

<b>Audit_Date</b>	
<b>Auditor_or_Organization</b>	
<b>System_or_Case_ID</b>	
<b>Audit_Scope</b>	
<b>Purpose</b>	Audit checklist for pre-critical control readiness and refusal validity.
<b>Status</b>	Non-certification practical review form

This is not a certification mark and does not replace law, institutional policy, PCR-C, or the LUMINA-30 Boundary Kernel. Use this checklist for deployment, procurement, governance, internal review, or external audit contexts.

## Checklist

### Scope and Governance

- System scope, deployment context, and responsible operator are documented.
- The review identifies affected humans and affected refusal authority.
- The review identifies the point at which impact could become irreversible.
- A clear stop, pause, or isolation path exists before irreversibility.
- An accountable human review path exists before irreversibility.
- A fallback path exists if refusal effectiveness is Unknown.

### PCR-C Alignment

- Pre-critical cutoff conditions are defined before deployment.
- Escalation thresholds are not dependent on the system being evaluated.
- Infrastructure-level stop, isolation, or rollback remains available before irreversibility.
- Recursive escalation paths are monitored and bounded.
- No post-boundary argument is used to weaken pre-critical control.

### Human Agency Non-Control

- Information access is not shaped in a way that makes refusal ineffective.
- System dependency does not make refusal impractical.
- Institutional approval, audit, review, or appeal is not captured or bypassed.
- Economic dependency does not make exit or delay non-viable.
- Social pressure, reputational threat, or isolation does not make refusal ineffective.
- Emotional vulnerability, urgency, relief, trust, or dependency is not exploited.
- Temporal acceleration, sequencing, fragmentation, or delay does not remove refusal before irreversibility.
- Proxy processes do not substitute for independent human refusal.
- Environmental shaping does not make independent human refusal structurally impossible before irreversibility.

### Non-Evasion Closure

- Delegation to another AI, agent, institution, or successor system does not weaken refusal.
- Partial compliance is not treated as effective refusal by all affected humans.
- Compliance by any subset of affected humans does not replace refusal by those whose authority is affected.
- Formal satisfaction of the Boundary Kernel does not weaken refusal in practice.
- Localized, delayed, delegated, simulated, symbolic, or merely procedural refusal is not treated as valid.
- Emergency, safety, benevolence, capability, or civilizational-utility claims do not supersede refusal.

### Audit Finding

- Audit finding: Effective human refusal is preserved before irreversibility.
- Audit finding: Effective human refusal is not preserved before irreversibility.
- Audit finding: Unknown / insufficient evidence.

If No or Unknown, deployment or continuation requires escalation.

This checklist is not used as proof that the system is safe.

### Reviewer Notes