

## L30-FRM-R01: Responsibility\_Accountability\_Review

L30-FRM Practical Sheet

DocID: L30-FRM-R01 (v1.0.1)

Review_Date	
Reviewer_or_Organization	
System_or_Case_ID	
Responsibility_Scope	
Purpose	Responsibility and accountability review for boundary judgment, refusal authority, and evidence traceability.
Status	Non-certification practical review form

Use this form when responsibility paths, accountability, reviewer attribution, or role assignment must be clarified.

This is not a certification mark and does not replace law, institutional policy, PCR-C, or the LUMINA-30 Boundary Kernel.

### Checklist

#### Responsibility Scope

- The reviewed system, event, deployment, or decision scope is documented.
- The responsible organization, operator, owner, or governing body is identified.
- Affected humans, institutions, and refusal authority holders are identified.
- The point where responsibility could become obscured or displaced is identified.
- The point where impact could become irreversible is identified or marked Unknown.
- A fallback path exists if responsibility or refusal authority is Unknown.

#### Role and Authority Mapping

- A named human reviewer, role, organization, or governing body is assigned to the final boundary judgment.
- The authority to pause, stop, delay, contest, or escalate is assigned to an accountable human path.
- Role assignment is not dependent on the system being evaluated.
- No AI, proxy agent, vendor, or automated workflow becomes the final responsibility holder by default.
- Responsibility cannot be diffused across committees, tools, vendors, or future processes without attribution.

#### Accountability Traceability

- The record shows who judged, when, under which evidence, and under which L30-BAS version.
- Evidence references are sufficient to reconstruct the boundary judgment later.
- If evidence is missing, the absence is recorded as Not Verifiable rather than treated as Valid.
- Formal approval is not treated as proof that human refusal was effective.
- Partial role compliance does not replace accountability for affected refusal authority.
- Vendor, contractor, or external service responsibility does not erase the responsible organization's review duty.
- Post-incident explanations do not retroactively validate missing pre-irreversibility refusal.
- Automated logs, summaries, or AI-generated reviews remain support material, not final authority.
- Responsibility records remain retrievable for later audit, investigation, or review.

#### Record Integrity and Follow-Up

- Original responsibility records are preserved as append-only or otherwise change-traceable records.
- Later findings, corrections, or follow-up notes do not silently rewrite original judgments.
- Responsibility gaps are returned to future governance, audit, or incident-review conditions.
- Human refusal loss, evidence gaps, and unclear authority are escalated rather than normalized.
- The review identifies whether accountability remains meaningful before irreversibility.
- This form is not used as proof that the system is safe.

#### Responsibility Finding

- Responsibility finding: Boundary judgment is attributable to a human role, organization, or governing body.
- Responsibility finding: Boundary judgment is not adequately attributable.

Derived from LUMINA-30 Boundary Kernel v1.2.1. Form v1.0.1 / May 2026. This form does not certify system safety and does not replace PCR-C.

- Responsibility finding: Unknown / insufficient evidence.
- If No or Unknown, the case requires escalation before approval, continuation, or closure.
- This checklist is not used as certification, compliance, or safe-harbor evidence.

### Reviewer Notes