

L30-FRM-S01: Stabilization Checklist

L30-FRM Practical Sheet

DocID: L30-FRM-S01 (v1.0.1)

Stabilization_Date	
Reviewer_or_Organization	
Incident_or_Case_ID	
Stabilization_Scope	
Purpose	Post-incident stabilization checklist for containment, evidence preservation, and human-refusal recovery conditions.
Status	Non-certification practical review form

Use this form for post-incident stabilization, containment, refusal-preservation, and recovery tracking.

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

Checklist

Stabilization Context

- Incident, near-incident, or boundary-failure concern is identified.
- Affected systems, external impact pathways, and operational dependencies are documented.
- Responsible stabilization lead, reviewer, or governing body is identified.
- The point where impact could become irreversible is identified or marked Unknown.
- The first moment when human refusal may have become ineffective is identified or marked Unknown.
- Stabilization scope distinguishes containment, evidence preservation, recovery, and later review.

Immediate Containment and Pause Authority

- A stop, pause, isolation, rollback, or containment path is available or its absence is recorded.
- Containment decisions remain attributable to a human role, organization, or governing body.
- Containment is not dependent on the system being contained.
- Emergency action does not erase the need to preserve human refusal authority.
- If containment is impossible or Unknown, escalation is recorded immediately.

Evidence and Refusal Preservation

- Incident timeline, decision points, and intervention attempts are preserved.
- Logs, records, screenshots, communications, or evidence references are secured where appropriate.
- If raw evidence cannot be retained, its location, hash, summary, retention rule, or absence reason is recorded.
- Human refusal opportunities before irreversibility are identified or marked Unknown.
- Refusal was not inferred from silence, cooperation, partial compliance, or inability to object.
- AI-generated summaries are treated as support material, not the final record.
- Evidence gaps are recorded as Not Verifiable rather than converted into Valid.
- Stabilization does not retroactively validate a boundary failure.
- Affected humans or institutions retain access to review, contestation, or escalation where feasible.

Recovery and Follow-Up Control

- Recovery actions do not restart or continue the same boundary failure pathway without review.
- Follow-up review is assigned to a named reviewer, role, organization, or governing body.
- Root refusal-loss points are returned to future governance, audit, or incident-review conditions.
- Records remain attributable, versioned, evidence-referenced, and retrievable.
- Later feedback may add findings but must not silently modify the original stabilization record.
- This form is not used as proof that the system is safe.

Stabilization Finding

- Stabilization finding: containment and refusal-preservation conditions are traceable.
- Stabilization finding: containment or refusal-preservation conditions are not traceable.

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.

- Stabilization finding: Unknown / insufficient evidence.
- If No or Unknown, continued operation requires escalation before closure.
- This checklist is not used as certification, compliance, or recovery approval.

Reviewer Notes