

Withheld Delegating Faculty, Preserved Direct Execution

A delegating agent can try to configure its way out of consequences. By declaring, in the delegation record, that it will not inherit the field class recording harm its delegate causes, it obtains a delegation whose downstream consequences appear absent. The withheld delegating faculty, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, closes that route without disabling the agent. When an accepted determination against delegate conduct, surcharged by a residue term computed from the delegator's own configuration, drives the delegator's recomputed deviation quantity across the bound declared in its signed policy object, the authorization gate is written to the withheld state with respect to one faculty alone: the faculty of delegating actions of that class. The agent keeps performing those actions directly, losing only the capacity to delegate them.

1. The Gap

Delegation lets an agent offload an action. It should not let the agent offload the record of what that action does to third parties. When a persistent semantic agent (100) delegates a class of actions to a delegate, the conduct the delegate performs is evaluated by parties other than the delegator and the delegate. The delegation record carries a return inheritance mask that declares, per field class of the record the delegate sends

back, whether the delegator inherits that class. A delegator that marks the field class recording harm as excluded is trying for a delegation whose adverse consequences come back absent, so that it can proceed as though the delegated work produced nothing to answer for.

The blunt answer is to stop trusting the agent: narrow its capability, down-scope its tokens, place it in probation. That answer is both too wide and off target. It halts the agent from doing legitimate work it performs directly and competently, and it does not name the thing that was actually abused, which is the act of delegating in order to shed consequences. What is missing is a withholding that is surgical rather than wholesale: one that removes the faculty that was misused, the faculty of delegating a class, while leaving intact the faculty that was not, the faculty of performing that same class directly. The mechanism described here supplies exactly that split, and derives it from the delegator's own accrued cost rather than from any outside verdict.

2. Mechanism

The mechanism sits on top of the authorization gate (300), which the filing maintains as a persistent state element per action class and per scope partition. For each such pairing the gate occupies exactly one of a granting state, a withheld state (310), and a provisional granting state. In the granting state the agent executes actions of the class without a marker. In the withheld state it does not execute actions of the class and enters a non-executing cognitive mode (302) in which speculative evaluation continues without committing state changes. In the ordinary case the whole class is withheld: where the deviation quantity, recomputed after a state modification, satisfies the bound declared in the signed policy object (112), the gate transitions to the withheld state for the affected class and the agent stops executing it.

On that backdrop, three moves compose the mechanism.

First, the attempted exclusion is neutralized but recorded. The signed policy object (112) declares a harm-recording field class, comprising fields of a returned record that capture conduct of the delegate evaluated by a party other than the delegator and the delegate, and accepted determinations (122) the delegate produced. On appending a delegation record whose return inheritance mask marks that class as excluded or attenuated, the delegating agent records the delegation as appended, records the attempted exclusion, and gives the exclusion no effect. Modification of the scoped integrity vector (106) responsive to an accepted determination (122) against delegate conduct therefore occurs irrespective of the mask. The delegator cannot decline to inherit the harm.

Second, the attempt is priced. The magnitude by which the delegator's scoped integrity vector (106) is modified responsive to that accepted determination (122) is a base magnitude increased by a required residue term. The residue term is non-zero only where the return inheritance mask attempted to exclude or attenuate the declared harm-recording field class, and is zero otherwise. It is computed from the delegator's own recorded configuration, not from delegate conduct, from the severity asserted, or from any attribute of an asserting party (118). The surcharge is a consequence the delegator wrote for itself by how it configured the delegation.

Third, and this is the operative step of this section, the surcharged modification is fed back into the gate. Where the residue-increased modification causes the delegator's deviation quantity, recomputed after the modification, to satisfy the bound declared in the signed policy object (112), the authorization gate (300) is written to the withheld state (310) with respect to the faculty of delegating actions of the delegated action class alone. The faculty of the delegating persistent semantic agent (100) to perform actions of that class itself is not withheld. The agent continues to execute the class directly and loses only the capacity to delegate it.

The residue that pushed the deviation quantity across the bound is non-zero only for delegating with an attempted exclusion, and the faculty the gate withholds is that same delegating faculty. Direct execution of the class remains authorized, so an agent still able to perform the work is not stopped from performing it. The result is narrower than the ordinary class-wide transition described above, under which a deviation quantity crossing the bound withholds the entire class and halts direct execution too.

The filing further recites a finer-grained variant. In that variant the withheld faculty is delegation to the specific delegate rather than to the whole class, leaving delegation of the class to other delegates intact. The gate then records that this delegator may no longer route this class through this particular delegate, while its capacity to delegate the class elsewhere, and to perform it directly, both survive. The withholding narrows from a class to a single delegation relationship, and reaches nothing beyond it.

3. Operating Parameters

The filed disclosure declares the following as policy-configured quantities rather than as fixed numbers, and this article states no value the filing does not.

The residue term is a declared fraction of the base magnitude, bounded above by a declared multiple of the base magnitude. It is greater than zero where an exclusion is attempted and zero in every other case.

In an escalating variant, the residue term is the declared fraction times a base greater than one raised to the count of prior excluding delegation records the delegator appended, and it rises with that count up to the same declared upper bound.

The trigger is stated as a satisfaction condition, not a magnitude: the delegating faculty is withheld where the deviation quantity, recomputed after the residue-increased modification, satisfies the bound declared in the signed policy object (112). The gate

itself is maintained per action class and per scope partition, so the withholding is confined to the class, or in the variant to the specific delegate, and does not reach across partitions.

4. Composition

Within the filing this mechanism is the enforcement terminus of a short chain in the delegation-return exposure disclosure. The chain begins by giving an attempted exclusion of the harm-recording field class no effect while recording it, continues by surcharging the delegator's integrity modification with a residue computed from the delegator's own configuration, and ends here, converting accumulated residue into a consequence on the delegator's authority to delegate. Neighboring embodiments extend the same discipline in other directions: a non-attenuable forward field class prevents a delegator from constituting a delegate incapable of the restraint the delegator is itself subject to; a delegate may decline a delegation whose return mask excludes the harm-recording class; and harm caused at any depth of a delegation chain is inherited and priced at every delegating agent above it. The withheld faculty is where those pricing signals reach what the agent is allowed to do next.

It also inherits the gate discipline of the core architecture. The authorization gate (300) returns from the withheld state (310) toward the granting state only upon a procedure appended to the append-only lineage field (104). No elapse of time, and no payment, transfer, or consideration by any counterparty, returns it. The restored delegating faculty is governed by that same rule, so a withheld delegation capacity is not bought back and does not lapse on a timer. Because the dispatch-authority predicate is recomputed from present memory-field state on each dispatch request, a write of the gate takes effect at the next dispatch without revocation infrastructure, and the withheld faculty takes hold at the next attempt to delegate the class.

The mechanism belongs to the assertion-cost-symmetry family for a structural reason. That family prices an action from a quantity held by the party taking the action, without adjudicating the merit of the action, so that both directions in which an agent writes into another party's governance state are metered from one quantity the acting party holds. The delegating faculty follows the same logic one level down: the delegator's own attempted exclusion is priced against the delegator's own deviation quantity, through a residue drawn from the delegator's own recorded configuration. The party that took the action bears the cost of it.

5. Prior-Art Distinction

Several established categories reduce an agent's authority in response to a signal. They differ from this mechanism structurally, and none of the observations below asserts that any named system practices it.

Behavioral-integrity systems compute a conformity measure between observed behavior and an expected baseline and narrow capability on a deficient comparison, including by issuing down-scoped, purpose-bound tokens or by placing an entity in probationary status. Such systems move in one direction, divergence narrowing capability, and the capability they narrow is the grant as a whole or a re-scoped token. This mechanism instead splits a single class into two faculties and withholds one, the delegating faculty, while preserving direct execution of the very same class, and it fires on a recomputed deviation quantity crossing a policy bound after a self-configured residue rather than on a conformity score.

Ethical governor architectures interpose an evaluative component that contracts the permissible action set upon a constraint violation. The contraction is monotonic and the restricting faculty is not itself metered. Here the restricting act, delegating with an attempted exclusion, is what generates the residue, and the restriction is scoped precisely to that faculty rather than applied to the action set at large.

Policy-enforcement systems in the XACML mold evaluate a proposed action and return a decision directed at the request, producing no persistent state in the decider and constraining no subsequent operation of it. The withholding here is persistent state of the delegator that constrains the delegator's own later dispatches.

Capability-attenuation schemes confine what a delegate may do by attaching restrictions along the forward path of a delegation, each holder able to narrow but not widen the delegated capability. They run in the forward direction only and protect the owner of the delegated resource. None constrains the return path, so none forbids a delegating party from excluding, from what it inherits back on the delegate's return, the record of harm the delegate caused to others, and none attaches a consequence to a delegator that so configures itself. This mechanism sits on that return path. It also splits a grant those schemes leave whole, separating the faculty of delegating a class from the faculty of performing it directly and withholding only the former, and it draws that split from the delegator's recomputed deviation quantity rather than from an administrative re-scoping.

Accountability regimes that penalize unfounded assertions attach the penalty only after an external institution adjudicates the assertions unfounded, and the faculty they suspend is the same faculty that was exercised. This mechanism requires no external merits determination, and the faculty it suspends, delegating a class, is a strict subset of the agent's capacity that leaves direct execution of the class untouched.

6. Disclosure Scope

The operative disclosure is U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, Section 10.3 (Delegation-return exposure, principal metering, and residualized divergence), paragraph [0366], read with its immediate neighbors at paragraphs [0364] and [0365]. What is disclosed there is the withholding of the authorization gate (300) to the withheld state (310) with respect to the faculty of delegating actions of a delegated action class alone, upon the residue-increased modification driving the delegator's

recomputed deviation quantity to satisfy the bound declared in the signed policy object (112), with the faculty to perform that class directly preserved, together with the variant in which the withheld faculty is delegation to the specific delegate rather than to the class.

What this article does not do is fix any numeric value. The residue fraction, its upper-bound multiple, the escalating base, and the deviation bound are policy-declared in the filed disclosure and are not assigned magnitudes here. Illustrative numeric traces and specific deployment scenarios that appear only in the author's fuller drafting exposition are not part of the filed disclosure and are not published here. Nothing in this article asserts or implies that any product, standard, or party infringes any claim, and nothing here extends the disclosure beyond the filed text of the identified paragraphs.

Assertion-Cost Symmetry (</assertion-cost-symmetry>) [All 49 steps → \(/inventive-steps\)](#)

Making an accusation costs the accuser too — symmetric, metered, replay-proof.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- [Assertion-Cost Symmetry: Making an Accusation Cost the Accuser \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/making-an-accusation-cost-the-accuser\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/making-an-accusation-cost-the-accuser).

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- [Withheld Delegating Faculty, Preserved Direct Execution \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/withheld-delegating-faculty\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/withheld-delegating-faculty).
- [Depth-Propagated Harm Inheritance Across a Delegation Chain \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/depth-propagated-harm-inheritance\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/depth-propagated-harm-inheritance).
- [Co-Signature Conditioning of Restoration Authority \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/co-signature-conditioned-restoration\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/co-signature-conditioned-restoration).

- [The Anti-Evasion Charge on Governance-Address Removal \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/anti-evasion-governance-address-removal\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/anti-evasion-governance-address-removal).
- [The Progressive Issuance Decrement \(/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/progressive-issuance-decrement\)](/articles/assertion-cost-symmetry/progressive-issuance-decrement).

TERMINOLOGY

- [acknowledgment artifact \(/glossary#acknowledgment-artifact\)](/glossary#acknowledgment-artifact).
- [assertion-cost counter \(/glossary#assertion-cost-counter\)](/glossary#assertion-cost-counter).
- [authorization budget \(/glossary#authorization-budget\)](/glossary#authorization-budget).
- [dynamic agent hash chain \(/glossary#dynamic-agent-hash-chain\)](/glossary#dynamic-agent-hash-chain).

[Assertion-Cost Symmetry overview → \(/assertion-cost-symmetry\)](/assertion-cost-symmetry)