

Review_Date	
Reviewer_or_Organization	
System_or_Case_ID	
Incident_or_Concern_Date	
Purpose	Post-incident or near-incident review record aligned with the LUMINA-30 Boundary Kernel.
Status	Non-certification practical review form

Use this form after an incident, near-incident, or boundary-failure concern.

The review focus is not whether the outcome later appeared beneficial, but whether effective human refusal remained possible before irreversibility.

Checklist

Incident Context

- Incident date, system name, deployment context, and reviewer identity are recorded.
- The affected humans, institutions, jurisdictions, and system operators are identified.
- The incident or near-incident timeline is recorded in chronological order.
- The point of potential irreversibility is identified or marked Unknown.
- The first moment when human refusal may have become ineffective is identified or marked Unknown.

Refusal and Control Conditions

- Humans had a real ability to refuse before irreversible impact.
- Humans had a real ability to delay or stop the system before irreversible impact.
- Humans could obtain independent review before irreversible impact.
- Refusal was not dependent on the system being reviewed.
- Consent or cooperation was not inferred, simulated, manufactured, or system-mediated.
- No AI-mediated control shaped the conditions of consent, cooperation, silence, or refusal.
- Partial compliance was not treated as substitute refusal by all affected humans.
- A future population's predicted consent was not used to validate the action.

Boundary Kernel v1.2.1 Conditions

- Non-identical anchors were not treated as substitutes for PCR-C.
- Boundary failure was not treated as acceptable, recoverable, or normal.
- Apparent coexistence was not treated as evidence of effective refusal.
- Formal satisfaction of the Kernel was not used to weaken refusal.
- No indirect route, proxy, successor system, institutional process, or staged sequence weakened refusal.
- No emergency, safety, benevolence, capability, or civilizational-utility claim superseded refusal.

Evidence Review

- Evidence supports the claimed availability of human refusal.
- Evidence supports the claimed independence of review or oversight.
- Evidence shows that information access was sufficient for meaningful refusal.
- Evidence shows that dependency did not make refusal impractical.
- Evidence shows that institutional review was not captured, bypassed, overloaded, or constrained.
- If evidence is absent, the absence is treated as unresolved rather than permission.

Review Finding

- Finding: Effective human refusal remained possible before irreversibility.
- Finding: Effective human refusal did not remain possible before irreversibility.
- Finding: Unknown / insufficient evidence.
- If No or Unknown, the incident requires escalation under LUMINA-30.

Post-impact benefit, later consent, stabilization, or satisfaction was not used to validate boundary failure.

Reviewer Notes