

# Structural Infringement Test for Governance Chain

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published April 25, 2026

## What It Specifies

The structural test evaluates: presence of authority credentialing, presence of admissibility evaluation, presence of lineage recording, presence of governed actuator execution. Implementations exhibiting all four exercise the coverage; partial implementations exercise partial coverage.

The test is technology-neutral and implementation-agnostic. Whether implemented through specific cryptographic primitives, specific identity frameworks, or specific technologies, exhibiting the structural primitives exercises the claim coverage.

## Why It Matters Structurally

Implementation-bound infringement tests produce structural avoidance opportunities. Defendants can implement equivalent functionality through alternative technology; the test fails to capture the inventive structure.

Structural infringement test produces structural specificity. The test captures the inventive structure rather than specific implementation; alternative technologies exhibiting the structure exercise the coverage.

## **How It Composes With Mesh Operation**

The architecture defines the structural-test primitives, the test-evaluation procedure, and the test-result recording. Patent prosecution applies the test; implementations exhibiting the structure exercise the coverage.

The test composes with claim construction across the patent. Cross-claim composition, doctrine-of-equivalents analysis, and continuation-claim construction all build on the structural test primitive.

## **What This Enables**

The architectural patent gains structural infringement-test support. Implementations exhibiting the inventive structure exercise the coverage regardless of technology choice.

The architecture also supports test evolution. As implementation technologies evolve, the structural test continues to capture implementations exhibiting the inventive structure.