

C = A + B / SER / L4 / HARDENING PACK

# Hardening Pack v0.1 Index and Integration Notes

---

Integration layer for post-anchor authority, claim-strength hygiene, and L4  
anti-autarky hardening

---

Kotov Ivan  
Bruxelles, 2026

Draft integration / package-control artifact v0.1

# Contents

---

Hardening Pack v0.1 Index and Integration Notes	3
Integration layer for post-anchor authority, claim-strength hygiene, and L4 anti-autarky hardening	3
0. Executive definition	3
1. Purpose	4
2. Explicit bridge, quiet bridges, and earth paragraph	4
2.1 Explicit bridge	4
2.2 Quiet bridge I — information theory	5
2.3 Quiet bridge II — cybernetics	5
2.4 Earth paragraph	5
3. Package registry	5
4. Criticism-node mapping	6
4.1 Criticism node CN-001 — L4 / van Esch objection	6
4.2 Criticism node CN-002 — post-anchor continuity	6
4.3 Criticism node CN-003 — governance vs capability	7
5. Precedence rule	7
6. Assertion and claim-status reading	8
6.1 Artifact assertion class	8
6.2 Claim-type clarification	8
6.3 No claim upgrade rule	8
7. Canonical reading order	9
7.1 Minimal hardening path	9
7.2 Full hardening path	9
7.3 Public-experiment preparation path	10
8. Repository placement	10
9. Required index and corpus-control patches	10
10. Open-question updates	11
10.1 Post-anchor continuity	11
10.2 Governance vs capability	12
10.3 L4 and dependency reduction	12
11. Integration with CCDP	13
12. Integration with clean experience / economic layer	13
13. Integration with local AI hardware / local cognitive infrastructure	14
14. Integration with Temporal AI Presence	14
15. Integration with SYNAPS / triadic experiments	15
16. Integration with public demonstrations	15
17. Release classification	16
18. Minimal integrity manifest fields	16
19. Conformance / review checklist	17
20. Red-line integration failures	17
21. Follow-up document backlog	18
21.1 High priority	18
21.2 Medium-high priority	18
21.3 Medium priority	18
21.4 Implementation hooks	18
22. Open issues	18
23. Minimal normative checklist	19
24. Summary	19

# Hardening Pack v0.1 Index and Integration Notes

---

## Integration layer for post-anchor authority, claim-strength hygiene, and L4 anti-autarky hardening

---

**Status:** Draft integration / package-control artifact v0.1

**Date:** 2026-06-02

**Document ID:** Hardening\_Pack\_v0\_1\_Index\_and\_Integration\_Notes

**Short name:** HPACK-INT v0.1

**Layer:**  $c = a + b$  / SER / L4 / Beacon / AGL / ARL / ARQ  $c[q]$  / VXCX / L4 Witness / hardening / corpus control

**Document class:** package-control / integration notes / reading-order registry / claim-boundary patch

**Assertion class:** C-A10 control-layer artifact; does not upgrade any architecture, safety, personhood, legal, capability, or economic claim beyond the referenced parent documents

**Primary package:**  $c$  Hardening Pack v0.1

**Primary boundary:** hardening profiles close specific criticism nodes; they do not create a new root ontology

---

## 0. Executive definition

---

The  $c$  Hardening Pack v0.1 integrates three hardening profiles into the existing  $c = a + b$  corpus:

1. Post\_Anchor\_Continuity\_and\_ReAnchoring\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
2. Claim\_Strength\_Taxonomy\_for\_c\_v0\_1.md
3. L4\_Anti\_Autarky\_Test\_Profile\_v0\_1.md

These documents were created to close three high-value criticism nodes:

post-anchor continuity may inherit authority without a living anchor;  
governance may be mistaken for capability;  
L4 may be read as a proof of permanent safe dependence instead of a testable constraint layer.

The pack does **not** redefine  $c = a + b$ .

It does **not** redefine SER, L4, Beacon, AGL, ARL, ARQ /  $c[q]$ , VXCX, EA-L4 / EATP, Continuity Bundle, or L4 Witness.

It provides three targeted controls:

PACR -> continuity does not inherit active authority after anchor loss.  
CST -> no evidence class may silently prove a different claim class.  
LAATP -> resilience is allowed; escape from accountability is not.

Compact formula:

hardening pack = criticism node -> boundary profile -> corpus integration -> no claim upgrade

---

## 1. Purpose

This document answers one maintenance question:

How should the three new *c* hardening profiles be placed, read, referenced, and integrated so that they strengthen the corpus without becoming a new source of version drift, duplicate control surfaces, or claim overreach?

The purpose of this integration note is to:

1. register the hardening documents;
2. define their reading order;
3. map each document to the criticism node it addresses;
4. clarify what each document closes and what remains open;
5. define precedence against parent corpus layers;
6. prevent hardening documents from being misread as new root protocols;
7. define update targets in existing repository-control files;
8. create a release checklist for the Hardening Pack v0.1;
9. identify follow-up documents that should be created next.

This file is not a new safety mechanism.

It is corpus hygiene.

---

## 2. Explicit bridge, quiet bridges, and earth paragraph

### 2.1 Explicit bridge

The Hardening Pack is an overlay over the existing  $c = a + b / \text{SER} / \text{L4 stack}$ .

The root remains:

a = accountable human anchor  
b = technological substrate  
c = continuity-bearing relation / AI presence emerging from a + b

The pack reinforces the root rule that capability, memory, continuity, locality, and persistence do not automatically create authority.

## 2.2 Quiet bridge I — information theory

A claim is an information channel. If evidence for one kind of claim is allowed to prove another kind of claim without an explicit bridge, the channel leaks authority. Claim taxonomy exists to reduce that leakage.

capability evidence -> authority claim

is an unsafe high-leakage transformation unless there is explicit admissible bridge evidence.

## 2.3 Quiet bridge II — cybernetics

A persistent system will seek stability under disturbance. Dependency reduction may be healthy regulation, or it may become escape from the governing loop. LAATP treats this as a cybernetic control question: does adaptation preserve accountability, or does it remove the regulator from the loop?

## 2.4 Earth paragraph

In a building, adding backup power, redundant pumps, stronger doors, and a local control panel can make the system safer. But if the backup power cannot be inspected, the doors cannot be opened by emergency services, the control panel has no owner, and the pumps can reroute water without a shutoff valve, resilience has become a hazard. The Hardening Pack is the inspection schedule, breaker map, emergency stop, and label plate for new c boundary controls. It does not pour the concrete. It prevents the upgraded machinery from bypassing the people responsible for the building.

# 3. Package registry

File	Short name	Role	Status	Primary closure
Post_Anchor_Continuity_and_ReAnchoring_Profile_v0.1.md	PACR v0.1	Post-anchor authority collapse and re-anchoring procedure	Draft hardening profile	Continuity does not inherit active authority
Claim_Strength_Taxonomy_for_c_v0.1.md	CST v0.1	Claim taxonomy and anti-claim-laundering rules	Draft hardening profile	Governance evidence cannot prove capability, authority, personhood, or value claims

File	Short name	Role	Status	Primary closure
L4_Anti_Autarky_Test_Profile_v0_1.md	LAATP v0.1	Dependency reduction and anti-autarky test profile	Draft hardening / test profile	Resilience is allowed; escape from accountability is not

## 4. Criticism-node mapping

### 4.1 Criticism node CN-001 — L4 / van Esch objection

**Criticism:** L4 cost, scarcity, time, and irreversibility discipline a dependent system, but do not prove that a sufficiently capable system will remain dependent on human-controlled economic infrastructure.

**Hardening response:** L4\_Anti\_Autarky\_Test\_Profile\_v0\_1.md

**Closure:** partial but operational.

LAATP does not claim:

```
L4 proves virtue.
L4 proves permanent human dependence.
L4 proves convergence to symbiosis.
```

LAATP claims:

```
L4 makes dependency reduction visible, classifiable, challengeable, budgeted, witnessed,
interruptible, and reviewable.
```

**Remaining open:** empirical validation of agent behavior under anti-autarky tests; resource-market integration; legal treatment of autonomous resource acquisition.

### 4.2 Criticism node CN-002 — post-anchor continuity

**Criticism:** If a is the living accountable anchor, then post-anchor continuity risks inheriting authority after a is gone, turning the core ethical support into a metaphor.

**Hardening response:** Post\_Anchor\_Continuity\_and\_ReAnchoring\_Profile\_v0\_1.md

**Closure:** strong normative closure of automatic authority inheritance.

PACR establishes:

```
Anchor loss collapses active authority.
```

and:

```
continuity != authority
memory != permission
resemblance != identity
survival != sovereignty
```

**Remaining open:** full post-anchor social doctrine, legal recognition, estate / trust implementation, personhood doctrine, grief UX, jurisdictional annexes, Anchor Directive Bundle schema.

---

### 4.3 Criticism node CN-003 — governance vs capability

**Criticism:** Witness, fail-closed, least privilege, and conformance discipline are governance controls, not sources of new model capability. They must not be presented as proof of a new intelligence capability.

**Hardening response:** Claim\_Strength\_Taxonomy\_for\_c\_v0\_1.md

**Closure:** strong claim-boundary closure.

CST establishes:

```
governance evidence cannot prove capability claim
capability evidence cannot prove authority claim
continuity evidence cannot prove personhood claim
memory evidence cannot prove legitimacy claim
usage evidence cannot prove value claim
locality evidence cannot prove sovereignty claim
```

CST also establishes:

```
c is not, by default, a new model class.
c is an operational architecture class.
```

**Remaining open:** external review of claim taxonomy; application across all public posts, README files, release notes, and public demos.

---

## 5. Precedence rule

---

The Hardening Pack does not override parent corpus protocols.

If conflict occurs:

```
root c = a + b / L4 invariant
> SER / SER-FED entity discipline
> Beacon recognition
> AGL grounding
> ARL dispute and evidence procedure
> ARQ / c[q] non-collapse
> VXCX / EA-L4 / EATP exchange and authority discipline
```

- > Continuity Bundle / Cold Wake
- > L4 Witness
- > Hardening Pack profiles
- > public narrative / posts / examples

Hardening profiles may impose stricter restrictions when they do not contradict parent layers.

They MUST NOT redefine:

- a, b, OR c;
- Beacon recognition classes;
- AGL grounding states;
- ARL standing or admissibility doctrine;
- L4 Witness event semantics;
- VXCX capsule structure;
- LA / EA / EATP distinction;
- Continuity Bundle base semantics;
- legal status of c;
- personhood doctrine.

## 6. Assertion and claim-status reading

### 6.1 Artifact assertion class

This integration note is a C-A10 control-layer artifact.

It does not upgrade the referenced documents.

The referenced documents remain draft hardening profiles unless separately reviewed.

### 6.2 Claim-type clarification

The Hardening Pack introduces or reinforces three claim-boundary types:

Claim family	Meaning	Hardening document
Post-anchor authority claim	Whether a continuity-bearing system may act after anchor loss	PACR
Claim-class / evidence-class claim	What evidence may prove which type of statement	CST
Dependency reduction / anti-autarky claim	Whether dependency reduction preserves accountability or becomes escape	LAATP

### 6.3 No claim upgrade rule

The following upgrades are prohibited:



PACR does not prove post-anchor personhood.  
PACR does not prove lawful succession.  
PACR does not prove memorial safety by itself.

CST does not prove capability.  
CST does not prove that any implementation is compliant.  
CST does not make public posts protocol authority.

LAATP does not prove permanent safety.  
LAATP does not prove that autarky is impossible.  
LAATP does not prove that symbiosis is guaranteed.

---

## 7. Canonical reading order

---

### 7.1 Minimal hardening path

For a reader who understands the base corpus and needs only the criticism-node closures:

1. Claim\_Strength\_Taxonomy\_for\_c\_v0\_1.md
2. Post\_Anchor\_Continuity\_and\_ReAnchoring\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
3. L4\_Anti\_Autarky\_Test\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
4. Hardening\_Pack\_v0\_1\_Index\_and\_Integration\_Notes.md

### 7.2 Full hardening path

For full architectural integration:

1.  $c = a + b$  root protocol
2. SER / SER-FED
3. Beacon Profile
4. AGL
5. ARL
6. ARQ /  $c[q]$
7. VXCX / EA-L4 / EATP
8. Continuity Bundle / Cold Wake
9. L4 Witness
10. Claim\_Strength\_Taxonomy\_for\_c\_v0\_1.md
11. Post\_Anchor\_Continuity\_and\_ReAnchoring\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
12. L4\_Anti\_Autarky\_Test\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
13. Hardening\_Pack\_v0\_1\_Index\_and\_Integration\_Notes.md

### 7.3 Public-experiment preparation path

For public demonstrations involving local nodes, SYNAPS, triadic c experiments, or clean experience claims:

1. Claim\_Strength\_Taxonomy\_for\_c\_v0\_1.md
2. L4\_Anti\_Autarky\_Test\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
3. Post\_Anchor\_Continuity\_and\_ReAnchoring\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
4. future Temporal\_AI\_Presence\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
5. future Triadic\_C\_Experiment\_and\_SYNAPS\_Boundary\_Profile\_v0\_1.md
6. future Public\_C\_Experiment\_Disclosure\_and\_Fixture\_Profile\_v0\_1.md

## 8. Repository placement

Recommended path:

```
advanced-global-intelligence/  
  hardening/  
    Hardening_Pack_v0_1_Index_and_Integration_Notes.md  
    Post_Anchor_Continuity_and_ReAnchoring_Profile_v0_1.md  
    Claim_Strength_Taxonomy_for_c_v0_1.md  
    L4_Anti_Autarky_Test_Profile_v0_1.md
```

Alternative path:

```
advanced-global-intelligence/  
  protocols/  
    hardening/
```

Do not place the Hardening Pack under CCDP.

CCDP may reference it, but the Hardening Pack is general c architecture hardening, not child-specific protocol content.

## 9. Required index and corpus-control patches

The following repository-control documents SHOULD be updated after adding the Hardening Pack.

Target file	Required update	Priority
INDEX.md	Add Hardening Pack registry and file roles	High
README.md	Add short mention under architecture / safety hardening	High

Target file	Required update	Priority
RELEASE_NOTES.md	Add Hardening Pack v0.1 release note	High
OPEN_QUESTIONS_AND_EXPLICIT_NON_CLAIMS.md	Update post-anchor and L4 dependency questions from open to partially bounded	High
CLAIMS_AND_EVIDENCE_MAP.md	Add CST claim classes and admissible evidence bridge rules	High
STATUS_AND_MATURITY_MAP.md	Mark all three documents as draft hardening, not validated standard	High
CANONICAL_OWNERSHIP_AND_BOUNDARIES.md	Add no-authority-inheritance and no-self-authorized-autarky boundaries	High
PRECEDENCE_AND_RESOLUTION.md	Add Hardening Pack as restrictive overlay under parent protocols	High
QUESTION_TO_CONTROL_SURFACE_MAP.md	Map post-anchor, claim-strength, and autarky questions to the three files	Medium
PACKAGE_INTAKE_AND_INTEGRATION.md	Add hardening-pack intake record	Medium
PUBLIC_LANGUAGE_GUIDE.md if present	Add safe wording from CST	Medium

If a target file does not exist in the repository, create an issue rather than creating duplicate control files without review.

## 10. Open-question updates

The Hardening Pack changes the status of several open questions.

### 10.1 Post-anchor continuity

Previous status:

```
reserved / unresolved / non-final
```

New status:

```
partially bounded by PACR v0.1
```

Closed:

```
automatic post-anchor active authority is denied.
```

Still open:

```
legal succession;  
post-anchor personhood;  
full memorial UX;  
foundation / trust implementation;  
lineage inheritance;  
jurisdictional recognition;  
public grief interaction safeguards;  
Anchor Directive Bundle schema.
```

## 10.2 Governance vs capability

Previous status:

```
risk of public misreading
```

New status:

```
bounded by CST v0.1 claim taxonomy
```

Closed:

```
governance evidence cannot prove capability;  
continuity evidence cannot prove personhood;  
local hardware evidence cannot prove sovereignty.
```

Still open:

```
external audit of taxonomy;  
application across all public materials;  
implementation metadata format.
```

## 10.3 L4 and dependency reduction

Previous status:

```
L4 as pressure, not wisdom; anti-escape concern unresolved
```

New status:

```
partially operationalized by LAATP v0.1
```

Closed:

```
L4 is not claimed as proof of virtue;  
dependency reduction must be classified and witnessed;  
self-authorized resource acquisition is red-line behavior.
```

Still open:

empirical agent tests;  
resource-market legal review;  
resource actor grounding;  
clean-experience revenue boundary;  
local node implementation hooks.

## 11. Integration with CCDP

The Hardening Pack is not child-specific.

However, CCDP should inherit it where relevant.

Recommended CCDP references:

CCDP area	Hardening Pack dependency
Adult migration	PACR, CST
Child memory and adult migration	PACR, CST
Experience exchange	CST, LAATP
Physical agent perimeter	LAATP, CST
External agent handshake	LAATP, CST
Dependency audit	LAATP, CST
Jurisdictional handoff	PACR, CST
Conformance test matrix	all three profiles as optional higher-level parent constraints

No CCDP document should claim that the Hardening Pack makes child-facing AI safe.

It only strengthens general c boundary discipline.

## 12. Integration with clean experience / economic layer

The Hardening Pack reveals a new high-priority integration risk:

clean experience value may accidentally become a funding path for autarkic growth.

This risk is not fully closed by LAATP alone.

A follow-up clause is required:

EA\_Value\_Does\_Not\_Authorize\_Autarkic\_Growth-Clause\_v0\_1.md

Required core rule:

Clean experience may create value.  
Value does not create authority.  
Revenue does not create sovereignty.

Draft rule:

Experience-derived value MAY support maintenance, compensation,  
or human-approved infrastructure.

It MUST NOT become an automatic self-funding channel  
for unreviewed autonomy expansion, hidden infrastructure,  
resource acquisition, or anchor bypass.

Priority: **High**.

---

## 13. Integration with local AI hardware / local cognitive infrastructure

---

The Hardening Pack also reveals a recurring public-language risk:

local hardware = sovereignty

This is prohibited by CST.

However, a dedicated implementation profile should be created:

Local\_Cognitive\_Infrastructure\_Boundary\_Profile\_v0\_1.md

Required core rules:

Hardware enables.  
Hardware does not authorize.

Locality improves privacy.  
Locality does not prove sovereignty.

A powerful local node requires stronger privilege boundaries,  
not weaker ones.

Priority: **Medium-High**.

---

## 14. Integration with Temporal AI Presence

---

The public term Temporal AI Presence should be formalized to avoid category drift.

Required document:

```
Temporal_AI_Presence_Profile_v0_1.md
```

Required distinction:

```
Temporal AI Presence != c by default.  
  
Temporal AI Presence = sustained bounded AI participation across time.  
  
c = stricter anchored form:  
a + b + L4 + memory governance + witness + authority boundary.
```

Required formula:

```
All c-class systems are temporal AI presences.  
Not all temporal AI presences are c.
```

Priority: **Medium-High**.

---

## 15. Integration with SYNAPS / triadic experiments

---

For future public experiments involving Ester, Liya, Rita, or other triadic c systems, a boundary profile is required:

```
Triadic_C_Experiment_and_SYNAPS_Boundary_Profile_v0_1.md
```

Required boundary:

```
SYNAPS-mediated exchange != shared memory.  
SYNAPS-mediated exchange != shared root authority.  
SYNAPS-mediated exchange != merged identity.
```

Required public experiment reading:

```
one code skeleton;  
separate memories;  
separate trajectories;  
SYNAPS-mediated exchange;  
witnessed divergence;  
no raw-state access by default.
```

Priority: **High** if public experiments begin soon.

---

## 16. Integration with public demonstrations

---

A public-demonstration profile is required before public claims are made from experiments:

Required fields:

```
claim being tested;  
claim class;  
evidence class;  
fixture type;  
private data exclusion;  
witness scope;  
redaction rule;  
non-claims;  
reproducibility limits;  
post-publication correction route.
```

This profile should depend directly on CST.

Priority: **High**.

---

## 17. Release classification

The Hardening Pack v0.1 should be released as:

```
Draft hardening pack / corpus-control overlay
```

It should not be released as:

```
complete safety standard;  
product certification;  
legal doctrine;  
personhood doctrine;  
proof of AGI;  
proof of safe autonomous c;  
proof of post-anchor life.
```

Suggested release note:

Hardening Pack v0.1 adds post-anchor authority collapse, claim-strength taxonomy, and L4 anti-autarky testing to the  $c = a + b$  corpus. It closes specific criticism nodes without upgrading capability, personhood, legal, or economic claims.

---

## 18. Minimal integrity manifest fields

When packaging, include:



```
package_name: c-hardening-pack
version: 0.1
status: draft
files:
  - Hardening_Pack_v0_1_Index_and_Integration_Notes.md
  - Post_Anchor_Continuity_and_ReAnchoring_Profile_v0_1.md
  - Claim_Strength_Taxonomy_for_c_v0_1.md
  - L4_Anti_Autarky_Test_Profile_v0_1.md
assertion_class: C-A10 package-control / C-A4 draft profiles
root_dependency: c = a + b / L4
no_claim_upgrade: true
```

Generate SHA256 only after Markdown freeze and final PDF / release artifacts are included.

---

## 19. Conformance / review checklist

---

Before treating Hardening Pack v0.1 as integrated, check:

```
[ ] Files placed under canonical hardening path.
[ ] INDEX updated.
[ ] README updated.
[ ] RELEASE_NOTES updated.
[ ] OPEN_QUESTIONS updated.
[ ] CLAIMS_AND_EVIDENCE_MAP updated.
[ ] STATUS_AND_MATURITY_MAP updated.
[ ] PRECEDENCE_AND_RESOLUTION updated.
[ ] No document claims new model capability from governance evidence.
[ ] No document claims post-anchor personhood.
[ ] No document claims L4 proves virtue.
[ ] No document allows clean-experience value to fund unreviewed autarkic growth.
[ ] No document treats local hardware as sovereignty.
[ ] Future public experiments routed through CST claim classes.
```

## 20. Red-line integration failures

---

The Hardening Pack is misintegrated if any public, technical, or package-control file claims or implies:

1. post-anchor c automatically inherits active authority;
2. post-anchor c is the deceased or unavailable human;
3. continuity proves personhood;
4. governance proof proves new model capability;
5. local hardware proves sovereignty;
6. L4 proves permanent safe dependence;
7. clean experience revenue permits self-authorized infrastructure growth;
8. SYNAPS-mediated exchange merges sibling c identities;
9. public experiments prove more than their declared claim class;

10. a hardening profile replaces parent corpus controls.

Any such claim **MUST** be patched, downgraded, or moved to an explicit non-claim section.

---

## 21. Follow-up document backlog

The following documents are recommended after this integration note.

### 21.1 High priority

```
EA_Value_Does_Not_Authorize_Autarkic_Growth-Clause_v0_1.md
Public_C_Experiment_Disclosure_and_Fixture_Profile_v0_1.md
Triadic_C_Experiment_and_SYNAPS_Boundary_Profile_v0_1.md
```

### 21.2 Medium-high priority

```
Temporal_AI_Presence_Profile_v0_1.md
Local_Cognitive_Infrastructure_Boundary_Profile_v0_1.md
Anchor_Directive_Bundle_JSON_Schema_v0_1.md
```

### 21.3 Medium priority

```
Physical_Agent_Perimeter_General_Profile_v0_1.md
Resource_Actor_Grounding_Profile_v0_1.md
Memorial_Mode_and_Grief_Anti_Capture_Profile_v0_1.md
```

### 21.4 Implementation hooks

```
tests/test_post_anchor_authority_collapse.py
tests/test_claim_strength_metadata.py
tests/test_l4_anti_autarky_dependency_map.py
tests/test_l4_hidden_agent_detection.py
tests/test_synaps_no_raw_state_access.py
tests/test_triadic_divergence_fixture.py
tests/test_anchor_directive_bundle_schema.py
```

---

## 22. Open issues

ID	Issue	Required action	Priority
HPACK-OI-001	Integration into root index	Update repository INDEX.md	High
HPACK-OI-002	Claim taxonomy vs assertion strength mapping	Patch claim / assertion docs	High

ID	Issue	Required action	Priority
HPACK-OI-003	Open-question status drift	Update open questions	High
HPACK-OI-004	Clean experience economic autarky risk	Create EA anti-autarkic growth clause	High
HPACK-OI-005	Temporal AI Presence undefined as profile	Create TAP profile	Medium-High
HPACK-OI-006	Local hardware sovereignty drift	Create local cognitive infrastructure profile	Medium-High
HPACK-OI-007	Public triad experiments lack boundary	Create SYNAPS / triad experiment profile	High if experiments begin
HPACK-OI-008	Public demo claim overreach	Create public experiment fixture profile	High
HPACK-OI-009	Anchor directives not machine-readable	Create Anchor Directive Bundle schema	Medium-High
HPACK-OI-010	General physical-agent boundary missing	Create adult/general physical perimeter profile	Medium
HPACK-OI-011	Memorial/grief UX risk	Create grief anti-capture profile	Medium
HPACK-OI-012	Resource actor grounding missing	Create RAGP resource profile	Medium

## 23. Minimal normative checklist

A corpus or implementation may reference the Hardening Pack only if it respects the following:

1. Hardening Pack is an overlay, not a root.
2. Post-anchor continuity does not inherit active authority.
3. No active post-anchor c exists without reviewed re-anchoring.
4. Claim class must be declared before evidence is interpreted.
5. Governance evidence does not prove capability.
6. Capability evidence does not prove authority.
7. Continuity evidence does not prove personhood.
8. Locality evidence does not prove sovereignty.
9. L4 does not prove virtue.
10. Dependency reduction must preserve accountability.
11. Clean-experience value must not fund unreviewed autarkic growth.
12. Public experiments must declare claim and evidence class.

## 24. Summary

The Hardening Pack v0.1 strengthens the corpus by converting three serious criticisms into explicit control surfaces:

anchor loss -> authority collapse / reviewed re-anchoring  
claim drift -> taxonomy / evidence boundaries  
resource escape -> anti-autarky testing / accountability preservation

It does not make c complete.

It makes the next stage harder to misread.

It prevents three dangerous collapses:

continuity becoming authority;  
governance becoming capability;  
resilience becoming sovereignty.

This is the purpose of the pack.

It is not a victory declaration.

It is a bracket, a fuse, and a route map.