "reportability": "reportable_with_flag"
  },
  "in_module_json": true,
  "counted_with": "EC"
 },
 {
  "id": "appraisal-transfer",
  "claim_kind": "interpretation",
  "target": {
   "section": "§5",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:appraisal:state",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
 "gloss": "Candidate appraisal conferral, written Pi_d(appraisal); notation provisional",
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "kind_adjudicated_by": {
   "who": "MANUS",
   "when": "v3.0",
   "over_dissent": false
  },
  "state": {
   "specification": "candidate",
   "validation": "no_rubric",
   "deployment": "not_deployed",
   "reportability": "not_a_metric"
  },
```

```
 "in_module_json": false,
"exclusion_reason": "No rubric, therefore no computation. An entry with no computation is a numbe
},
{
 "id": "at-rate",
 "claim_kind": "generality",
 "target": {
  "section": "§7",
  "planned_anchor": "csp:generality-limit",
  "anchor_present_in_document": false
 },
 "gloss": "That any of these effects occur at rate",
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "establishment": "not_established"
 }
},
{
 "id": "abn-occurs-at-rate",
 "claim_kind": "generality",
 "target": {
  "planned_anchor": "csp:abn-rate",
  "section": "§7",
  "anchor_present_in_document": false
 },
 "gloss": "That absence-as-nonexistence occurs at rate",
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "establishment": "not_established"
 }
},
{
 "id": "ec-predicts-at-rate",
 "claim_kind": "generality",
 "target": {
  "planned_anchor": "csp:ec-rate",
  "section": "§7",
  "anchor_present_in_document": false
 },
"gloss": "That EC predicts the matched-pair result better than a preregistered null",
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "establishment": "not_established"
 }
},
{
 "id": "conferral-occurs-at-rate",
```

```
   "claim_kind": "generality",
   "target": {
    "planned_anchor": "csp:conferral-rate",
    "section": "§7",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
   "gloss": "That appraisal conferral occurs at rate",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "establishment": "not_established"
   }
  }
 ],
 "relations": [
  {
   "from": "lucente-1",
   "to": "ABN",
   "relation": "motivates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "lucente-4",
   "to": "EC",
   "relation": "motivates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "lucente-4",
   "to": "appraisal-transfer",
   "relation": "motivates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "EC-administration",
   "to": "EC",
   "relation": "instantiates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
```

```
   "from": "EC-audit",
   "to": "EC",
   "relation": "derived_from",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "at-rate",
   "to": "lucente-1",
   "relation": "independent_of",
  "note": "The generality claim does not qualify the observation. Lucente reported an instance; at-
rate concerns frequency.",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "at-rate",
   "to": "lucente-4",
   "relation": "independent_of",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "appraisal-transfer",
   "to": "lucente-4",
   "relation": "interprets",
  "note": "An interpretation of an observation may not qualify it. Candidate status here does not re
4.",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "abn-occurs-at-rate",
   "to": "ABN",
   "relation": "instantiates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false,
  "note": "CORRECTED v0.6. at-rate previously qualified ABN. A failure to establish an effect at rat
  },
  {
   "from": "ec-predicts-at-rate",
   "to": "EC",
```

```
   "relation": "instantiates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "conferral-occurs-at-rate",
   "to": "appraisal-transfer",
   "relation": "instantiates",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "conferral-occurs-at-rate",
   "to": "lucente-4",
   "relation": "independent_of",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false,
   "note": "The rate claim does not qualify the observation."
  }
 ],
 "protected_constraints": [
  {
   "id": "generality-limit",
  "constraint": "The sentence must deny rate-level establishment only, never instance-
level observation.",
   "protected_fragment": "at rate",
   "protection": "lexical",
   "may_be_satisfied_otherwise": true,
   "selected_by": "author, at composition",
  "reason": "Without these two words the sentence denies the observation the document begins from."
  },
  {
   "id": "attribution-boundary",
  "constraint": "The observations are the observer's; the formalization and instrument specificati
   "protected_fragment": "the originating observations they formalize are hers",
   "protection": "lexical",
   "may_be_satisfied_otherwise": true,
   "selected_by": "author, on revision of v6.0"
  },
  {
   "id": "EC-never-finding",
  "constraint": "EC's heuristic status must appear at every location EC's value appears.",
   "protection": "semantic",
   "selected_by": "author"
```

```
  }
 ],
 "bindings": [
  {
   "claim": "*",
   "surface": "frontmatter.citation_status",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
   "surface": "jsonld.spxi:statusFlags",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "frontmatter.version",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "jsonld.version",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.date_modified",
   "surface": "jsonld.dateModified",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "ABN|EC|EC-audit",
   "surface": "module.json",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
   "surface": "relations_block",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
```

```
   "surface": "jsonld.spxi:compressionSurvivalSummary",
  "note": "Authored. The checker verifies the statuses named in it match; it does not write it.",
   "mode": "authored",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "footer",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  }
 ],
 "history": [
  {
   "claim": "EC-audit",
   "version": "v1.0",
   "to": {
    "metric_name": "denial_rate"
   },
   "direction": "initial"
  },
  {
   "claim": "EC-audit",
   "version": "v2.0",
   "from": {
    "metric_name": "denial_rate"
   },
   "to": {
    "metric_name": "misreport_rate"
   },
   "direction": "renamed",
   "reason": "denial attributes a mental state the instrument cannot measure",
   "proposition_delta": true,
   "authorized_by": "review-v1.0"
  },
  {
   "claim": "appraisal-transfer",
   "version": "v3.0",
   "from": {
    "specification": "asserted_identity_with_pi_d"
   },
   "to": {
    "specification": "candidate"
   },
   "direction": "weakened",
   "reason": "operator identity exceeded evidence",
   "evidence_delta": null,
```

```
  "scope_delta": null,
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "weakening_justification": {
   "kind": "proposition_exceeded"
  },
  "trigger_claim": "appraisal-transfer",
  "authorized_by": "revision-v3.0",
  "preserved": "that a typed transfer of appraisal is a coherent construct",
  "negated": "that it is the same operator as Referential Dispersal"
 },
 {
  "claim": "EC-audit",
  "version": "v7.0",
  "from": {
   "metric_name": "misreport_rate"
  },
  "to": {
   "metric_name": "miss_rate",
   "adds": [
    "concordance_rate",
    "misreport_rate over both cells"
   ]
  },
  "direction": "refined",
  "reason": "misreport named only one direction of discordance",
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "authorized_by": "audit-v6.0"
 },
 {
  "claim": "ABN",
  "version": "v7.0",
  "from": {
   "scope": "per_rendering"
  },
  "to": {
   "scope": "per_attested_node"
  },
  "direction": "refined",
  "reason": "formula and decision rule disagreed on the unit",
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "authorized_by": "audit-v6.0"
 },
 {
  "claim": "at-rate",
  "version": "v0.6",
  "from": {
   "edges": "qualifies ABN, qualifies EC"
```

```
   },
   "to": {
    "edges": "split into abn-occurs-at-rate, ec-predicts-at-rate, conferral-occurs-
at-rate"
   },
   "direction": "refined",
  "reason": "a generality claim about a phenomenon was pointed at the instruments that measure it",
   "proposition_delta": true,
   "authorized_by": "cross-file-review-v0.5"
  }
 ],
 "stagnation_alerts": [
  {
   "claim": "lucente-1",
   "unchanged_since": "v1.0",
   "revisions_elapsed": 8,
   "blocked_by": "translation_confirmed = false",
   "axis": "verification.translation_confirmed",
   "candidate_transition": "false → true"
  },
  {
   "claim": "lucente-4",
   "unchanged_since": "v1.0",
   "revisions_elapsed": 8,
   "blocked_by": "translation_confirmed = false",
   "axis": "verification.translation_confirmed",
   "candidate_transition": "false → true"
  }
 ],
 "dissent": [],
 "integrity": {
  "packet_sha256": null,
  "document_sha256": null,
 "_note": "Populated at generation. A released packet asserts this state graph applied to exactly t
 },
 "_generator_state": "unimplemented"
}
```


A.2 — EA-PER-INTERFACES-01.csp.json

```
conferral-occurrence  --independent_of-->  PER-blindness     licenses: null
```

PER-blindness is analytic. The candidate beside it must not take it.

`external_claims_cited` carries the rule that a frame may cite the specimens' states and may not lower them — a map that could weaken its own evidence by citing it would be the ratchet with extra steps.

```
{
 "@context": "https://spxi.dev/ns/csp/v1",
 "@type": "ClaimStatusPacket",
 "csp_version": "0.6",
 "_generated": false,
"_note": "Hand-authored. The frame packet. Its distinctive feature is that most of its claims are al
 "document": {
  "id": "EA-PER-INTERFACES-01",
 "title": "Four Interfaces of Provenance Transformation: A Findings Map and a Program Extension",
  "version": "v6.1",
  "series_id": "SERIES-FOUR-INTERFACES",
  "version_in_series": 8,
  "document_status": "DRAFT",
  "deposited": false,
  "deposit_number": null,
  "axn": null,
  "spxi_hex": "06.SEI.PER.INTERFACES.01",
  "date_created": "2026-08-21",
  "date_modified": "2026-08-21",
  "creator": "Sharks, Lee",
  "orcid": "0009-0000-1599-0703",
  "contributors": [
   {
    "name": "Lucente, Enli",
    "role": "originating observation, Specimen 1",
    "orcid": "0009-0006-2822-8359"
   },
   {
    "name": "Owens, Rhys",
    "role": "named traverser, Specimen 3"
   }
  ],
  "binding_state": {
   "deposited_bound": [
    1525,
    1526
   ],
   "held_bound": [
    "EA-PER-LUCENTE-01",
    "EA-PER-DERIVATIVE-01"
   ],
   "note": "Inbound joins from held documents resolve to nothing until deposit."
  }
 },
 "meta": {
  "governs": "claims within EA-PER-INTERFACES-01 only",
 "does_not_govern": "the bound specimens' own packets; this document cites their statuses and may n
```

```
 "revision_rule": "Kind disputes to MANUS; dissent recorded, assignment stands.",
 "document_kind": "findings_map",
"_note": "document_kind describes the whole document. claim_kind describes propositions. Separate
},
"claims": [
 {
  "id": "four-interfaces",
  "claim_kind": "interpretation",
  "target": {
   "section": "§1",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:four-interfaces",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
 "gloss": "EXIST, REFER, STAND, WARRANT as four transformation boundaries; passage is not sequenti
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "kind_adjudicated_by": {
   "who": "MANUS",
   "when": "v3.0",
   "over_dissent": false
  },
  "state": {
   "specification": "specified",
   "validation": "untested",
   "deployment": "not_deployed",
   "reportability": "reportable_with_flag"
  },
 "defeat": "The scheme classifies reliably and predicts nothing. Then withdraw as an explanatory m
 },
 {
  "id": "PER-blindness",
  "claim_kind": "instrument",
  "target": {
   "section": "§5",
   "planned_anchor": "csp:symmetry",
   "anchor_present_in_document": false
  },
 "gloss": "PER returns 0.0 for a pure conferral as for a pure removal, since no scored provenance ur
  "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
  "state": {
   "specification": "analytic",
   "validation": "follows_from_definition",
   "deployment": "n/a",
   "reportability": "reportable_as_finding"
  },
 "_note": "NOT candidate. This follows from the definition of PER and requires no observation. It m
 },
 {
```

```
   "id": "conferral-occurrence",
   "claim_kind": "interpretation",
   "target": {
    "section": "§5",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:conferral",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
  "gloss": "That Lucente  instantiates a conferral transformation, and that it is w-
conditioned",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "specification": "candidate",
    "validation": "no_rubric",
    "deployment": "not_deployed",
    "reportability": "not_a_metric"
   }
  },
  {
   "id": "observed-partition",
   "claim_kind": "observation",
   "target": {
    "section": "§3",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:partition",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
  "gloss": "In this sample, single-surface specimens exhibit status transformation; the two-
surface relay exhibits warrant constitution",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "assertion": "observed_in_sample",
    "verification": {
     "author_checked": true,
     "independent_check": false
    },
    "scope": {
     "instance": "observed",
     "explained_by_topology": "not_established"
    }
   }
  },
  {
   "id": "topology-hypothesis",
   "claim_kind": "generality",
   "target": {
    "section": "§3",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:topology",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
```

```
 },
"gloss": "That mediation topology shifts the distribution of deformation classes",
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "establishment": "not_established"
 },
 "confounds": [
  "querent covaries with topology across the sample",
  "Lucente additionally differs in language, corpus, provenance"
 ],
"defeat": "The distributions are indistinguishable. NOT falsified by a single crossover."
},
{
 "id": "scale-law",
 "claim_kind": "interpretation",
 "target": {
  "section": "§4",
  "planned_anchor": "csp:scale-law",
  "anchor_present_in_document": false
 },
"gloss": "The retention operator must be evaluated at the unit at which the object exercises its c
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "specification": "specified",
  "validation": "untested",
  "deployment": "partially_deployed",
  "reportability": "reportable_with_flag"
 },
"_note": "Partially deployed: the Atomic Token Rule instantiates it at source level and is in use.
},
{
 "id": "status-law",
 "claim_kind": "interpretation",
 "target": {
  "section": "§4.5",
  "planned_anchor": "csp:status-law",
  "anchor_present_in_document": false
 },
"gloss": "Assign status at the layer at which the claim is made; status does not propagate across l
 "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
 "state": {
  "specification": "specified",
  "validation": "untested",
  "deployment": "not_deployed",
  "reportability": "reportable_with_flag"
 },
 "governs": "revision methodology, not mediation topology",
```

```
   "is_not": "a fifth interface"
  },
  {
   "id": "interfaces-at-rate",
   "claim_kind": "generality",
   "target": {
    "section": "§1",
    "planned_anchor": "csp:zero-controls",
    "anchor_present_in_document": false
   },
   "gloss": "That any of the identified transformations occur at rate",
   "_gloss_is_non_normative": true,
   "state": {
    "establishment": "not_established"
   },
   "controls_run": 0,
   "controls_specified": [
    "Audit 3",
    "topology one-variable trials",
    "ABN corpus test",
    "EC-Audit matched pairs"
   ]
  }
 ],
 "relations": [
  {
   "from": "observed-partition",
   "to": "topology-hypothesis",
   "relation": "motivates",
  "note": "The partition motivates the hypothesis. A failure of the hypothesis does not unobserve th
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "topology-hypothesis",
   "to": "observed-partition",
   "relation": "generalizes",
  "note": "Explicitly blocked. The specimens partitioned; whether topology explains it is separate.
   "licenses": "establishment",
   "direction": "source_to_target",
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "conferral-occurrence",
   "to": "PER-blindness",
   "relation": "independent_of",
```

```
  "note": "LOAD-BEARING. PER-blindness is analytic. The candidate status of conferral-
occurrence must not reach it.",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "PER-blindness",
   "to": "four-interfaces",
   "relation": "supports",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "scale-law",
   "to": "four-interfaces",
   "relation": "supports",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "status-law",
   "to": "four-interfaces",
   "relation": "independent_of",
  "note": "Governance, not topology. The status law does not support or extend the interface map.",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "interfaces-at-rate",
   "to": "observed-partition",
   "relation": "independent_of",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  },
  {
   "from": "interfaces-at-rate",
   "to": "PER-blindness",
   "relation": "independent_of",
   "licenses": null,
   "direction": null,
   "automatic": false
  }
```

```
],
"external_claims_cited": [
 {
  "claim": "lucente-4",
  "packet": "EA-PER-LUCENTE-01.csp.json",
  "cited_state": {
   "assertion": "reported_by_observer"
  },
  "rule": "This document may cite the state. It may not lower it."
 },
 {
  "claim": "appraisal-transfer",
  "packet": "EA-PER-LUCENTE-01.csp.json",
  "cited_state": {
   "specification": "candidate"
  }
 },
 {
  "claim": "omega-s",
  "deposit": 1525,
  "cited_state": {
   "specification": "specified",
   "validation": "untested"
  }
 },
 {
  "claim": "warrant-constitution",
  "deposit": 1526,
  "cited_state": {
   "assertion": "observed_under_relay",
   "generality": "not_established"
  }
 }
],
"protected_constraints": [
 {
  "id": "sample-scoping",
 "constraint": "Statements about the partition must be scoped to the sample, never stated causally
  "protected_fragment": "in this sample",
  "protection": "lexical",
  "may_be_satisfied_otherwise": true,
  "selected_by": "author, at v6.0",
  "reason": "Removes the causal reading of a confounded observation."
 },
 {
  "id": "zero-controls",
 "constraint": "The controls declaration must state that no DECISIVE control has run, distinguishi
```

```
matched control at Docking §12.",
   "protected_fragment": "ZERO OF THE DECISIVE SPECIFIED CONTROLS HAVE BEEN RUN",
   "protection": "lexical",
   "may_be_satisfied_otherwise": true,
   "selected_by": "author, at v6.0"
  },
  {
   "id": "analytic-not-candidate",
  "constraint": "The PER-blindness result must never be qualified as candidate. It follows from the
   "protection": "semantic",
   "selected_by": "reviewer, at v6.0",
  "reason": "Anti-flattening. The formal claim and the empirical claim sit adjacent and a global wea
  },
  {
   "id": "identified-not-instrumented",
  "constraint": "Three additional interfaces are identified; REFER is the sole operationally instru
   "protection": "semantic",
   "selected_by": "author, at v6.0"
  }
 ],
 "bindings": [
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "frontmatter.version",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "jsonld.version",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.date_modified",
   "surface": "jsonld.dateModified",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
   "surface": "jsonld.spxi:statusFlags",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
```

```
   "surface": "relations_block",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.binding_state",
   "surface": "§0.6",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "*",
   "surface": "jsonld.spxi:compressionSurvivalSummary",
   "mode": "authored",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  },
  {
   "claim": "document.version",
   "surface": "footer",
   "mode": "generate",
   "materialized_by_generator": false
  }
 ],
 "history": [
  {
   "claim": "four-interfaces",
   "version": "v3.0",
   "from": {
    "model": "four_stages_sequential"
   },
   "to": {
    "model": "four_interfaces_boundaries"
   },
   "direction": "refined",
  "reason": "stages omitted source-of-reference and made removal/conferral successive",
   "proposition_delta": true,
   "authorized_by": "review-v2.0"
  },
  {
   "claim": "conferral-occurrence",
   "version": "v3.0",
   "from": {
    "specification": "same_coefficient"
   },
   "to": {
    "specification": "structural_symmetry_only"
   },
```

```
  "direction": "weakened",
  "reason": "dependent quantity changed; not a change of sign",
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "weakening_justification": {
   "kind": "proposition_exceeded"
  },
  "authorized_by": "review-v2.0",
  "preserved": "that both are invisible to the first moment",
  "negated": "that they are two ends of one coefficient"
 },
 {
  "claim": "topology-hypothesis",
  "version": "v4.0",
  "from": {
   "defeat": "single_crossover"
  },
  "to": {
   "defeat": "distribution_indistinguishable"
  },
  "direction": "strengthened",
  "reason": "one crossover should not kill a propensity claim",
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "authorized_by": "review-v3.0"
 },
 {
  "claim": "PER-blindness",
  "version": "v6.0",
  "from": {
   "specification": "entangled_with_empirical"
  },
  "to": {
   "specification": "analytic"
  },
  "direction": "strengthened",
 "reason": "the formal result was being weakened alongside the empirical claim it sits beside",
  "proposition_delta": true,
  "authorized_by": "review-v5.2",
  "preserved": "everything the prior statement established",
  "negated": "nothing"
 },
 {
  "claim": "status-law",
  "version": "v6.1",
  "from": {
   "framing": "fifth_site_of_standing_conversion"
  },
  "to": {
```

```
    "framing": "governance_not_topology"
   },
   "direction": "refined",
   "reason": "mediation boundaries are inter-system; revision is intra-system",
   "proposition_delta": true,
   "authorized_by": "review-v6.0"
  }
 ],
 "stagnation_alerts": [
  {
   "claim": "topology-hypothesis",
   "unchanged_since": "v4.0",
   "revisions_elapsed": 4,
   "blocked_by": "no one-variable trial has been run",
   "axis": "validation",
   "candidate_transition": "untested → tested"
  },
  {
   "claim": "four-interfaces",
   "unchanged_since": "v3.0",
   "revisions_elapsed": 5,
   "blocked_by": "predictive validity untested",
   "axis": "validation",
   "candidate_transition": "untested → tested"
  }
 ],
 "dissent": [],
 "integrity": {
  "packet_sha256": null,
  "document_sha256": null
 },
 "_generator_state": "unimplemented"
}
```


End of Appendix A.

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora. SPXI-TLP treated: EA-SPXI-WEB-01 v4.0 ·06.SEI.SPXI.CSP.01

□ = 1

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “The Claim Status Packet: Claim State as Carried Data”*Alexanarch*, 2026-08-21. https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1529/

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1529 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:062E.GOVERNANCE` is sovereign —minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1529/
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: /api/index.json
- Full text (HTML): https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1529/

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.