

Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) Framework

An Operating System Powered by the Dual Lens Principle

Monica M. Hernandez, PMP*

Daniel A. Montero[†]

April 2026

Contents

Document Information	2
Document Provenance	2
Abstract	3
Section 1. Introduction	5
Section 2. The Methodological Foundation	8
What the Diagnostic Layer establishes	8
What the Methodological Layer establishes	8
What the SDA implementation must respond to	9
Section 3. The SDA Framework Architecture on Convoking4	9
3.1 The five components and how the implementation renders each	10
3.2 The four functions and how the implementation serves each	12
3.3 What the architecture establishes	13
Section 4. The SDA Process	14
4.1 The shape of the session	14
4.2 The first part: capture and extraction	15
4.3 The second part: building the structural elements	16
4.4 The third part: auditing commitment and coherence	18
4.5 The fourth part: producing the artifacts and closing the loop	19
4.6 The session as a single arc	20
Section 5. The Conditions of Artificial Intelligence Participation	20
5.1 When AI is invited	21
5.2 What AI is asked to do	21
5.3 How AI output is evaluated	22
5.4 What AI is not asked to do	23
5.5 The four conditions as a coherent specification	24
Section 6. Practitioner Discipline and Failure Modes	25
6.1 Failure modes the implementation can exhibit when applied dishonestly	25
6.2 Failure modes the implementation does not address	26

*Decision Architect and System Designer. ORCID 0009-0006-3687-9530. BC-DS, Business Consultants for Digital Solutions, LLC, Rockville, Maryland, United States.

[†]Decision Architect and System Designer. ORCID 0009-0007-9131-8557. BC-DS, Business Consultants for Digital Solutions, LLC, Rockville, Maryland, United States.

6.3 The practitioner discipline the technique requires	27
6.4 The honest scope of what the implementation can do	28
Section 7. Compliance with the Methodological Constraints	29
7.1 The frame must be surfaced before deliberation, not after	29
7.2 Aspiration and constraint must be held together, not alternated	30
7.3 The output must be an artifact that can be examined and revised	31
7.4 The methodology must establish the conditions of AI participation, not be established by it	32
7.5 The technique must be operable across decision scales	32
7.6 The compliance argument as a whole	33
Section 8. The SDA Implementation, the BDA Implementation, and the Deci- sion Architecture Discipline	34
8.1 The two implementations on a shared methodological foundation	35
8.2 The structural relationship between individual and organizational de- cision governance	35
8.3 The practitioner journey through the Decisiontect ecosystem	36
8.4 The Decision Architecture discipline as a whole	38
8.5 What the SDA on Convoking4 contributes to the discipline	38
Section 9. Conclusion	39
9.1 What the SDA on Convoking4 establishes	39
9.2 What is bounded as forthcoming work	40
9.3 Empirical research questions	41
9.4 The SDA on Convoking4 as a contribution to the discipline	42
References	43
Companion Documents	43
Copyright and Licensing	45

Document Information

Document type: Framework Layer (Individual) of the Decision Architecture discipline

Version: Decision Architecture, Framework Layer (Individual), version 2.0

License: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Suggested citation: Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026). *Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) Framework: An Operating System Powered by the Dual Lens Principle*. Decision Architecture, Framework Layer (Individual), version 2.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19871192.

Document Provenance

This whitepaper is the Framework Layer publication of the Decision Architecture discipline at the individual scale. It documents the Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) framework as currently implemented on the Convoking4 platform, where a single Decision Architect runs the framework through the live conversational instrument the platform provides. The framework operationalizes the foundational technique

documented in the published Methodological Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026b) at the scale of one person making a consequential commitment.

The Decision Architecture discipline rests on a four-paper publication architecture. The foundational layer consists of the Diagnostic Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026a, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19831515) and the Methodological Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026b, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19832436), which establish the discipline’s scholarly foundation by documenting the structural realities of decision distortion and the foundational technique that responds to those realities. The implementation layer consists of this paper (the Framework Layer publication at the individual scale) and the forthcoming Business Decision Architecture (BDA) framework paper (the Framework Layer publication at the organizational scale). Each layer carries durability appropriate to its scope: the foundational layer remains authoritative regardless of how the technique is operationalized in practice; the implementation layer documents specific platform-anchored operationalizations and will be revised in subsequent versions as the platforms evolve.

This paper supersedes Solo Decision Architecture v1.0 (Hernandez 2026), the framework’s first standalone publication. Version 2.0 reflects substantive revisions for cross-paper coherence with the published Diagnostic and Methodological Layers, applies the canonical terminology established in those papers, integrates the methodological requirements they document, and refines the operational specificity of the framework based on the field validation work conducted through the Dual-Lens Decision Architecture (DLDA), the Convoking4 platform’s first operational instrument for individual practitioners. Earlier public versions of the framework remain available at the BC-DS GitHub repository (<https://github.com/BCDS-LLC/Frameworks-BDA-and-SDA>), the BC-DS frameworks site (<https://frameworks.bc-ds.com/>), and the BC-DS website (<https://bc-ds.com/framework-documents>). Convoking4 is available at <https://convoking4.com>.

The framework’s open-discipline commitment is preserved at version 2.0. The paper is released under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, and the framework knowledge documented here is freely available to any practitioner, researcher, or framework developer who wishes to apply it, evaluate it, or build on it. The Convoking4 platform monetizes platform capability and credentialing through its tier structure; the framework specification itself remains open.

Abstract

The Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) framework operationalizes the foundational technique documented in the Methodological Layer of the Decision Architecture discipline (Hernandez and Montero 2026b) at the individual scale, where a single Decision Architect is the unit of accountability for a consequential commitment. The framework is currently implemented on the Convoking4 platform, and this paper documents that implementation. The Diagnostic Layer of the discipline (Hernandez and Montero 2026a) establishes that consequential decisions are distorted by the compounding interaction of human cognitive bias, organizational dynamics, and the technical properties of generative artificial intelligence, with distortion forming inside

one person's thinking before it ever reaches a team. The Methodological Layer establishes the technique that responds to the diagnostic, backcasting and the dual lens with a decision architecture artifact as its output, and the five constraints any framework operationalizing the technique must meet.

The implementation captures the practitioner's frame in a Brain Dump phase conducted human-only, extracts four coordinates under the Honest Extraction rule, and proceeds through a nine-phase session that holds aspiration and constraint together through the dual lens. Structural mechanisms enforce the methodology's conditions at specific gates: the Camera Test on milestone inspectability, the ADICE Matrix on stakeholder assumptions, the Flinch Test on commitment acceptance, and the bidirectional Verification on artifact convergence.

The paper documents the implementation's structural answers to the methodology's five constraints, with platform-design enforcement of the four AI participation conditions producing the methodology's required conditions during the practitioner's normal use of the system rather than relying on the practitioner to maintain the conditions through self-discipline. The implementation does not eliminate the diagnostic's failure modes; it bounds their reach into the artifact through structural mechanisms documented across the paper. Practitioner discipline at specific points where the platform structures but does not strictly enforce remains essential, and the paper names honestly the failure modes the implementation can exhibit when applied dishonestly and the failure modes the implementation does not address.

The SDA on Convoking4 is one of two platform-anchored implementations of the technique on a shared methodological foundation. The Business Decision Architecture (BDA) framework, forthcoming as the companion publication, operationalizes the same technique at the organizational scale. The two implementations interlock through practitioners who move between scales: the SDA produces audited individual frames that the BDA process integrates, and the BDA produces organizational decisions that individuals execute through their own SDA practice. The Decision Architecture discipline as a whole rests on the foundational layer (Diagnostic and Methodological) and the implementation layer (the framework papers), with each layer carrying durability appropriate to its scope.

The paper closes with empirical research questions specific to the SDA's claims, offered to the broader research community as a structured agenda for testing what the framework asserts about artifact examinability, the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary, milestone inspectability, commitment accountability, and the implementation's bounded scope. Subsequent versions of the paper will revise as the comprehensive Convoking4 platform evolves; the framework specification is durable across implementations, and the bounded scope is honest about what the current platform delivers versus what the comprehensive platform will deliver.

Keywords: Decision Architecture, Solo Decision Architecture, decision architect, backcasting, dual lens, decision architecture artifact, Decision Blueprint, AI governance, individual decision-making, Convoking4, Decisiontect, framework operationalization.

Section 1. Introduction

A consequential decision rarely begins in a meeting. It begins earlier, inside one person's thinking, in the moment when a situation that matters has not yet been resolved and the mind has already started to settle on what to do about it. The person sitting with the decision is the Decision Architect. The framework documented in this paper is the Solo Decision Architecture, and it governs that moment. The framework is currently implemented on the Convoking4 platform, and this paper is the documentation of that implementation.

The Decision Architecture discipline rests on two scholarly foundations. The Diagnostic Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026a) establishes that consequential decisions in modern organizations are distorted by the compounding interaction of human cognitive bias, organizational dynamics, and the technical properties of generative artificial intelligence, and names the failure modes that produce the distortion. The Methodological Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026b) establishes the technique that responds to the distortion: backcasting and the dual lens, with a decision architecture artifact as the technique's output, evaluable against five methodological constraints any framework must meet. These two papers carry the discipline's foundational claims and remain authoritative regardless of how the technique is operationalized in practice. SDA v2.0 documents one specific operationalization of the technique: the implementation built for individual practitioners on the Convoking4 platform.

The implementation matters because the technique alone is not enough. A practitioner working alone with a consequential commitment, without a team to enforce discipline, without an organizational process to require audit, and without a colleague to separate the proposer's voice from the challenger's voice, has the methodology available to them as a documented standard. They do not yet have the structural support that makes the methodology practicable at sustained scale. The Convoking4 platform's role is to provide that structural support. It asks the questions, structures the artifact, enforces the AI participation conditions the methodology specifies, and tracks the governance conditions that an unaided practitioner would otherwise have to maintain entirely through self-discipline. The platform is what makes the technique operable for the Decision Architect working alone.

The current implementation of the SDA on Convoking4 is the Dual-Lens Decision Architecture (DLDA), the platform's first operational instrument for individual practitioners, available at convoking4.com/decision-engine. The DLDA was scoped to validate that the technique documented in the Methodological Layer responds to the failure modes documented in the Diagnostic Layer at the individual scale. It is the empirical apparatus through which the framework has been field-tested, and the early field evidence is reported throughout this paper where it is relevant. A more comprehensive platform, supporting the full practitioner lifecycle including longitudinal Evolve governance and multi-session continuity, is forthcoming. The framework specification documented here is durable across implementations. The specific platform features described in this paper reflect the platform's current state and will be revised in subsequent versions as the platform evolves. This is the appropriate posture for implementation documentation, distinct from the foundational documentation that

the Diagnostic and Methodological Layers carry.

The Decision Architect using the SDA on Convoking4 produces a Decision Blueprint. The Blueprint is the practitioner's working document, downloaded at the close of a session and shared with anyone who needs to understand what was decided. It is the platform's specific rendering of what the Methodological Layer specifies abstractly as the decision architecture artifact: the five components and four functions Section 6 of the Methodological Layer establishes. The compliance demonstration in Section 7 of this paper shows that the Convoking4 implementation produces Blueprints meeting the methodology's requirements.

The individual scale matters because distortion forms inside one person's thinking before it ever reaches a team. The Diagnostic Layer is explicit on this point: the cognitive failure modes (the Performance of Rigor, the recruitment of analytical work to defend a frame established before deliberation) operate on individuals, and organizational failure modes compound on top of them. By the time a decision enters a meeting, a stakeholder review, or an AI assistant, the frame the decision sits inside has usually been formed somewhere upstream, by a single mind, without a structure that surfaced what was being assumed. The Methodological Layer's first constraint, that the frame must be surfaced before deliberation, has its first natural home at this scale.

The SDA on Convoking4 and the forthcoming Business Decision Architecture (BDA) framework on Convoking4 are the two platform-anchored implementations of the technique at different scales. The SDA governs the integrity of one person's thinking. The BDA governs the integrity of organizational deliberation across multiple stakeholders, altitudes, and time horizons. Both produce Blueprints. The differentiation is implementation-level: different audiences, different infrastructure, different credentialing, different operational challenges, on a shared methodological foundation. The SDA produces audited individual frames that the BDA process integrates into multi-stakeholder deliberation. Organizations that adopt the BDA without supporting individual SDA practice may continue to surface the same individual-level distortions the discipline was built to interrupt. The relationship is not hierarchical. It is the natural composition of two implementations operating at scales that, in practice, intersect through the practitioners who move between them.

What distinguishes the SDA framework as implemented on Convoking4 from general-purpose decision tools, AI assistants, and analytical methods is the following combination of properties. It governs the moment before the Decision Architect's thinking enters any system, organizational or artificial. It produces a structured Blueprint that survives the deliberation that produced it. It establishes the conditions under which artificial intelligence may participate in the deliberation, and the work AI is structurally permitted and structurally not permitted to do. It produces a Blueprint that can be examined, revised, and accounted for over the lifetime of the commitment. It does this at a scale a single person can sustain on their own initiative, supported by the open framework documentation and the free tier of the Convoking4 platform, without requiring organizational adoption or institutional permission.

Three things the framework does not claim to do are worth naming at the opening. The SDA does not eliminate cognitive bias; it makes bias structural rather than invisi-

ble, so the Decision Architect can govern it instead of being governed by it. The SDA does not produce decisions automatically; it structures the deliberation that produces a decision, and the work the technique requires remains the practitioner's work. The SDA does not guarantee that the complete picture was available at the moment of commitment; it does require that what was knowable was named, what was assumed was specified at a level it could be tested, and what was carried despite uncertainty was carried consciously. These boundaries are the honest scope of what any framework operating at this scale can do, and naming them is part of the discipline's posture.

The Convoking4 platform is delivered through a tier structure. The free tier provides the SDA framework's core operational environment for the individual practitioner, including the DLDA validation instrument in its current form. Practitioners working at the free tier can produce Blueprints, generate the audience-specific hypothesis documents derived from them, and pursue the foundational credential of the Decisiontect ecosystem (DT-S, Decisiontect Solo, the Calibrated Practitioner credential), which certifies competence in applying the SDA framework on Convoking4. DT-S is referenced here as a forthcoming credential within the Decisiontect certification program scheduled to launch in 2027, with the publication of SDA v2.0 helping to establish the foundation for the credential. The paid tier adds capabilities such as multi-AI integration and advanced features that serious practitioners may want as their practice deepens. The framework knowledge itself remains open under CC BY 4.0; what the paid tier monetizes is platform capability and credentialing, not the methodology.

The audience for this paper is, in the first instance, the Decision Architect: the professional, founder, manager, clinician, or anyone making a consequential commitment at the personal or individual scale who wants a structured method for applying the technique to their own thinking, supported by the Convoking4 platform. The secondary audience is researchers and other framework developers who may cite the SDA as one specific platform-anchored operationalization of the technique, evaluable against the methodological standards the Methodological Layer establishes. The paper is written so that practitioners can apply the framework on Convoking4 after reading it, and so that researchers can evaluate the implementation on the same evidentiary grounds the discipline applies to itself.

The remainder of the paper develops the implementation in nine sections. Section 2 restates the methodological foundation briefly and refers the reader to the Diagnostic and Methodological Layers for the discipline's full scholarly argument. Section 3 documents the SDA implementation's framework architecture: the five components and four functions the Blueprint must carry, and how the Convoking4 implementation renders each one. Section 4 documents the SDA process step by step as the practitioner experiences it on Convoking4. Section 5 documents the conditions of artificial intelligence participation as they are enforced by the platform at the individual scale. Section 6 documents practitioner discipline and the failure modes the implementation can exhibit when applied poorly. Section 7 demonstrates the Convoking4 implementation's compliance with each of the five methodological constraints established in the Methodological Layer. Section 8 documents the SDA's relationship to the BDA implementation and to the broader Decision Architecture discipline. Section 9 closes by naming what the SDA on Convoking4 establishes, what is left to subsequent versions, and the empirical research questions that follow specifically from the

implementation's claims.

Section 2. The Methodological Foundation

The Solo Decision Architecture as implemented on Convoking4 responds to a discipline whose foundations are already established in two published papers. This section names what those foundations require of any implementation, including this one, and refers the reader to the published Diagnostic Layer and Methodological Layer for the full scholarly argument. The work done in those papers is not repeated here.

What the Diagnostic Layer establishes

The Diagnostic Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026a, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19831515) documents the structural realities that distort consequential decisions in modern organizations, organized across three compounding layers. The first is human cognitive bias, including the Performance of Rigor (the recruitment of analytical work to defend a frame established before deliberation rather than examine it). The second is organizational dynamics, including the Illusion of Alignment (the systematic confusion of the absence of conflict with the presence of agreement) and the Filtration of Reality (the systematic distortion of operational truth as it travels upward through hierarchy). The third is artificial intelligence-specific distortion, including sycophancy, hallucination, automation bias, attention degradation in long contexts, and the empirically documented amplification of human bias through human-AI feedback loops (Glickman and Sharot 2024). The compounded dynamic the diagnostic names the Cascade of Distortion. Decision Debt is the accumulating cost of decisions performed rather than genuinely made.

The diagnostic is explicit that distortion forms inside one person's thinking before it ever reaches a team. This is the scale at which the SDA implementation operates, and the failure modes the implementation must respond to operate first at this scale. The full argument and supporting evidence are in the published Diagnostic Layer.

What the Methodological Layer establishes

The Methodological Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026b, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19832436) documents the foundational technique that responds to the diagnostic: backcasting and the dual lens, applied to consequential decision-making, with a decision architecture artifact as the technique's output. The technique is scale-independent, operable at the individual scale of a single decision-maker, the small-team scale of a coordinated group, and the organizational scale of an enterprise commitment. What changes between scales is the rendering of the artifact, the cadence of the iteration, and the number of participants in the audit.

Section 6 of the Methodological Layer specifies that the artifact must contain five components: the decision and its scope; the desired future state with end-conditions; the current-state grounding with audited assumptions; the path between them; and the governance conditions under which the artifact is examined and revised. The

artifact must serve four functions that verbal alignment cannot perform: memory, examinability, revisability, and accountability. The methodology also establishes the conditions of artificial intelligence participation: when AI is invited (after the frame and end-condition are captured, before path convergence), what AI is asked to do (operate against audited assumptions), how AI output is evaluated (against the artifact, not against fluency or confidence), and what AI is structurally not asked to do (specify the desired future state, audit current-state assumptions, or determine convergence).

Section 2 of the Methodological Layer derives five constraints that any framework operationalizing the technique must meet. The frame must be surfaced before deliberation, not after. Aspiration and constraint must be held together, not alternated. The output must be an artifact that can be examined and revised. The methodology must establish the conditions of AI participation, not be established by it. The technique must be operable across decision scales. The full derivation and rationale are in the published Methodological Layer.

What the SDA implementation must respond to

The SDA framework as implemented on Convoking4 is one specific platform-anchored operationalization of the technique at the individual scale. To meet the methodology's bar, the implementation must produce Blueprints that contain the five components and serve the four functions. It must enforce the AI participation conditions structurally, through the platform's design, rather than relying on the practitioner to enforce them through self-discipline. It must respond to all five methodological constraints, demonstrably, at the scale a single Decision Architect can sustain. Sections 3 through 7 of this paper document how the implementation does this work. Section 7 returns to each of the five methodological constraints explicitly and demonstrates the implementation's compliance with each.

The remainder of this paper proceeds on the foundation the published Diagnostic and Methodological Layers establish. Readers encountering the SDA framework first, without prior familiarity with the foundational papers, are encouraged to consult them for the full argument. The summary in this section is sufficient to make the implementation documentation legible. It is not sufficient to substitute for the foundational papers' scholarly contribution.

Section 3. The SDA Framework Architecture on Convoking4

The Methodological Layer specifies what the artifact produced by any framework operationalizing the technique must contain (five components) and what functions it must serve (four functions). It does not specify how those components are rendered or how those functions are operationalized. That work belongs to the framework layer. This section documents the SDA implementation's specific rendering at the individual scale, on the Convoking4 platform.

The section is organized in two parts. The first names the five components and the platform mechanisms that render each one. The second names the four functions

and the platform mechanisms that serve each one. Section 4 documents the practitioner's experience across the platform's nine phases. Section 5 documents the conditions of artificial intelligence participation. Section 7 returns to the methodological constraints established in the Methodological Layer and demonstrates the implementation's compliance with each.

3.1 The five components and how the implementation renders each

The Methodological Layer's Section 6 specifies that the artifact must contain five components: the decision and its scope; the desired future state with end-conditions; the current-state grounding with audited assumptions; the path between current and desired future; and the governance conditions under which the artifact is examined and revised. Each is necessary; each addresses a structural condition that without the component would remain ungoverned. The Convoking4 implementation produces a Decision Blueprint that contains all five.

Component 1: The decision and its scope The methodology requires that the artifact name what is being decided and what is not. The SDA implementation renders this component through three mechanisms operating in sequence. Strategic Triage classifies the deliberation as Cope, Adapt, Transform, or Active Hold before the session opens, calibrating the decision's magnitude. The Catalyst, extracted from the practitioner's raw expression in Phase 2, names what is genuinely driving the decision, distinct from urgency and distinct from the desired future state. The Parking Lot quarantines solutions named prematurely in the practitioner's raw expression and removes them from the active scope until the deliberation has produced its own structural answer.

The Catalyst is a substantive framework-level contribution, not an artifact label. It forces the practitioner to surface the actual driver of the deliberation before any forward motion. The diagnostic establishes that the frame must be surfaced before deliberation rather than after; the Catalyst is the SDA implementation's specific answer to that requirement at the practitioner's scale, where the frame the methodology requires to be surfaced is the frame inside one person's thinking.

Active Hold, the deliberate finding that no change is required at this time, is itself a methodologically valid output of the technique. The Methodological Layer establishes that non-convergence is informative; Active Hold operationalizes that finding for the case where the most honest output is that the current state is the correct state.

Component 2: The desired future state with end-conditions The methodology requires that the artifact specify the desired future state at the level of inspectable end-conditions, not at the level of values or aspirations. Two qualified observers must be able to verify independently whether the end-condition has been reached.

The SDA implementation renders this component as Future State, the first of the four coordinates extracted from the practitioner's raw expression. The Stakes phase locks the desired future state's specific Expected Impact and Deadline through the Paradox Audit, which compares them against the physical distance between Future State and

Current State and rejects them when subjective adjectives or vague timelines fail to support inspection.

The implementation's most consequential operationalization at this component is the Camera Test, applied to every milestone the practitioner proposes during the path construction. The Camera Test requires that each milestone describe a static artifact a camera could photograph: a signed contract, a deployed system, a published document. Action verbs and process descriptions fail. The Bouncer is the implementation's structural mechanism for enforcing the Camera Test, operating as a validation gate at the milestone level. The methodology's inspectability requirement is honored by the platform's design rather than by the practitioner's discretion.

Component 3: The current-state grounding with audited assumptions The methodology requires that the artifact document what is true about the present, with assumptions surfaced and specified at the level at which they were audited.

The SDA implementation renders this component through Current State, the fourth of the four coordinates extracted from the raw expression, held separately from Felt Urgency so that psychological pressure does not contaminate the audit of factual baseline. The implementation's distinctive operationalization at this component is the ADICE Matrix, which audits the practitioner's assumptions about who has standing in the decision. ADICE maps stakeholders into five roles: Authority, Decide, Influence, Contribute, and Experience. The matrix is constructed by the practitioner with platform assistance; the platform reviews the matrix for gaps and proposes additions that surface stakeholders the practitioner may not have named.

ADICE is more than a stakeholder list. It is the SDA implementation's specific rendering of the audited current-state assumptions component, applied to the assumptions about other people's standing that the practitioner most often makes invisibly. The methodology's requirement that current-state assumptions be specified at a level they can be tested is honored at the stakeholder dimension by the matrix's role taxonomy and gap-detection logic.

ADICE is shared across the SDA and BDA implementations, with the SDA paper carrying the individual-scale specification and the forthcoming BDA paper carrying the organizational-scale specification. The matrix structure is the same; what changes is the cadence of construction and the audit cadence.

Component 4: The path between current and desired future The methodology requires that the artifact specify the path as a structural account of what must be true at intermediate moments along the way to the desired future state, not as a project plan listing activities.

The SDA implementation renders this component as the Bridge, constructed backward from the Future State. At each step the platform asks what must have been physically true the moment before the next condition was reached. The practitioner names the milestone; the Bouncer validates it against the Camera Test; the platform locks the milestone and asks the next backward question. The construction is iterative and bounded, completing when the final milestone is causally adjacent to the

Current State.

After the Bridge is constructed, the platform performs the Quarantine Resolution. Each solution previously held in the Parking Lot is adjudicated against the completed Bridge: the Future State and Current State together determine whether each solution earned its place or was set aside. The Quarantine Resolution is the implementation's structural answer to Solution Bias. Solutions are not suppressed at capture but isolated until the path has been built without them, then audited against the path they did not participate in shaping.

The Final Check follows. The platform generates two parallel narratives from the completed artifact, one reading forward and one reading backward, and the practitioner confirms that both hold as absolute truth. This is the implementation's specific rendering of the Methodological Layer's convergence specification: the deliberation has converged when both anchors are mutually supported and the artifact survives examination from both directions.

Component 5: The governance conditions The methodology requires that the artifact specify when it will be re-examined, who is responsible, what conditions trigger unscheduled re-examination, and how revisions are recorded.

The SDA implementation renders this component through the activation step at the close of the session and through the Revise and Rebuild pathway. The activation step closes the gap between the artifact and the practitioner's behavior by requiring the practitioner to choose between executing immediately, generating an audience-specific hypothesis document, or sharing the Blueprint with a stakeholder. The Revise and Rebuild pathway allows the practitioner to load a saved session and update the artifact when conditions change, with platform routing through the validation gates again.

The current MVP's rendering of this component is bounded relative to the methodology's full scope. The Living Record Rule, the Thinking Log with classified trigger sources, automated threshold monitoring, and cascade-depth governance are part of the comprehensive platform's developmental scope. The current implementation supports manual revision and basic preservation; the comprehensive platform extends this with longitudinal tracking and platform-driven re-entry routing. Section 9 names this as one of the implementation's bounded current scope items.

3.2 The four functions and how the implementation serves each

The Methodological Layer's Section 6 specifies four functions that verbal alignment cannot perform and that the artifact must serve: memory, examinability, revisability, and accountability. The SDA implementation serves all four through the artifact's structure and the platform's preservation of the deliberation.

Memory The implementation serves memory through the two-artifact pair produced at session close. The Decision Blueprint is the public artifact, organized for the audience the practitioner will share it with. The Thinking Record is the private artifact, preserving the raw expression, the platform's extraction at each phase, and

the practitioner's confirmations and corrections. The two artifacts are downloaded together; the implementation enforces the practitioner's possession of both before the session is considered complete. At the individual scale, the practitioner's future self is the participant who would otherwise reconstruct the deliberation from memory. The two-artifact pair removes the need for that reconstruction.

Examinability The implementation serves examinability through three mechanisms. The Decision Blueprint's structure presents the deliberation in a form an outside reader can audit: the Catalyst, the four coordinates, the Stakes, the Bridge, the Asymmetry of Change, and the bidirectional Verification narratives. The bidirectional reading rule requires that the Blueprint be presented as a backcasting process when shared, forcing any audience into the same cognitive posture the practitioner used to build the artifact. The Thinking Record preserves the audit trail from raw expression to confirmed artifact, available to the practitioner's future self for examining how the artifact was actually built.

Revisability The implementation serves revisability through the Revise and Rebuild pathway. A practitioner returning to a saved session can revise any of the artifact's components, and the platform routes the revision through the validation gates again rather than allowing the revision to bypass them. Revision triggers re-validation. The current MVP supports practitioner-initiated revision; the comprehensive platform's automated trigger detection will extend this in subsequent versions.

Accountability The implementation serves accountability through the Asymmetry of Change generated before commitment, the Flinch Test that requires explicit acceptance of the cost, and the activation step that closes the loop between deliberation and action. The Asymmetry of Change names the Beneficiary (who specifically captures the reward) and the Blast Radius (who absorbs the friction). The Flinch Test requires the practitioner to confirm explicitly that they are prepared to absorb the named cost; if the practitioner flinches, the platform routes them into a triage diagnostic to surface the design conflict, hidden trade-off, hidden beneficiary, or gap between the practitioner's belief and the structural reality. The activation step requires the practitioner to choose what comes next before the session closes. Together these mechanisms render the methodology's specification that resistant assumptions must be named and the practitioner must take responsibility for them at the moment of commitment.

3.3 What the architecture establishes

The five components are structurally present in every Decision Blueprint the implementation produces, and the four functions are served by the artifact's structure together with the platform's preservation of the deliberation. The components are not optional or aspirational. The platform's design produces the conditions the methodology requires during the practitioner's normal use of the system. Section 4 documents the practitioner's experience of the architecture across the platform's nine phases. Section 5 documents the AI participation conditions and how the platform enforces them. Section 6 documents the failure modes the implementation can exhibit despite

the platform's design. Section 7 demonstrates the implementation's compliance with each of the five methodological constraints established in the Methodological Layer. Section 8 documents the SDA implementation's relationship to the BDA implementation and to the broader Decision Architecture discipline.

Section 4. The SDA Process

This section documents what the Decision Architect does and what the Convoking4 platform does across the nine phases of an SDA session. The phases are presented in the order the practitioner experiences them. Each phase is documented at the level of what it accomplishes for the deliberation: what the practitioner contributes, what the platform contributes, and what the phase produces that the next phase operates on. Operational mechanics specific to the current MVP are referenced where they are constitutive of the phase's structure but are not exhaustively documented; that work belongs in product documentation that lives separately.

A judgment about illustration. Section 3 documented the architecture without a running example, which served the structural register that section needed. Section 4 has different illustrative needs because the practitioner's experience is what the section is documenting. One brief illustrative case, set in italics where it appears, is drawn from a recent SDA session in which a product leader was deliberating a board-mandated restructuring with significant client and team consequences. The illustration appears in three short passages where the phase's character is clearest with a concrete reference, and is otherwise absent.

4.1 The shape of the session

The SDA session is a single arc that produces a single artifact. The practitioner enters the session with a consequential decision they cannot delegate and cannot afford to get wrong. The practitioner exits the session with a Decision Blueprint, a Thinking Record, and an activation path. The arc between these two endpoints passes through nine phases, each with a defined contribution and a defined transition into the next phase.

The phases group naturally into four parts. The first two phases (Brain Dump, Your Reading) capture the raw expression and extract the four coordinates. The next three phases (The Stakes, The Bridge, Who's Involved) build the structural elements of the artifact: the end-conditions, the path, and the stakeholders. The next two phases (The Gut Check, The Final Check) audit the practitioner's commitment and the artifact's coherence. The final two phases (The Blueprint, What's Next) produce the artifacts and close the loop between deliberation and action.

UCADE is the cycle structure of the Decision Architecture discipline, applicable at any scale: Understand applies the backcasting and dual lens to the situation; Communicate translates the understanding into language and structure that can be shared and examined; Align brings diverse perspectives into mutual coherence; Decide commits to a path informed by the prior work; and Evolve compounds adaptations into accumulated decision wisdom over time. The nine phases of the SDA implementation on

Convoking4 operationalize this cycle at the individual scale, where the diverse perspectives Align brings together are the practitioner’s own (analytical and affective, present and future, aspirational and constrained), and where Evolve operates as the practitioner’s accumulated wisdom across consequential commitments. The BDA implementation operationalizes the same cycle at the organizational scale, where Align brings together multiple stakeholders’ perspectives and Evolve operates as institutional memory.

The phase walkthrough that follows documents the practitioner’s experience of the framework on the Convoking4 platform, where automated gates enforce the methodology’s specifications during normal use. The framework specification itself is operable independently of the platform. A practitioner applying the SDA without Convoking4 substitutes self-discipline, prompt engineering, or a trusted colleague for each of the platform’s enforcement points: the human-only Brain Dump becomes a deliberate session conducted without AI; the Honest Extraction rule becomes a strict prompt-engineering constraint; the Camera Test and the Bouncer become a self-audit or a colleague’s challenge against each proposed milestone; the Final Check becomes a written reading of the artifact backward and forward before commitment. The platform’s contribution is the structural enforcement of these conditions during the practitioner’s normal use of the system; the conditions themselves are what the methodology requires, and they remain available to any practitioner who chooses to apply them by other means.

4.2 The first part: capture and extraction

Phase 1: Brain Dump The practitioner records or types their raw expression of the decision they are sitting with. The instruction is simple: describe the decision you cannot get clear on, and say everything about it. The phase imposes no questions, no fields, and no structure. The platform offers a recording control or a typing surface and nothing else.

The phase’s contribution to the deliberation is the capture of System 1 expression before any analytical structure is allowed to enter. The diagnostic establishes that the frame inside one person’s thinking is formed before deliberation begins; the Brain Dump is the implementation’s specific point of capture for that pre-deliberation frame. Voice is the default capture mode because speech bypasses the polish that typed answers acquire. Practitioners who cannot use voice can type, and the methodology is honored either way.

Phase 1 is human-only. No artificial intelligence participates in the capture. This is the implementation’s first enforcement point for the methodology’s AI participation conditions, documented further in Section 5.

The product leader records ninety seconds of unfiltered description: the board’s restructuring vote, the CTO who designed the proposal, the head of QA who does not yet know, the enterprise client whose contract requires what the restructuring would eliminate, the practitioner’s own doubts, the ten-day window before the situation becomes uncontainable.

Phase 2: Your Reading The platform processes the raw expression and extracts four coordinates: Future State (where the practitioner has chosen to be), the Catalyst (what is genuinely driving the decision), Felt Urgency (the psychological pressure the practitioner is under), and Current State (the unvarnished present). The Catalyst names the structural driver forcing the choice; Felt Urgency names the psychological or temporal stress inflating it. The two are extracted as separate coordinates because conflating them is one of the most common ways consequential decisions are framed inaccurately at the outset. The platform also identifies named people who appear in the expression and proposes ADICE assignments for each. Solutions the practitioner named prematurely are quarantined in the Parking Lot rather than evaluated.

The practitioner reviews each coordinate and confirms or corrects it. The platform's extraction is governed by the Honest Extraction rule: the platform cannot include in any coordinate field anything the practitioner did not say. A blank field is correct; an invented field would be a system failure. The practitioner's correction is the authoritative version; the platform preserves both versions in the session record.

The phase's contribution to the deliberation is the conversion of unstructured expression into the four coordinate fields the rest of the session operates on, with the practitioner's authority over each coordinate established before any further work proceeds.

4.3 The second part: building the structural elements

Phase 3: The Stakes The practitioner specifies the Expected Impact (the specific, measurable real-world result that proves the decision worked) and the Deadline (the exact calendar moment by which the decision's window closes). The platform applies the Paradox Audit, which compares both specifications against the physical distance between the Future State and the Current State. The Audit operates through semantic evaluation: it tests for logical contradiction between the proposed end-condition and the documented current state, for timelines that would require physically impossible rates of change, and for subjective adjectives that mask unfeasibility behind language a camera could not photograph. The Audit rejects subjective adjectives and vague timelines.

The phase's contribution is the conversion of the Future State into a falsifiable end-condition with a hard temporal boundary. The methodology requires that the desired future state be specifiable at the level of inspectable end-conditions; the Stakes phase is where that specification is locked. If the Audit rejects the practitioner's specification, the phase does not advance until the practitioner produces a specification that survives the Audit.

Phase 4: The Bridge The practitioner builds the path from the Future State to the Current State by working backward, one milestone at a time. The platform asks at each step: for the next condition above to be reached, what had to be physically true the moment before? The practitioner names the milestone. The Bouncer validates it against the Camera Test, which requires that each milestone describe a static artifact a camera could photograph: a signed document, a deployed system, a published artifact. Action verbs and process descriptions fail.

The phase's contribution is the construction of a causally complete path between the Future State and the Current State, with each milestone passing the Camera Test. The Bridge reads backward when complete; this is the form in which it appears in the Decision Blueprint and the form in which it must be read by anyone who later examines the artifact.

After the Bridge is locked, the platform performs the Quarantine Resolution. Each solution from the Parking Lot is adjudicated against the completed Bridge: each receives a verdict of Earned Its Place or Set Aside, with a one-line rationale tied to the Future State or Current State. This resolves the Parking Lot before the deliberation closes.

The product leader builds three milestones backward from the Future State. The Bouncer rejects an early attempt that names an action; the practitioner revises to name the artifact the action produces. The Quarantine Resolution adjudicates the five solutions the practitioner named in the Brain Dump, identifying which ones the completed Bridge incorporates and which the Current State makes unfeasible.

Phase 5: Who's Involved The practitioner constructs the ADICE Matrix, mapping stakeholders into the five roles: Authority, Decide, Influence, Contribute, and Experience. The platform proposes additions based on the named people extracted in Phase 2 and surfaces gaps in the matrix when essential roles are unfilled.

ADICE is a governance matrix rather than a task assignment matrix. Where role-based decision rights frameworks (such as RACI, RAPID, and DACI) assign accountability for executing the work of deciding, the ADICE Matrix audits the practitioner's assumptions about who has standing in the deliberation and what each stakeholder's relationship to the decision actually is. The structural addition that distinguishes ADICE most sharply at the framework level is the Experience role, which names the stakeholders who absorb the consequences of the decision without participating in making it. Most legacy role frameworks treat consequence-bearers as out of scope; ADICE treats them as a structural input to the deliberation, on the methodological grounds that decisions made without grounding in operational consequence routinely fail to govern the commitments they were built to govern.

At the individual scale, the practitioner holds the Decide role for their own commitment. The Authority role surfaces the external constraints, including a board, a regulator, a partner, a client contract, or any other source of veto power, that have standing to override or invalidate the practitioner's choice. The Influence role surfaces the people whose data and expertise are structural inputs to the decision rather than courtesies. The Contribute role surfaces the people whose execution turns the decision into reality. The Experience role surfaces the people who live with the outcome regardless of whether they were ever consulted. The matrix is therefore not a redundant exercise at the individual scale; it is the structural mechanism for surfacing the assumptions about other people's standing that the practitioner most often makes invisibly.

The phase's contribution is the audit of the practitioner's assumptions about who has standing in the decision. The methodology requires that current-state assumptions be specified at a level they can be tested; the ADICE Matrix is where the assumption set

the practitioner most often holds invisibly (who is affected by this decision, and how) is rendered explicit and reviewable. The Bridge is constructed before the ADICE Matrix because the act of building the operational path surfaces the actual stakeholders the path requires, including stakeholders an abstract mapping exercise conducted in the absence of the path would routinely miss.

4.4 The third part: auditing commitment and coherence

Phase 6: The Gut Check The platform generates the Asymmetry of Change from the completed Bridge and the ADICE Matrix. The Asymmetry has two parts: the Beneficiary, naming who specifically captures the reward when the decision works, and the Blast Radius, naming who absorbs the friction, the disruption, and the collateral cost. The practitioner is then presented with the Flinch Test: a binary acceptance question that requires explicit confirmation that the practitioner is prepared to absorb the named cost.

If the practitioner accepts, the Gamble is recorded in the Thinking Record as the explicit cost the practitioner has chosen to carry. If the practitioner flinches, the platform routes the practitioner into a triage diagnostic that surfaces what the flinch is registering: a design conflict in the Bridge, a hidden trade-off, a hidden beneficiary, or a gap between the practitioner's belief and the structural reality. The diagnostic returns the practitioner to the architecture to revise.

The phase's contribution is the methodology's accountability requirement made operational. Resistant assumptions are named, falsification conditions for them are surfaced through the Asymmetry, and the practitioner takes responsibility for them by accepting or revising before the deliberation closes.

The platform generates the product leader's Asymmetry of Change. The Beneficiary names the board, the CTO whose proposal is advanced, and the practitioner's own performance against the restructuring mandate. The Blast Radius names the head of QA, the QA team whose roles change materially, and the enterprise client whose contract requires the human sign-off the restructuring would eliminate. The Flinch Test asks the practitioner to confirm that they are prepared to absorb that cost. The practitioner flinches at the enterprise client exposure. The platform routes them into the triage diagnostic, which surfaces the gap between the Bridge as locked and the contractual reality the Current State documented but the Bridge did not yet account for. The practitioner returns to Phase 4 and revises the Bridge to include a milestone that resolves the contractual constraint before the restructuring takes effect.

Phase 7: The Final Check The platform generates two parallel narratives from the completed artifact. The Forecast Bridge reads forward from the Current State through the Bridge to the Future State, testing the path's momentum and stamina. The Backcast Bridge reads backward from the Future State through the Bridge to the Current State, testing the structural causality. Both must hold as absolute truth before the phase advances.

The practitioner reads both narratives and confirms that both hold. If either reading fails to hold, the practitioner returns to the source, the phase does not advance, and

the Blueprint does not generate. This is the methodology's convergence specification operationalized as a state-transition gate at the artifact level.

The phase's contribution is the bidirectional verification the methodology specifies: the deliberation has converged when the artifact survives examination from both directions. A converged artifact passes through; a non-converged artifact returns the practitioner to the source.

4.5 The fourth part: producing the artifacts and closing the loop

Phase 8: The Blueprint The platform generates the two artifacts. The Decision Blueprint is the public artifact, organized for sharing: the Catalyst, the four coordinates, the Stakes, the Bridge read backward, the Asymmetry of Change, the bidirectional Verification narratives, and the Quarantine Resolution. The Thinking Record is the private artifact, preserving the raw expression, the platform's extraction at each phase, the practitioner's confirmations, the Stakes as entered, the Bridge as locked, the Gamble as accepted, and the confirmed ADICE Matrix.

The practitioner downloads both artifacts. The platform requires possession of both before the session is considered complete. The Decision Blueprint is the practitioner's working document for everything that follows; the Thinking Record is the practitioner's private ledger of how the artifact was actually built.

The phase's contribution is the production of the artifacts themselves: the structural objects that survive the deliberation and govern what comes next.

Phase 9: What's Next The practitioner chooses one of three activation paths. The first path is to execute the decision personally, by committing to one specific physical action the practitioner will take in the next twenty-four hours. The second path is to communicate the decision through one of the audience-specific hypothesis documents derived from the Blueprint: an Execution Hypothesis, a Value Hypothesis, a Decision Hypothesis, a Pitch Hypothesis, a Project Brief Hypothesis, or a Stakeholder Brief Hypothesis. The list of hypothesis documents will grow as the platform develops. Each hypothesis document is generated from the Blueprint without invention; every claim traces back to the validated artifact, and the document is framed as a hypothesis because the practitioner must validate it with external stakeholders before commitment. The third path is to share the Blueprint directly with a stakeholder.

The product leader's session closes with the practitioner choosing the second path. The platform generates a Stakeholder Brief Hypothesis from the Blueprint, with the ADICE Matrix's Influence and Experience roles named explicitly so the practitioner can decide which stakeholders the Brief is intended for. The Brief is the practitioner's working document for the conversation that comes next.

The phase's contribution is the closure of the gap between the artifact and the practitioner's behavior. The methodology specifies that an artifact without activation is an artifact that has not yet done its work; the What's Next phase requires the practitioner to choose what comes next before the session is considered complete.

4.6 The session as a single arc

The nine phases are not independent steps. They are the operational rendering of a single arc that produces a single artifact. The platform's enforcement points across the arc (the Honest Extraction rule in Phase 2, the Paradox Audit in Phase 3, the Camera Test and the Bouncer in Phase 4, the gap detection in Phase 5, the Flinch Test in Phase 6, the bidirectional verification in Phase 7, the artifact possession requirement in Phase 8, the activation requirement in Phase 9) are each specific operationalizations of methodology requirements documented in Section 3 and demonstrated against the methodology's compliance bar in Section 7.

The session can be paused and resumed; the platform preserves session state at each phase, and the practitioner can return to a saved session and continue where they left off. The session can also be revised through the Revise and Rebuild pathway, which routes the revised artifact through the validation gates again. These continuity capabilities are bounded in the current MVP relative to the comprehensive platform's scope; longitudinal Evolve governance, automated trigger detection, and platform-driven re-entry routing are part of the platform's developmental work.

The arc's coherence is its critical property. Each phase produces what the next phase requires. The capture in Phase 1 produces the raw material that Phase 2 extracts coordinates from. The coordinates in Phase 2 produce the Future State and Current State that Phase 3 audits. The Stakes in Phase 3 produce the end-condition that Phase 4 builds the Bridge to. The Bridge in Phase 4 produces the structural account that Phase 5 audits the stakeholder map against. The matrix in Phase 5 produces the standing roster that Phase 6 surfaces the Asymmetry against. The Asymmetry and the Gamble in Phase 6 produce the accepted commitment that Phase 7 verifies bidirectionally. The verified artifact in Phase 7 produces the Blueprint and Thinking Record that Phase 8 generates. The artifacts in Phase 8 produce the deliberation closure that Phase 9 activates. The phases are not independent steps. They are the operational rendering of a single arc that traverses the architecture from raw expression to activated commitment. The architecture documented in Section 3 is what the arc realizes in practice.

Section 5. The Conditions of Artificial Intelligence Participation

The Methodological Layer specifies that any framework operationalizing the technique must establish the conditions under which artificial intelligence participates in the deliberation, rather than allowing AI to establish those conditions through the practitioner's habits of use. Section 6 of the Methodological Layer lays out four specifications: when AI is invited into the deliberation, what AI is asked to do, how AI output is evaluated, and what AI is structurally not asked to do. This section documents how the SDA implementation on Convoking4 honors each of these four specifications.

The four specifications are documented in turn. Each treatment names the methodology's requirement, names the implementation's structural answer, and identifies the kind of enforcement the answer represents. The compliance demonstration that maps each enforcement point to the methodology's broader constraints is performed

in Section 7. The phase-level walkthrough that situates each enforcement point in the practitioner’s experience is documented in Section 4.

A note on the cycle. The Understand stage of UCADE is where the AI participation conditions are most consequentially enforced, because the foundational technique (backcasting and the dual lens) operates within Understand and AI’s participation in the technique is most carefully bounded there. The implementation’s tightest enforcement clusters in Phases 1 and 2 (the Brain Dump and Your Reading), which together do the Understand work at the individual scale. Subsequent phases continue to enforce conditions, but the Understand boundary is the implementation’s most distinctive structural choice.

5.1 When AI is invited

The Methodological Layer specifies that AI participation occurs after the artifact has captured the frame and the desired future state at the level of inspectable end-conditions, and before the iteration that converges on the path. AI invited before the frame is captured operates within the frame’s establishment, which is where the diagnostic’s failure modes around AI bias amplification operate most powerfully. AI invited after the path has converged contributes refinement to a settled artifact rather than amplifying an unexamined frame.

The SDA implementation honors this specification through the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary. Stage 1 is the Brain Dump, where no AI surface is offered to the practitioner. The phase’s only available actions are recording or typing the raw expression and signaling completion. The platform’s enforcement at this point is the absence of an AI invocation surface in the practitioner’s normal use of the system. The boundary is structural in the sense that the practitioner cannot, in the standard path through the platform, invoke AI before the raw expression is captured. Stage 2 begins at Phase 2 (Your Reading), where AI participates for the first time, processing the raw expression that Stage 1 produced.

This is the implementation’s most important AI governance design choice. The diagnostic establishes that human-AI feedback loops amplify human bias more than human-human interaction does, and that the amplification operates on the frame the prompter brings to the prompt. The Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary moves AI participation downstream of the frame’s establishment. The frame is captured before AI can shape it, and the AI then operates against the captured frame rather than co-producing it.

The kind of enforcement is AI-surface absence. Stage 1’s Phase 1 simply has no surface for AI participation. The practitioner’s raw expression is preserved verbatim, and the platform advances to Stage 2 only when the practitioner signals completion of the capture.

5.2 What AI is asked to do

The Methodological Layer specifies that AI is asked to operate against the artifact’s audited assumptions, not against the prompter’s frame directly. The artifact provides the external reference the model would otherwise lack. AI asked to evaluate the path’s coherence, propose alternative path elements, or surface conditions the

practitioner has not anticipated does so against the audited current state and the specified end-conditions, not against the practitioner's framing in conversation.

The SDA implementation honors this specification through the Honest Extraction rule, which governs every AI operation in Stage 2. The rule requires that any AI output trace back to material the practitioner expressed. A coordinate field cannot be populated with content the practitioner did not say. A milestone cannot be proposed that the practitioner did not articulate. A stakeholder cannot be added to the ADICE Matrix whose name does not appear in the practitioner's expression or the practitioner's confirmation. The rule's operational signature is that a blank field is correct and an invented field is a system failure.

The Honest Extraction rule operates against the deliberation's accumulating record, which is the implementation's working substitute for the artifact while the artifact is still being built. The practitioner's raw expression in Phase 1 is the first reference the AI works against. The four confirmed coordinates after Phase 2 become the reference for Phase 3's audit. The locked Stakes after Phase 3 become part of the reference for Phase 4's Bridge construction. The Bridge after Phase 4 becomes part of the reference for Phase 6's Asymmetry of Change generation. By the time the Final Check generates the bidirectional Verification narratives in Phase 7, the AI is operating against the substantially complete artifact. At each step, the AI's contribution is structurally constrained to operate against what has already been audited. The AI is constrained at every phase to operate against material that the practitioner has confirmed, and the confirmed material accumulates as the artifact takes shape.

The kind of enforcement is AI output validation against accumulating audited material. The Honest Extraction rule is the platform's specific implementation of the methodology's specification that AI operates against the artifact rather than the prompt.

5.3 How AI output is evaluated

The Methodological Layer specifies that AI output is evaluated against the artifact's audited assumptions, not against fluency, confidence, or coherence with the artifact's framing. A coherent and confident AI output that contradicts an audited assumption is information the practitioner integrates as a finding, not a recommendation the practitioner adopts. The artifact is the reference; AI output that does not survive comparison to the reference is treated as such, regardless of how well-formed the output is.

The SDA implementation honors this specification through the practitioner's correction authority at every Stage 2 phase. The platform presents AI output as a proposal, not as a determination. The practitioner reviews each AI extraction, each AI-generated structural element, and each AI synthesis, and confirms or corrects before the deliberation advances. The platform preserves both the AI's proposal and the practitioner's confirmed version in the session record. The practitioner's confirmed version is the authoritative version that the next phase operates against; the AI's proposal is preserved as part of the audit trail of how the artifact was built.

The implementation's specific structural mechanism for AI output evaluation against the artifact is the validation gate. The Paradox Audit in Phase 3 evaluates the prac-

itioner's Stakes against the artifact's emerging structural reality. The Bouncer in Phase 4 evaluates each milestone against the Camera Test, which is the artifact's specification for what milestones the architecture will accept. The Final Check in Phase 7 evaluates the completed artifact against itself, generating two parallel narratives that must hold as absolute truth before the Blueprint generates. At each gate, the evaluation is performed against the artifact's accumulating specification, not against the AI's confidence or the proposal's surface fluency.

The kind of enforcement is dual: AI proposals are subordinated to practitioner confirmation throughout, and structural validation gates evaluate the artifact's coherence against itself at three points along the arc.

5.4 What AI is not asked to do

The Methodological Layer specifies that AI is not asked to specify the desired future state, audit current-state assumptions, or determine whether the deliberation has converged. These are the practitioner's responsibilities. The methodological reasoning is direct: each of these tasks requires judgment under uncertainty that the diagnostic's failure modes bear on, and AI participating in any of them participates in the cascade rather than in its interruption.

The SDA implementation honors this specification through three structural design choices, one for each of the methodology's prohibitions.

The desired future state is not specified by AI. Future State (Lens 1) is extracted from the practitioner's raw expression in Phase 2, with the Honest Extraction rule preventing the AI from inventing or completing the desired future state on the practitioner's behalf. The practitioner confirms the extraction, and the practitioner's confirmation is the authoritative specification. The Stakes phase further specifies the Future State's Expected Impact and Deadline, but the practitioner enters both, and the AI's role is limited to running the Paradox Audit against the practitioner's specification. The methodology's prohibition is honored by the practitioner being the source of the desired future state at every point where it is specified.

Current-state assumptions are not audited by AI. The Current State coordinate is extracted from the practitioner's raw expression and confirmed by the practitioner. The ADICE Matrix audits the practitioner's assumptions about who has standing in the decision; the platform proposes additions and surfaces gaps, but the practitioner confirms each role assignment, and the practitioner's confirmed matrix is the audited result. The platform's contribution is to structure the audit and surface what the practitioner may have missed; the practitioner's contribution is to perform the audit. The methodology's prohibition is honored by the practitioner remaining the auditor throughout.

Convergence is not determined by AI. The Final Check phase generates the bidirectional Verification narratives, but the practitioner is the one who confirms whether both narratives hold as absolute truth. The platform does not advance the phase; the practitioner does, by confirming convergence. If the practitioner judges that either narrative does not hold, the practitioner returns to the source, and the deliberation continues iterating. The methodology's prohibition is honored by the convergence

determination being a practitioner judgment that the platform structures but does not make.

The kind of enforcement at each of these three points is structural role allocation. The platform’s design assigns the methodology-specified human-only tasks to the practitioner and assigns the AI-permitted tasks to the AI. Neither task category drifts into the other in the platform’s normal use.

5.5 The four conditions as a coherent specification

The four conditions are not independent. They form a single specification: AI participates downstream of the frame’s establishment, operates against the artifact’s accumulating audited material, is evaluated by structural gates that compare AI output to the artifact’s specification, and is structurally prohibited from performing the methodology-specified human-only tasks. The implementation’s enforcement mechanisms operationalize each of the four specifications. AI-surface absence in Phase 1 enforces the first; the Honest Extraction rule across Stage 2 enforces the second; the validation gates at Phases 3, 4, and 7 enforce the third; and the structural role allocation at the points the methodology prohibits AI participation enforces the fourth.

The implementation’s enforcement is structural in the sense that the platform’s normal use produces the methodology-specified conditions during the practitioner’s deliberation. This is platform-design enforcement rather than practitioner-discretionary application: the practitioner does not have to remember to invoke the conditions or maintain them through self-discipline, because the platform’s design produces them as part of the practitioner’s interaction with the system. The compliance demonstration in Section 7 maps each of these enforcement points to the broader methodological constraints the Methodological Layer’s Section 2 derives.

The implementation does not eliminate the AI-specific failure modes the diagnostic documents. Sycophancy, hallucination, automation bias, and bias amplification through human-AI feedback loops continue to operate at the level of how generative AI systems process input and produce output. The implementation constrains the conditions under which those failure modes can manifest in the deliberation: by holding AI participation downstream of frame establishment, by binding AI output to the practitioner’s expressed material through the Honest Extraction rule, by subordinating AI proposals to practitioner confirmation, and by allocating the methodology-specified human-only tasks to the practitioner. The failure modes still operate; the implementation bounds their reach into the artifact.

This is the appropriate posture for a framework operating at the individual scale. The methodology specifies what conditions of AI participation must be established; the implementation specifies how the platform establishes them; the compliance demonstration in Section 7 shows that the establishment honors the specification. The remainder of the paper, beginning with Section 6 on the failure modes the implementation can exhibit despite this enforcement, takes the AI participation conditions as documented and proceeds to the conditions under which the implementation can fail.

Section 6. Practitioner Discipline and Failure Modes

The platform's enforcement architecture documented in Sections 3 through 5 is not infallible. The platform structures the deliberation, validates the artifact at specific gates, and bounds AI participation through the four conditions. It does not eliminate the failure modes the diagnostic establishes at the individual scale, and it does not relieve the Decision Architect of the discipline the technique requires. This section documents the failure modes the implementation can exhibit despite the platform's enforcement, and the practitioner discipline that operates at the points where the platform structures but does not strictly enforce.

The section is the implementation's honest acknowledgment of where platform-design enforcement reaches its limits. The Methodological Layer's Section 8 establishes that the technique constrains the conditions under which failure modes can manifest, but does not remove the failure modes themselves. The Diagnostic Layer establishes that the failure modes operate at the level of human cognition and organizational dynamics, and that the AI-specific failure modes operate at the level of how generative AI systems process input and produce output. The platform's design addresses the conditions under which these failure modes can manifest in the deliberation. It does not address the failure modes' underlying mechanisms.

This section is organized in three parts. The first names the failure modes the implementation can exhibit when the practitioner applies the framework dishonestly. The second names the failure modes that the framework explicitly does not address, drawing the implementation's scope honestly. The third names the practitioner discipline the technique requires, at the points where the platform structures but does not strictly enforce.

6.1 Failure modes the implementation can exhibit when applied dishonestly

The platform's gates evaluate the artifact's structural coherence. They cannot evaluate the practitioner's honesty in producing the inputs the gates evaluate. A practitioner who provides dishonest inputs produces an artifact that passes the gates and fails to govern the decision the artifact was supposed to serve.

The Performance of Rigor at the practitioner's scale. The diagnostic establishes the Performance of Rigor as the use of structured tools, formatted outputs, and procedural rituals to produce the appearance of disciplined deliberation while the underlying epistemic work has not been done. At the individual scale, the SDA implementation can be subjected to a Performance of Rigor by a practitioner who completes the session's gates without the honest reflection the gates are designed to surface. The Brain Dump can be a polished pre-formed account rather than an unfiltered expression. The four coordinates can be confirmed without genuine examination of whether they reflect what is actually true. The Stakes can be set at a level the practitioner already preferred rather than at the level a Camera-Test-passing inspection would identify. The Bridge can be built with milestones the practitioner is already committed to rather than milestones the destination genuinely requires. The Flinch Test can be answered with acceptance the practitioner does not feel.

A session conducted in this manner produces an artifact that meets the implementa-

tion's structural specification while failing the methodology's deeper purpose. The artifact's components are present; the four functions appear to be served; the validation gates have all returned passing results. What is missing is the honesty in the inputs that the gates were designed to evaluate. The methodology requires honest practitioner work; the platform structures the work but cannot manufacture the honesty.

The Illusion of Alignment with the self. The diagnostic establishes the Illusion of Alignment as the systematic confusion of the absence of conflict with the presence of agreement. At the individual scale, the equivalent failure mode is the practitioner mistaking the absence of internal disagreement for the presence of genuine commitment. The Final Check's bidirectional Verification can hold as true to a practitioner who has already settled on the conclusion before the deliberation began. The forward and backward narratives describe the artifact accurately, but the practitioner's commitment to the artifact does not survive contact with execution because the commitment was performed at the moment of confirmation rather than genuinely held.

The implementation's Flinch Test in Phase 6 is the structural mechanism most directly responsive to this failure mode, because it requires the practitioner to confront the cost the decision will impose. The triage diagnostic that the platform routes the practitioner through if the practitioner flinches is the implementation's specific operationalization of the methodology's specification that resistant assumptions must be named and the practitioner must take responsibility for them. A practitioner who accepts the cost without genuinely facing it has used the structural mechanism without doing the work the mechanism was designed to require.

Decision Debt accumulation at the individual scale. The diagnostic establishes Decision Debt as the accumulating cost of decisions performed rather than genuinely made. At the individual scale, a practitioner who repeatedly produces artifacts that meet the structural specification while failing the methodology's deeper purpose accumulates Decision Debt across their commitments. The artifacts pile up; the commitments fail in execution; the practitioner's accumulating frustration with execution failures may not converge on the actual cause, which is that the artifacts were performed rather than built honestly. The implementation's preservation of the Thinking Record provides a substrate for the practitioner's future self to identify the pattern, but the recognition is the practitioner's work, not the platform's.

6.2 Failure modes the implementation does not address

The implementation's scope is bounded. Several categories of failure operate outside what the platform's design can structure or constrain.

Knowledge the practitioner does not have. The implementation cannot supply domain expertise the practitioner lacks. A practitioner deliberating a clinical decision, a legal decision, or a technical decision in a domain they do not know enough about will produce an artifact that meets the structural specification while resting on assumptions that are confidently wrong. The Camera Test verifies that milestones are inspectable; it does not verify that the inspection would yield the result the practitioner expects. The ADICE Matrix audits the practitioner's assumptions about who

has standing; it does not audit the practitioner's assumptions about what those stakeholders' interests actually are. The Honest Extraction rule prevents the AI from inventing content; it does not prevent the practitioner from working with material the practitioner does not understand.

Anchoring bias on inputs the practitioner brings. The implementation operates on the practitioner's expression. A practitioner whose initial framing of the situation is shaped by an anchor (a recent conversation, a preferred conclusion, a frame inherited from a person whose authority the practitioner has not examined) will produce an artifact that operates within that frame. The Catalyst surfaces what is genuinely driving the decision, which is the implementation's most direct response to the anchoring problem, but the Catalyst still operates against the practitioner's expression and is not a defense against an anchor the practitioner has fully internalized.

Blind spots about omitted material. The implementation cannot evaluate what the practitioner does not say. A Brain Dump that omits a material consideration produces a Phase 2 extraction that does not include the omitted consideration. The Bridge cannot be built around an obstacle the practitioner has not named. The Asymmetry of Change cannot identify a stakeholder the practitioner has not surfaced. The platform's gap-detection in the ADICE Matrix can suggest stakeholders that appear in the practitioner's expression but were not assigned to roles; it cannot suggest stakeholders the practitioner did not mention at all. Blind Spot Bias operates at the level of what the practitioner has access to about their own situation, which is upstream of what the platform can evaluate.

Self-assessment errors the framework cannot test. The Dunning-Kruger effect, in which a practitioner's confidence in a domain exceeds their actual competence in that domain, operates on the practitioner's relationship to their own knowledge. The implementation can structure the deliberation; it cannot test whether the practitioner's confidence in their own assessment is calibrated to their actual capacity to make the assessment. The methodology's specification that the practitioner is the auditor of current-state assumptions presupposes a practitioner whose self-assessment is honest enough to perform the audit. When that presupposition fails, the audit fails with it, and the platform has no mechanism to detect or correct the failure.

These four categories are not exhaustive. They are the most consequential failure types the implementation explicitly does not address, named honestly so that practitioners and researchers understand the framework's bounded scope.

6.3 The practitioner discipline the technique requires

The implementation's enforcement reaches the points the platform's design can structure. Three categories of practitioner work operate at points where the platform structures but does not strictly enforce, and these are where practitioner discipline matters most.

Honest expression in the Brain Dump. The platform offers no AI participation in Phase 1 and no questions or fields that would shape the practitioner's expression. The platform's contribution is the absence of structure; the practitioner's contribution is the willingness to use the unstructured space honestly. A practitioner who treats

the Brain Dump as a place to deliver a polished account, rather than as a place to express the situation as it actually exists in their thinking, produces a raw expression that lacks the System 1 material the rest of the session is designed to operate on. The methodology requires that the frame inside one person's thinking be surfaced before deliberation; the platform creates the conditions for the surfacing; the practitioner does the surfacing or fails to.

Confirmation against actual experience. The Honest Extraction rule binds the AI to the practitioner's expressed material. The practitioner's confirmation step at every Stage 2 phase asks whether the AI's extraction matches what the practitioner actually expressed and what the practitioner actually believes. A practitioner who confirms an extraction without checking it against their own experience converts the confirmation step into a procedural ritual, and the artifact comes to rest on the AI's first articulation rather than the practitioner's audited material. The platform structures the confirmation step; the practitioner performs the audit or fails to.

Genuine acceptance at the Flinch Test. The Flinch Test is a binary acceptance question. The platform can detect the practitioner's answer; the platform cannot detect whether the answer reflects genuine acceptance of the named cost or performed acceptance of a cost the practitioner has not actually faced. The triage diagnostic the platform routes the practitioner through if the practitioner flinches is structurally responsive to the practitioner's expressed reluctance, but it cannot reach the practitioner who declines to express the reluctance. Genuine acceptance at this point is the practitioner's work, and it is one of the points where the methodology requires the practitioner to do work the platform cannot do for them.

These three categories are where the methodology's requirement for practitioner discipline is most concentrated in the implementation. The platform's enforcement does not relieve the practitioner of the work; it creates the conditions under which the work is most likely to produce an artifact that survives contact with execution.

6.4 The honest scope of what the implementation can do

The implementation is a structural intervention at the conditions under which decisions are made. It is not a guarantee of decision quality. The methodology specifies what conditions any framework operationalizing the technique must establish; the implementation establishes those conditions on the Convoking4 platform; the practitioner's honest engagement with the conditions is what produces a Decision Architecture that governs the commitment the artifact was built to govern.

This is the appropriate scope for the framework at the individual scale. A framework that promised to eliminate the practitioner's failure modes would be making a claim the methodology does not support and the implementation cannot deliver. A framework that structured the conditions under which the practitioner's failure modes can be most effectively managed, and named honestly the failure modes the framework does not address, is making a claim the methodology does support and the implementation does deliver.

Section 7 demonstrates the implementation's compliance with each of the five methodological constraints established in the Methodological Layer. The compliance

demonstration is performed against the architecture documented in Section 3, the practitioner experience documented in Section 4, the AI participation enforcement documented in Section 5, and the bounded scope documented in this section. The implementation's claim is that within these bounds, it operationalizes the technique in a manner that meets the methodology's bar at the individual scale.

Section 7. Compliance with the Methodological Constraints

The Methodological Layer's Section 2 derives five constraints that any framework operationalizing the technique must meet. The constraints are not optional. A framework that fails to meet any one of them does not operationalize the technique; it operates against a different specification, regardless of how the framework is described. This section demonstrates the SDA implementation's compliance with each of the five constraints in turn.

For each constraint, the demonstration follows a consistent structure. The methodology's specification is named, drawing directly on the Methodological Layer's Section 2 derivation. The SDA implementation's structural answer is identified, with reference to the architecture documented in Section 3, the practitioner experience documented in Section 4, the AI participation enforcement documented in Section 5, and the bounded scope documented in Section 6. The kind of compliance the answer represents is identified. Where appropriate, the constraint's relationship to specific failure modes from the diagnostic is named explicitly.

The demonstration is the implementation's claim that within the bounds documented in Section 6, the SDA on Convoking4 operationalizes the technique in a manner that meets the methodological bar at the individual scale. The compliance is demonstrated against the methodology's own derivation, not against an external standard, which is the appropriate evaluative frame for an implementation of a discipline-internal technique.

7.1 The frame must be surfaced before deliberation, not after

The Methodological Layer establishes that the structural intervention point in the Cascade of Distortion is Stage 1, before an unexamined frame is reinforced by AI assistance and entrenched by organizational dynamics. The diagnostic's Performance of Rigor operates by allowing System 2 to be recruited to defend the frame established by System 1, which is why the methodology requires that the frame be surfaced before deliberation begins rather than examined retrospectively after deliberation has produced its conclusions.

The SDA implementation's structural answer to this constraint operates across the first two phases of the session. The Brain Dump (Phase 1) is the implementation's specific point of frame capture, conducted human-only with no AI participation. The phase imposes no questions, fields, or analytical structure on the practitioner's expression. The frame inside the practitioner's thinking is captured in the form it takes before deliberation begins, preserved verbatim in the session record. Your Reading (Phase 2) extracts the four coordinates from the captured expression: Future State,

the Catalyst, Felt Urgency, and Current State. The Catalyst names what is genuinely driving the decision, distinct from the urgency the practitioner feels and from the desired future state, and surfaces the frame as a discrete element of the artifact rather than allowing it to operate invisibly through the rest of the deliberation.

The kind of compliance is structural sequencing. The frame is captured before any deliberative work proceeds, and the captured frame is preserved as a coordinate field that subsequent phases operate against. The Performance of Rigor cannot operate within the implementation's normal use because the analytical apparatus the diagnostic identifies as the rigor performance's defensive mechanism does not have access to the frame until after the frame has been documented. The frame is not eliminated; the diagnostic establishes that the frame is part of human cognition and cannot be removed by methodology. The frame is rendered structurally examinable, which is what the constraint requires.

7.2 Aspiration and constraint must be held together, not alternated

The Methodological Layer establishes that Information, Goals, and People are coupled forces in any consequential deliberation, and that the coupling is invisible from any single position inside it. A methodology that examines goals without grounding in current information produces aspiration disconnected from execution capacity. A methodology that examines current information without reference to where the decision is supposed to take the practitioner produces local optimization. The constraint requires that both anchors be held together within a single deliberation, not sequenced across separate deliberations or alternated as the conversation drifts.

The SDA implementation's structural answer to this constraint is the dual lens carried through every phase of the session. The four coordinates extracted in Phase 2 contain both the Future State (Lens 1) and the Current State (Lens 2), and both are confirmed by the practitioner before any further work proceeds. The Stakes phase locks the Future State's end-conditions through the Paradox Audit, which compares the proposed Expected Impact and Deadline against the physical distance between the Future State and the Current State; the Audit's evaluation requires that both anchors be present as inputs to the comparison. The Bridge phase constructs the path backward from the Future State to the Current State, with the Camera Test enforcing that each milestone be a Camera-Test-passing artifact and the Bouncer enforcing that each milestone be causally adjacent to the milestone above it; the construction requires both anchors throughout because the path's termination point is the Current State and the path's origin is the Future State. The Final Check generates two parallel narratives, the Forecast Bridge reading forward and the Backcast Bridge reading backward, and both must hold as absolute truth before the artifact generates; the bidirectional verification structurally requires that both anchors hold at the same time.

The kind of compliance is simultaneity by construction. The implementation cannot proceed through any of the path-construction or verification phases without both anchors as active inputs. The Methodological Layer's specification that the dual lens be held simultaneously rather than alternated is operationalized through the platform's design: each phase that operates on the path operates on both anchors at once, and

the verification phase requires both anchors to support the artifact bidirectionally before the deliberation can converge.

7.3 The output must be an artifact that can be examined and revised

The Methodological Layer establishes that verbal alignment and the absence of dissent are routinely mistaken for genuine agreement, a pattern the diagnostic names the Illusion of Alignment. Without an artifact that survives the deliberation, there is nothing to inspect when the alignment turns out to have been performed. Decision Debt, the diagnostic's name for the accumulating cost of decisions performed rather than genuinely made, compounds in part because the original deliberation cannot be reexamined; only its consequences can. The constraint requires that the output be an artifact that can be examined by participants who were not in the original room and revised when conditions change.

The SDA implementation's structural answer to this constraint is the two-artifact pair produced at session close, together with the Revise and Rebuild pathway. The Decision Blueprint is the public artifact, organized for sharing, containing the Catalyst, the four coordinates, the Stakes, the Bridge read backward, the Asymmetry of Change, the bidirectional Verification narratives, and the Quarantine Resolution. The Thinking Record is the private artifact, preserving the raw expression, the platform's extraction at each phase, the practitioner's confirmations and corrections, the Stakes as entered, the Bridge as locked, the Gamble as accepted, and the confirmed ADICE Matrix. The two artifacts are downloaded together; the platform requires possession of both before the session is considered complete.

The four functions the methodology requires of the artifact (memory, examinability, revisability, accountability) are documented in Section 3.2. The two-artifact pair serves memory by removing the practitioner's future self's need to reconstruct the deliberation. The Decision Blueprint's structure and the bidirectional reading rule together serve examinability by presenting the deliberation in a form an outside reader can audit and by requiring that the artifact be presented backward when shared. The Revise and Rebuild pathway serves revisability by allowing the practitioner to load a saved session and route revisions through the validation gates again. The Asymmetry of Change, the Flinch Test, and the activation step at What's Next together serve accountability by naming the cost the practitioner is accepting and requiring an explicit choice of activation path before the session closes.

The kind of compliance is artifact production with structural function-service. The implementation produces an artifact that contains the five components specified in the Methodological Layer's Section 6 and that serves the four functions specified there. The Illusion of Alignment cannot operate at the individual scale within the implementation's normal use because the artifact is the structural object against which the practitioner's own future commitment is verified, replacing verbal alignment with a documented record that survives the moment of deliberation.

7.4 The methodology must establish the conditions of AI participation, not be established by it

The Methodological Layer establishes that human-AI feedback loops amplify human bias more than human-human interaction does, that AI sycophancy reinforces the frame the user brings to the prompt, and that AI applied to questions with no external reference produces statistically plausible outputs that inherit and amplify the prompter's frame. A methodology that invites AI participation before the frame, the desired future state, and the audited current state have been established has already lost the intervention point. The constraint requires that AI participation be governed by the methodology, not the other way around.

Section 5 documents the SDA implementation's structural answer to this constraint in detail, mapped to the methodology's four AI participation specifications. The compliance argument is summarized here.

The implementation answers the methodology's first specification (when AI is invited) through the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary. AI participation is structurally absent during Phase 1's frame capture and begins at Phase 2 only after the frame has been captured and the four coordinates can be extracted from material the practitioner has produced. The implementation answers the second specification (what AI is asked to do) through the Honest Extraction rule, which constrains AI output at every Stage 2 phase to operate against material the practitioner has confirmed, with the confirmed material accumulating as the artifact takes shape. The implementation answers the third specification (how AI output is evaluated) through practitioner correction authority at every phase combined with the structural validation gates at Phases 3, 4, and 7, which evaluate AI proposals and the practitioner's confirmed artifact against the artifact's own emerging specification rather than against AI fluency or confidence. The implementation answers the fourth specification (what AI is not asked to do) through structural role allocation: the Future State is specified by the practitioner, current-state assumptions are audited by the practitioner, and convergence is determined by the practitioner.

The kind of compliance is platform-design enforcement of the four specifications operating together. The methodology's AI participation conditions are produced as conditions of the practitioner's normal use of the system rather than as conditions the practitioner must remember to maintain through self-discipline. Section 5.5 documents the four specifications as a coherent specification rather than as four independent constraints; Section 7.4 confirms that the implementation honors the coherent specification through the four enforcement mechanisms named in Section 5.

7.5 The technique must be operable across decision scales

The Methodological Layer establishes that distortion forms inside one person's thinking before it ever reaches a team, and that organizational decisions are built from the individual deliberations of the people who participate in them. A methodology operable only at the organizational scale leaves individual-level distortion as uncontrolled input. A methodology operable only at the individual scale leaves organizational dynamics unaddressed. The constraint requires that the technique be the same tech-

nique at both scales, not a different technique for each.

The SDA implementation’s compliance with this constraint is partial by design. The SDA on Convoking4 operationalizes the technique at the individual scale; the BDA on Convoking4, forthcoming as the companion implementation, operationalizes the same technique at the organizational scale. The two implementations share the methodological foundation documented in the Methodological Layer, share the platform infrastructure on Convoking4, share the artifact produced (the Decision Blueprint, rendering the decision architecture artifact specified in the Methodological Layer), and share cross-scale constructs from the canonical Decision Architecture terminology, including ADICE, UCADE, the Cascade of Distortion, the Wise Mind, North Star, Expected Impact, Destination, Solution, Provenance of Commitment, Translation Point, and Fragility Point.

The differentiation between the two implementations is at the level of the operational challenge each addresses. The SDA on Convoking4 governs the integrity of one person’s thinking, with the practitioner as the unit of accountability and the Blueprint’s first audience the practitioner themselves. The BDA on Convoking4 governs the integrity of organizational deliberation across multiple stakeholders, altitudes, and time horizons, with the Blueprint’s first audience the multi-stakeholder governance group. Both implementations produce Blueprints meeting the methodological specification. Both run on the same Convoking4 platform with appropriate operational adaptations for their scale. The technique is the same technique at both scales; what changes is the rendering of the artifact, the cadence of the iteration, and the number of participants in the audit, exactly as the Methodological Layer’s Section 8 specifies.

The kind of compliance is composability across the two scale-specific implementations. The SDA produces audited individual frames that the BDA process integrates into multi-stakeholder deliberation. Organizations that adopt the BDA without supporting individual SDA practice may continue to surface the same individual-level distortions the discipline was built to interrupt. The SDA paper’s compliance with this constraint is the SDA’s correct operation at the individual scale; the BDA paper, when it is published, will demonstrate the BDA’s compliance with the same constraint at the organizational scale; the cross-scale operability of the technique is established by both implementations meeting the methodology’s specifications and producing artifacts that are structurally interoperable.

The current SDA implementation’s compliance with the cross-scale operability constraint is therefore documented as: the SDA operationalizes the technique at the individual scale in a manner that produces artifacts compatible with the methodology’s cross-scale specification, with the BDA’s parallel implementation at the organizational scale forthcoming.

7.6 The compliance argument as a whole

The five constraints are not independent. They form a single specification: the technique must surface frames before deliberation, hold both anchors simultaneously, produce an artifact that can be examined and revised, govern AI participation, and operate across decision scales. The SDA implementation on Convoking4 honors each constraint through specific platform-design choices documented in Sections 3 through

6 of this paper. The compliance demonstration in this section confirms that within the bounded scope documented in Section 6, the implementation operationalizes the technique in a manner that meets the methodology's bar.

The compliance is structural rather than aspirational. The platform's design produces the conditions the methodology requires during the practitioner's normal use of the system, rather than relying on the practitioner to remember and maintain those conditions through self-discipline. The conditions themselves are bounded; the diagnostic's failure modes are bounded in their reach into the artifact rather than eliminated; the practitioner's discipline at the points the platform structures but does not strictly enforce remains essential. Within these bounds, the implementation meets the five constraints, and the compliance is demonstrable against the Methodological Layer's own derivation rather than against an external standard.

This compliance is what the SDA framework paper claims at the implementation level. The Diagnostic Layer establishes the realities the discipline responds to; the Methodological Layer establishes the technique that responds to the realities and the constraints any operationalization must meet; the SDA on Convoking4 is one specific operationalization of the technique at the individual scale that meets the constraints. The remainder of the paper, beginning with Section 8 on the relationship between the SDA and BDA implementations and the broader Decision Architecture discipline, takes this compliance as the basis for what the SDA on Convoking4 contributes to the discipline as a whole.

Section 8. The SDA Implementation, the BDA Implementation, and the Decision Architecture Discipline

The SDA implementation on Convoking4 does not stand alone. It is one of two platform-anchored implementations of the technique the Methodological Layer documents, with the BDA implementation on Convoking4 forthcoming as the companion publication. Both implementations operationalize the same technique at different scales, both produce Blueprints, and both rest on the foundational layer of the Decision Architecture discipline established in the published Diagnostic and Methodological Layers. This section consolidates the relationship between the two implementations at the framework level, documents the practitioner journey through the Decisiontect ecosystem, and locates the SDA's contribution within the discipline as a whole.

The section is organized in five parts. The first establishes the two implementations as parallel operationalizations on a shared methodological foundation. The second names the structural relationship between individual and organizational decision governance. The third documents the practitioner journey through the Decisiontect ecosystem. The fourth locates the framework papers within the discipline as a whole. The fifth closes the section by naming what the SDA on Convoking4 contributes to the discipline.

8.1 The two implementations on a shared methodological foundation

The SDA on Convoking4 and the BDA on Convoking4 are platform-anchored implementations of the same foundational technique at different scales. Both produce Decision Blueprints, the platform's specific deliverable rendering the decision architecture artifact specified in the Methodological Layer. Both honor the five components and four functions the methodology requires. Both establish the conditions of artificial intelligence participation as the methodology specifies. Both operationalize UCADE, the cycle structure of the Decision Architecture discipline applicable at any scale. Both can be evaluated against the methodological constraints documented in the Methodological Layer's Section 2; the SDA's compliance demonstration is performed in Section 7 of this paper, and the BDA's parallel demonstration will be performed in the BDA framework paper when it is published.

The two implementations differ in the operational challenge each addresses. The SDA on Convoking4 governs the integrity of one person's thinking. The Decision Architect using the SDA is the unit of accountability; the Blueprint's first audience is the practitioner themselves; the deliberation happens inside one person's deliberation, with the platform providing the structural support that the methodology requires when no team, no organizational process, and no role-separated colleague is available to perform the audit. The BDA on Convoking4 governs the integrity of organizational deliberation across multiple stakeholders, altitudes, and time horizons. The Blueprint's first audience is the multi-stakeholder governance group; the deliberation happens through coordinated work across roles; the platform provides the multi-stakeholder coordination infrastructure that organizational deliberation requires.

The differentiation is structural focus rather than scale alone. Some decisions are clearly individual: the Decision Architect alone with a personal commitment, no organizational process available or appropriate to the deliberation. Some decisions are clearly organizational: a strategic commitment that binds the enterprise across functions and requires multi-stakeholder coordination from the outset. Some decisions sit in the middle range, where either implementation could serve the practitioner's need depending on whether the deliberation requires multi-stakeholder coordination architecture or one-person governance architecture. The implementations are not mutually exclusive; a Decision Architect may run an individual SDA session in preparation for entering an organizational BDA deliberation, and an organizational BDA deliberation may surface individual decisions that participants address through their own SDA practice.

8.2 The structural relationship between individual and organizational decision governance

The Diagnostic Layer establishes that distortion forms inside one person's thinking before it ever reaches a team. This is not an incidental observation; it is the structural foundation on which the discipline's two-implementation architecture rests. Cognitive failure modes operate on individuals. Organizational failure modes compound on top of individual failure modes. AI-specific failure modes amplify whatever frame the prompter brings to the prompt, and the prompter is a person. The cascade has its origin at the individual scale.

The SDA on Convoking4 addresses the cascade at its origin. The Brain Dump captures the frame inside one person’s thinking before AI participation can amplify it. The Catalyst surfaces what is genuinely driving the deliberation. The Bridge construction holds aspiration and constraint together. The Final Check verifies bidirectionally before the artifact generates. The activation step requires a specific commitment to action. The implementation’s structural answers operate at the scale where the diagnostic establishes the cascade begins.

The BDA on Convoking4 addresses the multi-stakeholder coordination problem that organizational deliberation introduces. The diagnostic establishes that organizational dynamics introduce their own layer of failure modes (the Filtration of Reality through hierarchy, the Illusion of Alignment across stakeholders, the Performance of Rigor as performed consensus rather than performed individual deliberation), and that these dynamics operate on top of whatever individual-scale distortions the participants bring to the deliberation. The BDA implementation’s structural answers operate at the scale where the diagnostic establishes the organizational layer of distortion compounds.

The two implementations interlock. SDA produces audited individual frames that the BDA process integrates into multi-stakeholder deliberation; the integration is more reliable when the frames have been audited at the individual scale before they enter the organizational scale, because the organizational deliberation does not have to compensate for individual-level distortions that were never surfaced. BDA produces organizational decisions that individuals execute through their own deliberation; the execution is more reliable when the individuals carrying out the decision have the SDA framework available to govern their contribution at the individual scale. Organizations that adopt the BDA without supporting individual SDA practice may continue to surface individual-level distortions in their deliberations, because the BDA process can structure the multi-stakeholder coordination but cannot retroactively audit the individual frames the participants bring. Individuals who apply the SDA without engaging organizational deliberation may have governed contributions to decisions that organizational dynamics still distort, because the SDA can structure individual-scale governance but cannot reach the multi-stakeholder coordination the organizational decision requires.

The two implementations together address the cascade at both layers where it operates. Neither is sufficient alone for organizational consequential decisions. Both are sufficient together for the discipline’s structural ambition: a governed decision-making system at organizational scale, with individual and organizational governance interlocking through practitioners who move between the two scales.

8.3 The practitioner journey through the Decisiontect ecosystem

Practitioners enter the Decision Architecture discipline through the SDA on Convoking4 at the free tier. The free tier provides the framework’s core operational environment for the individual practitioner: the nine-phase session structure, the Brain Dump capture, the four-coordinate extraction, the Stakes phase with its Paradox Audit, the Bridge construction with the Camera Test and the Bouncer, the Who’s Involved phase with the ADICE Matrix, the Gut Check with the Asymmetry of Change and the Flinch

Test, the Final Check with bidirectional Verification, the Blueprint generation with the Thinking Record, and the What's Next phase with the activation paths. The framework knowledge is open under CC BY 4.0; the platform's free tier monetizes nothing about applying the framework to consequential individual commitments.

Practitioners who develop competence in applying the SDA to their own commitments may pursue DT-S (Decisiontect Solo, the Calibrated Practitioner credential) certification. DT-S is the foundational credential of the Decisiontect ecosystem, recognizing competence in governing one's own thinking through the SDA framework on Convoking⁴. A practitioner who has earned DT-S has demonstrated that they can run SDA sessions independently, produce Blueprints meeting the methodological specification, and apply the framework to consequential individual commitments with the discipline the technique requires. DT-S is referenced here as a forthcoming credential within the Decisiontect certification program scheduled to launch in 2027, with the publication of SDA v2.0 helping to establish the foundation for the credential.

Practitioners may engage the SDA paid tier for advanced capability beyond what the free tier provides, such as multi-AI integration and additional features that serious practitioners may want as their practice deepens. The paid tier extends the practitioner's working environment without changing the framework specification; the methodological compliance demonstrated in Section 7 holds at both tiers, with the paid tier adding capability rather than redefining the technique.

When practitioners enter organizational decision contexts, they may engage the BDA on Convoking⁴. The BDA's free and paid tiers serve organizational governance with operational structures appropriate to that scale, including the proprietary tools of the Decisiontect ecosystem (ImpactBridge, ContextBridge, Designed Evolution) that operationalize specific structural interventions at organizational scale. Practitioners working in organizational governance roles may pursue the Decisiontect credentials specific to those roles: DT-A for the practitioner serving as internal steward of organizational decision practice, DT-C for the external advisor or consultant supporting organizational decision practice, and DT-P for the enterprise distributor scaling decision practice across organizations. CDA is the mastery credential of the Decisiontect ecosystem, recognizing the practitioner who has integrated competence across the discipline at the level of leading practice rather than applying it.

The progression through the Decisiontect ecosystem is developmental rather than hierarchical. A DT-S certified practitioner is not a junior practitioner working toward DT-A as a senior credential; the credentials recognize different competencies operating at different scales of decision governance. A practitioner may hold DT-S and never pursue further credentials because their decision governance practice is appropriately individual. A practitioner may pursue DT-A or DT-C without DT-S if their entry into the discipline is through organizational governance rather than individual practice. The discipline supports practitioners across the arc from individual decision governance through organizational decision governance, with credentialing recognizing the specific competencies practitioners develop along the way.

8.4 The Decision Architecture discipline as a whole

The Decision Architecture discipline rests on three foundational constructs documented in the published Diagnostic and Methodological Layers and in canonical Decision Architecture terminology. The technique is backcasting and the dual lens, applied to consequential decision-making, with the decision architecture artifact as its output. The artifact specification names the five components the artifact must contain and the four functions the artifact must serve. The cycle structure is UCADE: Understand, Communicate, Align, Decide, Evolve. These three constructs together establish what the discipline addresses and how it addresses it; the framework papers operationalize these constructs at their respective scales.

The four-paper architecture documenting the discipline consists of the Diagnostic Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026a), the Methodological Layer (Hernandez and Montero 2026b), and the framework papers operationalizing the technique at the individual and organizational scales (this paper at the individual scale; the BDA framework paper forthcoming at the organizational scale). Detailed operational documentation supporting framework practice, including the Convoking4 platform’s architectural specifications, the DLDA’s operational mechanics, and the Decisiontect certification program’s structure, lives in BC-DS materials separate from the framework paper’s scope. The framework papers describe what the implementations meet at the methodological level; the supporting documentation describes how the platform and the ecosystem operate in practice.

The two-layer architecture clarifies the durability of each layer. The foundational layer (Diagnostic and Methodological) carries the discipline’s scholarly claims and remains authoritative regardless of how the technique is operationalized in practice. The implementation layer (the SDA and BDA framework papers) documents specific platform-anchored operationalizations and will be revised in subsequent versions as the platforms evolve. This is the appropriate split for a discipline that must establish both what the structural realities of decision distortion are (foundational, durable) and how those realities are addressed in practice (implementation-specific, versioned).

The discipline as a whole is the integrated body of work documented across these papers. The Diagnostic Layer establishes the realities the discipline responds to. The Methodological Layer establishes the technique that responds to the realities and the constraints any operationalization must meet. The framework papers establish how specific implementations meet the methodological requirements at their respective scales. The integrated body of work is what practitioners and researchers can engage with as the Decision Architecture discipline.

8.5 What the SDA on Convoking4 contributes to the discipline

The SDA on Convoking4 is the implementation that completes the individual-scale operationalization of the technique. The methodology specifies that the technique must be operable across decision scales; the SDA’s contribution to the discipline is the demonstration that the technique is operable at the individual scale through a platform that produces the conditions the methodology requires during the practi-

tioner's normal use of the system. The BDA on Convoking4, when it is published, will be the parallel completion of the organizational-scale operationalization.

The discipline's coherence rests on both implementations meeting the methodological bar. A discipline whose foundational technique is operable only at one scale is a discipline whose claims about cross-scale operability are theoretical. A discipline whose foundational technique is operationalized at both scales by implementations that demonstrably meet the methodological requirements is a discipline whose claims about cross-scale operability are demonstrated. The SDA and BDA implementations together carry the demonstration; the SDA paper carries the half of the demonstration that the SDA's correct operation at the individual scale establishes.

This is the SDA on Convoking4's contribution at the level the framework paper makes claims. The implementation demonstrates that the technique works at the individual scale, that the methodological constraints can be met by an implementation that operates at a scale a single person can sustain, and that the cascade of distortion can be addressed at the individual layer where the cascade originates. The remainder of the paper, in Section 9, names what is established by this contribution, what is left to subsequent versions and the comprehensive platform's continuing development, and the empirical research questions that follow specifically from the SDA's claims.

Section 9. Conclusion

This paper has documented the Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) framework as currently implemented on the Convoking4 platform. The framework operationalizes the foundational technique documented in the Methodological Layer at the individual scale, where the Decision Architect is the unit of accountability and the deliberation happens inside one person's thinking. The implementation produces a Decision Blueprint, the Convoking4 platform's specific deliverable, which renders the decision architecture artifact specified in the Methodological Layer with the five components and four functions that specification requires. The implementation establishes the conditions of artificial intelligence participation through structural enforcement at the platform level, and it meets each of the five methodological constraints derived from the Diagnostic Layer's failure modes.

This section closes the paper by naming what the SDA on Convoking4 establishes, what is bounded as the comprehensive platform's forthcoming work, and the empirical research questions that follow specifically from the SDA's claims.

9.1 What the SDA on Convoking4 establishes

The implementation establishes that the technique documented in the Methodological Layer is operable at the individual scale through a platform whose design produces the methodology's required conditions during the practitioner's normal use of the system. The compliance demonstration in Section 7 confirms that the implementation meets the five methodological constraints: the frame is surfaced before deliberation through the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary; aspiration and constraint are held together through the dual lens carried across every phase of the session; the output is an

artifact that can be examined and revised through the two-artifact pair and the Revise and Rebuild pathway; the conditions of AI participation are established by the platform through the four enforcement mechanisms documented in Section 5; and the technique is operable at the individual scale in a manner that produces artifacts compatible with the methodology’s cross-scale specification.

The implementation’s structural answer to the cascade of distortion at the individual scale is the SDA’s primary substantive contribution. The Diagnostic Layer establishes that distortion forms inside one person’s thinking before it ever reaches a team, that the cognitive failure modes operate at the individual scale, and that AI-specific failure modes amplify whatever frame the prompter brings to the prompt. The SDA on Convoking4 addresses the cascade at its origin. The Brain Dump captures the frame before AI participation can amplify it. The Catalyst surfaces what is genuinely driving the deliberation. The Camera Test enforces inspectability at the milestone level. The bidirectional Verification gates the artifact’s coherence. The Flinch Test forces explicit acceptance of the cost the decision will impose. Each of these structural answers operates at the scale where the diagnostic establishes the cascade begins, and together they constitute a working operationalization of the technique that is operable by a single Decision Architect on their own initiative.

The implementation also establishes that platform-design enforcement of methodological conditions is a viable engineering target. The methodology specifies what conditions must be established; the platform’s design produces those conditions during the practitioner’s normal use, rather than relying on the practitioner to remember and maintain the conditions through self-discipline. The four enforcement kinds documented in Section 5 (AI-surface absence, AI output validation against accumulating audited material, practitioner correction authority combined with structural validation gates, and structural role allocation) are specific design choices that produce specific compliance with specific methodological specifications. The implementation demonstrates that the methodology can be honored through engineering rather than through exhortation, which is significant for the broader question of how the Decision Architecture discipline’s other implementations might be designed.

9.2 What is bounded as forthcoming work

The current SDA implementation on Convoking4 is bounded relative to the comprehensive platform’s continuing scope. Several implementation areas are part of that developmental scope and explicitly named here.

The Evolve phase’s full operationalization is part of the comprehensive platform’s continuing development. The current implementation supports manual revision through the Revise and Rebuild pathway and basic preservation through the session’s two-artifact output. The comprehensive platform extends this with longitudinal Evolve governance, automated trigger detection, the Living Record Rule’s classified change tracking, the Thinking Log with multi-session continuity, and platform-driven re-entry routing. The methodology’s specification of the artifact’s revisability function is met at the current level by the manual revision pathway; the comprehensive platform meets it more fully through the automated capabilities just named.

The hypothesis document set will grow. The What’s Next phase currently offers six

audience-specific hypothesis documents derived from the Blueprint: the Execution Hypothesis, Value Hypothesis, Decision Hypothesis, Pitch Hypothesis, Project Brief Hypothesis, and Stakeholder Brief Hypothesis. The comprehensive platform extends the set as practitioner needs surface additional audiences and use cases. Each hypothesis document inherits the Blueprint’s audit trail, with every claim tracing to validated material in the artifact and the document framed as a hypothesis because the practitioner must validate it with external stakeholders before commitment.

Multi-AI integration is a paid-tier capability scoped for development. Practitioners with deeper practice may want the option to invoke multiple AI assistants against the artifact’s audited material, comparing extractions, generating alternative path elements, or surfacing conditions from different perspectives. The methodology’s AI participation specifications apply at the multi-AI level the same way they apply at the single-AI level: AI participates downstream of frame establishment, operates against audited material, is evaluated against the artifact, and is structurally prohibited from the methodology-specified human-only tasks. The comprehensive platform’s multi-AI capability honors these specifications across all participating AI surfaces.

The Decisiontect certification program is forthcoming with the 2027 platform launch. DT-S (Decisiontect Solo, the Calibrated Practitioner credential) is the foundational credential available to SDA practitioners at the free tier, recognizing competence in governing one’s own thinking through the SDA framework on Convoking4. The credential’s certification mechanics will be developed after the 2027 platform launch (full SDA, first phase of BDA); SDA v2.0 references the program at the level of its existence and developmental status. The Decisiontect ecosystem’s role is teaching infrastructure for the discipline rather than heavyweight credentialing apparatus, supporting practitioners in learning what the discipline of Decision Architecture is and how to operate it, and establishing Decision Architect as a recognizable professional identity.

The implementation’s scope is appropriately bounded for the validation phase the platform is currently in. Subsequent versions of this paper will revise as the platform evolves; the framework specification documented here is durable across implementations, and the bounded scope is honest about what the current platform delivers versus what the comprehensive platform will deliver.

9.3 Empirical research questions

The SDA framework’s claims are empirically testable, and several research questions follow specifically from those claims. Each can be examined as platform usage data accumulates, and each is offered to the broader research community as a question the discipline should answer rather than as a question only BC-DS will pursue.

The first question is whether SDA-produced Decision Blueprints survive subsequent examination better than artifacts produced through ad hoc individual decision practices. The methodology specifies that the artifact’s examinability function is what allows practitioners who were not in the original room to interrogate the reasoning, including the practitioner’s own future self. A longitudinal study comparing SDA-produced artifacts to artifacts produced through other individual decision methods, on dimensions including the practitioner’s ability to reconstruct the deliberation’s reasoning, the artifact’s resilience under condition changes, and the practitioner’s

reported confidence in commitments at twelve and twenty-four months post-decision, would test the examinability claim directly.

The second question is whether the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary produces decision outcomes different from those produced when AI participates throughout the deliberation. The Diagnostic Layer's claim that AI participation in frame establishment amplifies the frame is empirically grounded (Glickman and Sharot 2024), and the SDA's structural answer to that claim is the Stage 1 / Stage 2 boundary. A controlled comparison of deliberations conducted with the boundary versus deliberations conducted with AI participation throughout would test whether the boundary produces measurable differences in the resulting commitments, in practitioners' reported sense of ownership over the commitments, and in the rate at which commitments survive contact with execution.

The third question is whether the Camera Test and the Bouncer at the Bridge phase produce milestone specifications that are more reliably executable than milestone specifications produced through unbounded specification practices. The methodology requires that end-conditions be inspectable; the SDA implementation enforces this requirement at the milestone level through the Camera Test and the Bouncer. Field studies of execution against Camera-Test-passing milestones versus execution against unbounded milestone specifications would test the inspectability claim's connection to execution reliability.

The fourth question is whether the Flinch Test at the Gut Check phase produces commitments that are more reliably honored than commitments made without explicit cost acceptance. The methodology requires that resistant assumptions be named and the practitioner take responsibility for them at the moment of commitment. The Flinch Test is the SDA's structural mechanism for that requirement. Longitudinal studies of practitioner follow-through on commitments accepted through the Flinch Test versus commitments made without the explicit acceptance step would test the accountability claim.

The fifth question is whether the SDA's bounded scope (the failure modes the implementation can exhibit when applied dishonestly, and the failure modes the implementation explicitly does not address, both documented in Section 6) is itself an honest characterization of where the implementation succeeds and fails. The methodology requires honest practitioner work; the implementation cannot produce the honesty. Studies of where SDA practice produces artifacts that survive execution and where it produces artifacts that fail in execution, with attention to which of the bounded-scope failure modes correlate with execution failures, would test the bounded-scope claim itself.

These five questions are not exhaustive. They are the most consequential empirical questions the SDA's claims raise, and they are offered to the broader research community as a structured agenda for testing what the framework asserts.

9.4 The SDA on Convoking⁴ as a contribution to the discipline

The SDA framework paper documents one specific platform-anchored operationalization of the technique at the individual scale. The Diagnostic Layer establishes the

realities the discipline responds to. The Methodological Layer establishes the technique that responds to the realities. The SDA on Convoking4 establishes that the technique is operable at the individual scale through a platform whose design produces the methodology's required conditions. The BDA framework paper, when it is published, will establish the parallel operationalization at the organizational scale. The discipline as a whole rests on the foundational layer's scholarly authority and the framework papers' demonstration that the technique works in implementation.

This is the SDA on Convoking4's contribution at the level the framework paper makes claims. The paper's purpose has been to document the implementation in a manner that allows practitioners to apply the framework, researchers to evaluate the implementation against the methodological standard, and the broader discipline to develop on the foundation that this paper, together with its companion publications, establishes. The framework specification is durable. The implementation will continue to evolve, and subsequent versions of this paper will document the comprehensive platform's developmental work. The discipline's coherence rests on what is established here, what is forthcoming in the BDA framework paper, and what the foundational layer carries indefinitely.

References

Glickman, M., and Sharot, T. (2024). How human-AI feedback loops alter human perceptual, emotional and social judgements. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 9(2), 345-359. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-024-02077-2.

Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026a). *The Realities of Decision Distortion in the Age of AI: Human Cognitive and Organizational Biases and AI-Specific Amplification Mechanisms*. Decision Architecture, Diagnostic Layer, version 1.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19831515.

Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026b). *Backcasting and the Dual Lens: A Methodological Foundation for the Decision Architecture Discipline*. Decision Architecture, Methodological Layer, version 1.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19832436.

Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026c, forthcoming). *Business Decision Architecture (BDA) Framework: A System Architecture for Decision-Making in the Age of AI*. Decision Architecture, Framework Layer (Organizational), version 2.2. Zenodo.

Companion Documents

The Solo Decision Architecture framework on Convoking4 is one of four publications documenting the Decision Architecture discipline. Two publications are foundational; two are framework-layer implementations.

The Diagnostic Layer. Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026). *The Realities of Decision Distortion in the Age of AI: Human Cognitive and Organizational Biases and AI-Specific Amplification Mechanisms*. Decision Architecture, Diagnostic

Layer, version 1.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19831515. The Diagnostic Layer documents the structural realities that distort consequential decisions in modern organizations: the established literature on human cognitive bias, the established literature on organizational and social distortion, and the rapidly developing literature on AI-specific distortion mechanisms. The SDA framework on Convoking4 responds to these realities at the individual scale, where the diagnostic establishes that distortion forms before it ever reaches a team.

The Methodological Layer. Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026). *Backcasting and the Dual Lens: A Methodological Foundation for the Decision Architecture Discipline*. Decision Architecture, Methodological Layer, version 1.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19832436. The Methodological Layer documents the foundational technique of the discipline: backcasting and the dual lens applied to consequential decision-making, with a decision architecture artifact as the technique's output. The Methodological Layer establishes the five components and four functions any artifact must contain and serve, the four conditions of artificial intelligence participation any framework must establish, and the five methodological constraints any framework must meet. The SDA framework on Convoking4 operationalizes the technique at the individual scale and demonstrates compliance with the methodological constraints in Section 7 of this paper.

The Business Decision Architecture (BDA) framework, organizational layer. Hernandez, M. M., and Montero, D. A. (2026, forthcoming). *Business Decision Architecture (BDA) Framework: A System Architecture for Decision-Making in the Age of AI*. Decision Architecture, Framework Layer (Organizational), version 2.2. Zenodo. The BDA framework operationalizes the same foundational technique at the organizational scale, where the deliberation requires multi-stakeholder coordination architecture rather than one-person governance architecture. The SDA on Convoking4 and the BDA on Convoking4 are platform-anchored implementations of the same technique on a shared methodological foundation; the two implementations interlock through practitioners who move between scales, with the SDA producing audited individual frames that the BDA process integrates and the BDA producing organizational decisions that individuals execute through their own SDA practice.

The framework specification documented in this paper remains operable independently of the Convoking4 platform. A practitioner who finds the SDA framework useful but does not wish to engage the platform can apply the technique as documented, with the understanding that the structural enforcement the platform provides becomes the practitioner's discipline to maintain through self-application of the framework's mechanisms. The platform's contribution is to make the technique operable at sustained scale through structural enforcement of methodological conditions; the technique itself is open under CC BY 4.0 and operable by any practitioner who chooses to apply it.

Detailed operational documentation supporting framework practice on Convoking4, including the platform's architectural specifications, the DLDA's operational mechanics, and the Decisiontect certification program's structure, lives in BC-DS materials separate from the framework paper's scope. The framework paper describes what the implementation meets at the methodological level; the supporting documentation describes how the platform and the ecosystem operate in practice.

Copyright and Licensing

Copyright © 2026 Monica M. Hernandez and Daniel A. Montero.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You are free to share and adapt this material for any purpose, including commercially, under the following terms: you must give appropriate credit to the authors, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Solo Decision Architecture (SDA) framework documented in this paper is the individual-scale operationalization of the Decision Architecture discipline. The framework is implemented on the Convoking4 platform, operated by BC-DS, Business Consultants for Digital Solutions, LLC, the firm founded by Monica M. Hernandez with Daniel A. Montero as co-founder.

The framework's vocabulary draws on canonical Decision Architecture terminology developed across the publication architecture and the Decisiontect ecosystem. The named constructs documented in this paper (including Performance of Rigor, Illusion of Alignment, Cascade of Distortion, Decision Debt, ADICE, UCADE, Camera Test, Bouncer, Honest Extraction rule, Quarantine Resolution, Flinch Test, and Asymmetry of Change) are released under the same CC BY 4.0 license. Convoking4, Decisiontect, and the credentialing names (DT-S, DT-A, DT-C, DT-P, CDA) are trademarks used in this paper without trademark marks for readability; the trademark status of these names is preserved.

The framework's intellectual debt to the cognitive science traditions, the backcasting literature, and the multi-perspective decision sciences tradition is acknowledged through the Methodological Layer's References, which this paper inherits.