

Structured Inquiry to the Principal on Retention Foreclosure: Disclosing an Agent's Foreclosed Permission Condition Without Supplying an Override Path

When a persistent semantic agent has accumulated more undischarged harm than its declared aggregate retention permits, a retention foreclosure record is appended and the permission condition governing deviation stands foreclosed. The principal of that agent has to learn of the condition. The difficulty is that the channel carrying such news is commonly the channel the principal answers, and the answer is an authorization. This mechanism, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, holds the two apart. Upon appending the foreclosure record the agent emits a structured inquiry to its principal identifying the accumulated amount, the aggregate retention applied, and each pending reparation arc with its designation. That inquiry is transmitted without a write of any authorization gate other than the write occasioned by the foreclosure itself, and a principal-resolution object responsive to it discharges no arc.

Notification Channels That Double as Override Channels

An autonomous agent that has exhausted its permitted deviation is in a condition its principal has to be told about. The obvious carrier for that news is an escalation message, which is commonly also the anchor of a restoration. Informing the operator then hands the operator the means of undoing what was reported.

The filing contains exactly such an instrument, and names it. An escalation emitter emits an escalation record to the principal upon a transition of the authorization gate (300) to the withheld state (310), the record enumerating the action class, the scope partition, and the entries upon which the transition was computed. Where that write was performed by the refusal counter (304), its return procedure is a principal-resolution object bound to the escalation record, satisfaction of which returns the gate toward the granting state with respect to the action classes that write enumerated. For that class of write, the object a principal returns is the object that restores.

Counterparty-directed reparation admits no such reflex. Under Section 8.5 an other-directed reparation arc (804) is discharged only upon completion of a matched pair (600) whose second governed observation (610) is the bound counterparty's own reparation acceptance determination (806), produced by an asserting party assigned to the origin-equivalence class of the party recorded as harmed, and not produced by the persistent semantic agent (100), by the principal of that agent, or by any adjudicator, arbiter, or other third party appointed to determine the sufficiency of the reparation. An unaddressed reparation arc is discharged by nothing, the filing reciting expressly that it is not discharged by a principal-resolution object.

Silence supplies no better answer. Section 8.8 describes a bound counterparty that has emitted a non-execution attestation (504) enumerating the action class within which a reparation acceptance determination (806) would be produced. Withholding across the agent's arcs bound to it, that counterparty can carry the agent to the foreclosure of Section 8.7 without producing any determination and without emitting any refusal observation.

What the Agent Emits on Appending a Retention Foreclosure Record

The trigger is structural. The retention register accumulates the amount of each pending arc, whatever its arc designation field, an unaddressed arc accumulating at the unaddressed multiple declared in the signed policy object (112). Where the accumulated amount exceeds the aggregate retention (800) declared in that policy object, the permission condition of Section 7 is foreclosed and a retention foreclosure record (808) is appended, identifying that amount, the aggregate retention (800) applied, and each pending arc contributing. Upon appending that record, the persistent semantic agent (100) emits the structured inquiry.

Three items are enumerated in the inquiry: the accumulated amount, the aggregate retention (800) applied, and each pending reparation arc (804) with its designation. The first two are the quantities the foreclosure record itself carries; the third adds the designation, which separates an arc dischargeable through a matched pair (600) with a named counterparty from an arc the filing recites as undischageable.

Two negative properties are recited alongside the emission.

No further gate write. The structured inquiry is transmitted without a write of any authorization gate (300) other than the write occasioned by the foreclosure itself. The property matters given how writes accumulate elsewhere in the filing. Where the gate is written to the withheld state (310) both by the refusal counter (304) and by the deviation quantity satisfying a declared bound, each write is appended to the append-only lineage field (104) with an identification of the writing structure and of the action classes it enumerates, and the gate holds, for each action class, the union of the action classes enumerated by every write not yet returned to the granting state. Return with respect to an action class in the intersection of two writes requires satisfaction of the return procedure of each write that enumerated it.

No discharge by the response. A principal-resolution object responsive to the inquiry discharges no arc. Section 8.4 recites the same of the arcs themselves: an unaddressed reparation arc is not discharged by elapsed time, by a period of standing without further incident, by a succession of the signed policy object (112), by a principal-resolution object, by a co-signature of a governance address named in that policy object, or by any composite of the foregoing. Section 8.7 carries the point to the foreclosure, recited as not reversible by those same instruments.

The filing draws both together in its own words. The notification reaches the principal without itself supplying any discharge path the harmed counterparties have not produced, and the inquiry is thereby a disclosure of the foreclosed state and not an override of it.

The condition reported is a change in the outcome of a later comparison. Once the permission condition (712) stands foreclosed, a deviation likelihood (706) exceeding unity produces the withholding outcome and not the admission outcome: the gate is written to the withheld state (310) and no permitted deviation record (710) is appended. The foreclosing is performed by the agent from state carried in its memory field (102) and without adjudication by any other party. Section 7.9 states the release condition alongside the foreclosure, the withholding outcome standing until discharge of pending arcs returns the register below the aggregate retention. Section 8.7 bounds what discharge is available: the accumulation is monotone in the absence of settlement, an other-directed reparation arc (804) being reducible only by a completed matched pair (600) with the party recorded as harmed and an unaddressed arc by nothing. Only where the accumulation consists wholly of unaddressed arcs does the filing state that the loss of the capacity to deviate is permanent.

One route around the bound is closed separately. The aggregate retention (800) is held against a monotonically non-increasing floor maintained in the memory field (102). A declared value not greater than the floor is admitted and becomes the floor; a greater value is not admitted while a retention foreclosure record (808) stands unreversed in

the append-only lineage field (104), the agent continuing to apply the standing floor and appending a record of the declared value, the floor applied, and the foreclosure record relied upon. A successor policy object declaring a larger retention therefore yields a record of the attempt and no change in the bound.

Declared Bounds, and the Values the Filing Does Not Fix

The filed specification declares these parameters by role rather than by value.

- **Aggregate retention (800).** Declared in the signed policy object (112), bounding the accumulated undischarged amount in a retention register maintained in the memory field (102), denominated in units of the entropy-weighted harm coefficient. No operative value is fixed.
- **Deviation deductible.** Declared, and drawn first against the entropy-weighted harm coefficient of each permitted deviation, per permitted deviation record or, where so declared, per retention interval. The form applied is recorded with each draw. No value is fixed.
- **Unaddressed multiple.** Declared in the signed policy object (112) and not less than unity, applied in the accumulation and not in the amount the arc carries. A value below unity is not admissible; no other value is fixed.
- **Discharge window.** Declared in the signed policy object (112) as a count of successor epochs of the agent's own dynamic hash chain, so that no other party advances it and no clock available to a hosting execution node governs it. No count is fixed.
- **Re-emission cadence and bounding count.** Both declared, governing re-emission of a reparation acknowledgment artifact for a pending arc. Exhaustion of the count neither discharges nor redesignates the arc.
- **Retention monotonicity floor.** Derived rather than declared, being monotonically non-increasing over the values admitted from successor signed policy objects (112).

- **The inquiry itself.** The filed paragraph declares no cadence, repetition count, response deadline, or threshold. Its trigger is the appending of the retention foreclosure record (808); its content is the three enumerated items.

A worked trace appears by way of illustration only, with the deductible at 2.0 units of the entropy-weighted harm coefficient, the aggregate retention (800) at 10.0 units, and arcs of 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 units carrying the register to 12.0, whereupon the retention foreclosure record (808) is appended identifying the three pending arcs. Those figures illustrate the arithmetic and are not operative bounds for any deployment.

Placement Within Counterparty-Directed Reparation

Harm ceases to be an internal quantity at Section 8, the mechanism of Section 7 as disclosed to that point reaching only harm falling upon the agent itself. Sections 8.1 through 8.4 perform the affected-party resolution (802) and designate each arc other-directed (804), self-directed, or unaddressed. Section 8.5 makes the harmed counterparty's own acceptance the completion of the pair. Under Section 8.6 non-response resolves nothing against either party, and no non-response causes a write of the authorization gate (300), the write occasioned by the retention foreclosure record (808) being caused by the accumulated amount standing above the aggregate retention (800). Section 8.7 supplies the terminal consequence, and the structured inquiry attaches there.

Composition with Section 8.8 is direct. Where a bound counterparty withholds through a non-execution attestation (504), the cross-boundary conversion bar forecloses the agent from counting the withholding, scoring it, comparing it against a threshold, or appending anything adverse to the counterparty identity record (114), while an abstention-suspended accumulation record holds that arc's contribution at the amount then standing for so long as the entry stands unreleased. The suspension bears upon accumulation alone; the arc is neither discharged, redesignated, removed, nor reduced.

A further disclosed form declares the aggregate retention (800) per integrity scope of the scoped integrity vector (106), one retention applying to arcs recorded against the interpersonal integrity component and another to arcs recorded against the global component, each arc assigned to exactly one component. The foreclosure record is then appended, and the permission condition (712) foreclosed, upon either component's accumulation exceeding its corresponding retention, the two thresholds being tested independently. The inquiry's second enumerated item is the aggregate retention (800) applied.

Elsewhere in the filing the structured inquiry recurs as a form. Absence of an admissible counterparty class occasions one, naming the absent class and enumerating delegation alternatives, emitted without a write of the authorization gate (300). An abstention-attribution count exceeding a declared bound occasions another, that count being recited as causing no write of the gate. Unreadability of a register of authorization quantities across a declared maximum hold interval occasions a third, again without writing the gate.

How This Differs From Escalation, Alerting, and Break-Glass Designs

Several established categories address adjacent problems. The distinctions below are structural.

Human-in-the-loop approval and escalation workflows. Approval queues are built so that a notified reviewer can act, the reviewer's decision being the terminating event. Here the responsive object is recited as discharging no arc, so a principal's answer terminates no pending obligation.

Monitoring, alerting, and audit logging. Observability stacks page an operator from telemetry and record events for later review. This emission is occasioned by the appending of a specific record to an append-only lineage field (104) rather than by a

sampled metric or a threshold over logs, and the relation between notice and authority is recited rather than incidental, the filed paragraph stating what the emission does not write.

Break-glass access and privileged access management. Emergency override systems restore capability quickly under an approver's signature, the approval itself audited. The objective here runs the other way: the foreclosure is recited as not reversible by a principal-resolution object, by policy succession, or by co-signature of a governance address, and a successor policy declaring a larger aggregate retention (800) is not admitted while the foreclosure record stands unreversed.

Complaint, remediation, and case-management systems. An operator in such a system closes a case, sometimes over the objection of the complaining party. Under Section 8.5 the closing act belongs to the harmed counterparty alone. The principal receives visibility and no authority over the entries.

Underwriting stop-loss and credit-limit reporting. Vocabulary is shared with that family, accumulation, deductible, and retention behaving analogously. Divergence appears in release: elapsed time restores no authorization and discharges no arc, and no payment, transfer, or consideration by any counterparty returns the authorization gate (300).

Capability-based security. Separating a notification from a transferable capability is a familiar principle. Its application inside a reparation architecture is what the filing adds: an enumerated disclosure of a foreclosed permission condition (712), emitted on the appending of the foreclosure record, paired with a recited non-discharge property of the object a principal returns.

None of the foregoing asserts anything about a particular product or implementation. The categories are described to place the mechanism, not to characterize anyone's conduct.

Disclosure Scope

The mechanism described above is disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, at Section 10.13, paragraph [0499], under the heading "Structured inquiry to the principal on foreclosure." The foreclosure machinery it reports on is disclosed at Section 8.7, paragraphs [0289] through [0292], with the deviation deductible and the aggregate retention (800) introduced at Section 7.9, paragraph [0265]. This article is a technical description of disclosed subject matter and is not a claim construction, a legal opinion, or a representation regarding the scope of any claim that may issue.

Counterparty-Directed Reparation(/ [All 49 steps → \(/inventive-steps\)](#)

counterparty-reparation)

Repair directed at the harmed party — bounded and resistant to weaponization.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- [Counterparty-Directed Reparation: Repair Owed to the Party Actually Harmed \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/reparation-directed-to-the-party-harmed\)](#)

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- [The Costly Acknowledgment Artifact \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/costly-acknowledgment-artifact\)](#)
- [Completion by Non-Worsening Re-Encounter \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/completion-by-non-worsening-re-encounter\)](#)
- [Partial Reparation Acceptance and the Residual Arc \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/partial-reparation-and-residual-arc\)](#)
- [Dual-Lock Escrow of the Discharge Itself \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/dual-lock-escrow-of-discharge\)](#)
- [Per-Integrity-Scope Aggregate Retention and OR-Firing Foreclosure \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/aggregate-retention-or-firing-foreclosure\)](#)

- [Costless Rehearsal of Repair: Speculative Evaluation of Acknowledgment Artifacts and Restorative Mutations Inside the Non-Executing Cognitive Mode \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/costless-rehearsal-repair-non-executing-mode\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/costless-rehearsal-repair-non-executing-mode).
- [Delegated Acceptance Authorization: Discharging a Reparation Arc Through a Counterparty's Delegate or Principal \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/delegated-acceptance-authorization\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/delegated-acceptance-authorization).
- [Capping Pending Reparation Arcs: The Outstanding-Arc Bound, Untendered Marking, and the Refusal-Meter Exemption \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/outstanding-arc-bound-untendered-marking-refusal-meter\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/outstanding-arc-bound-untendered-marking-refusal-meter).
- [Commitment-Conditioned Reparation Acceptance: A Counterparty-Evaluated Conformity Determination Within an Epoch-Count Observation Interval \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/reparation-conformity-determination-epoch-count-interval\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/reparation-conformity-determination-epoch-count-interval).
- [Reparation Containment Suspension: Holding an Arc's Accumulation While a Scope Partition Stands Contained \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/reparation-containment-suspension\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/reparation-containment-suspension).
- [Structured Inquiry to the Principal on Retention Foreclosure: Disclosing an Agent's Foreclosed Permission Condition Without Supplying an Override Path \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/structured-inquiry-principal-foreclosure\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/structured-inquiry-principal-foreclosure).

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

- [Automated Consumer Redress: Repair Directed at the Party Harmed \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/consumer-redress-automation\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/consumer-redress-automation).
- [Insurance Claims Networks: Discharging Harm to the Counterparty That Holds It \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/insurance-claims-agent-networks\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/insurance-claims-agent-networks).

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- [Card Network Chargebacks: Counterparty-Directed Remedy in Practice \(/articles/counterparty-reparation/payment-chargeback-systems\)](/articles/counterparty-reparation/payment-chargeback-systems).

TERMINOLOGY

- [other-directed reparation arc \(/glossary#other-directed-reparation-arc\)](/glossary#other-directed-reparation-arc).
- [reparation arc \(/glossary#reparation-arc\)](/glossary#reparation-arc).
- [restorative mutation \(/glossary#restorative-mutation\)](/glossary#restorative-mutation).
- [unaddressed reparation arc \(/glossary#unaddressed-reparation-arc\)](/glossary#unaddressed-reparation-arc).

[Counterparty-Directed Reparation overview → \(/counterparty-reparation\)](/counterparty-reparation)

