Nick Clark · Published July 28, 2026 · PDF

Contribution Encumbrance on Severance or Quarantine: Governing Dispatch to Models Trained on a Severed Counterparty's Corpus Without Retraining or Deletion

A receiving agent that admits training-corpus contributions from counterparties records, per model endpoint, which settled contribution identifiers went into it. Contribution encumbrance on severance or quarantine, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812 at Section 10.5, paragraph [0404], governs what becomes of those endpoints when the agent severs a counterparty or writes a quarantine attribute to that counterparty's counterparty identity record (114). The filed recitation is that the receiving agent (100) neither retrains nor deletes. It enumerates every endpoint whose recorded contribution set contains a settled contribution identifier of that counterparty and writes into each a contribution-encumbered attribute naming the counterparty, the identifiers, and the condition relied upon. It maintains per endpoint an encumbrance count of distinct encumbering counterparties, and it narrows that counterparty's scope object by an encumbrance narrowing record rendering dispatch to each encumbered endpoint inadmissible for any action whose affected-party class maps to that counterparty. The narrowing is evaluated at the dispatch-authority predicate and, when it withholds, appended as a positive abstention.

Severance Arrives After the Model Is Already Built

Under the filed disclosure a receiving agent (100) admits a counterparty's training-corpus contribution only through a settled matched pair (600), and every retraining event records the set of settled contribution identifiers it incorporated. Once the resulting artifact is registered as an endpoint, the agent holds a recorded contribution set for it.

Then the relationship ends. The agent severs that counterparty, or writes a quarantine attribute into the counterparty identity record (114) it holds for that party. The endpoint stands registered, its recorded contribution set still carrying that counterparty's settled identifiers. What the agent has to settle at the next request is not a question about the artifact. It is a question about routing: may this endpoint be reached, for which actions, and affecting whom.

Paragraph [0404] forecloses two routes at the outset. The receiving agent (100) neither retrains nor deletes. What the paragraph changes instead is admissibility, evaluated at the dispatch-authority predicate whose satisfaction the filing makes a precondition of any dispatch.

That the change can be made at all rests on records the agent already holds. Which endpoints a counterparty's contributions reached is answerable by digest equality from the agent's own state, without adjudication by any other party.

Enumerate, Attribute, Count, Narrow

The encumbrance rests on an antecedent the filing establishes one paragraph earlier, at [0403]. A receiving agent (100) admits a counterparty's training-corpus contribution only as the second governed observation (610) of a matched pair (600) whose first observation (608) is a contribution-scope offer the agent itself emits, enumerating the corpus policy version, the scope partitions in which a retrained model will be held and registered, and the action classes for which it will be dispatched. The counterparty's

observation carries a digest of the contributed material and a reference to the offer. On recognition each party appends a settlement-lineage entry, and the receiving agent computes a settled contribution identifier as a digest over that entry, recording against it the contributor identity, the material digests, the policy version, and the scopes.

The filing draws two things from that gate. No counterparty-sourced material is admitted for which no settled identifier exists, a limitation the paragraph expressly does not extend to the ingestion of user-authored, user-curated, or user-designated material, nor to the other retraining triggers disclosed elsewhere in the applicant's tool-registry disclosure. And each retraining event records the set of settled identifiers it incorporated, being its recorded contribution set, matched to corpus material by digest equality alone.

Paragraph [0404] is conditioned on either of two events: the agent severs a counterparty, or the agent writes a quarantine attribute to that counterparty's counterparty identity record (114). Responsive to either, and performing no retraining and no deletion, the receiving agent (100) carries out three recited acts.

Enumeration and attribution. The agent walks every endpoint whose recorded contribution set contains a settled contribution identifier of that counterparty and writes into each a contribution-encumbered attribute. The filed attribute names three things: the counterparty, the identifiers, and the condition relied upon.

The count. Per endpoint, the agent maintains an encumbrance count of distinct encumbering counterparties, incremented per new counterparty. What accumulates is a tally of parties rather than of identifiers. Paragraph [0406] later attaches a consequence to that count; at [0404] the count is maintained and nothing further is recited of it.

The narrowing. That counterparty's scope object is narrowed by an encumbrance narrowing record, rendering dispatch to each encumbered endpoint inadmissible for any action whose affected-party class maps to that counterparty. Two writes occur here and they land in different places. The contribution-encumbered attribute goes into the

endpoint; the narrowing record goes into the scope object the agent holds for the counterparty, which the filing elsewhere describes, in its reliance-bounding paragraph, as the scope object governing admissible dispatch and disclosure toward that party.

Reach is stated in party-relative terms. Set the filed recitation beside the neighboring one at [0398]: a provenance-withdrawn attribute causes the consuming agent thereafter to route no request to that endpoint, whereas the contribution-encumbered attribute of [0404] renders dispatch inadmissible for any action whose affected-party class maps to the encumbering counterparty.

Where the narrowing is evaluated is itself recited: at the dispatch-authority predicate. Section 1.5 describes that predicate as one the semantic agent (100) recomputes responsive to each request to dispatch an action, from state then carried in the memory field (102), and not from a previously issued authorization token, a cached predicate result, or a session grant. Paragraph [0029] states the consequence for the writes it enumerates, which take effect at the next dispatch request without revocation infrastructure.

When the narrowing withholds a dispatch, the withholding is appended as a positive abstention. The definitions section of the filing gives that term a meaning: a recorded, governed withholding of an action, the semantic agent appending a determination naming the withheld action and the ground relied upon, and withholding dispatch of the action. The same construct appears at [0398], where each withheld dispatch is appended as a positive abstention rather than a denial. Under the conversion bar (502) of Section 5.4, a consuming determination is foreclosed from converting an abstention outcome into a scalar value, into a default value, into an operand of a threshold comparison (510), or into a consequence adverse to any party, and the filing states that no counter of the architecture is incremented by an abstention outcome.

The paragraph closes by reciting that all acts are performed from the agent's own state without adjudication by any other party. The severance or quarantine condition, the recorded contribution sets, and the digest equality that matches material to them are all

held locally.

Bounds the Policy Declares and Values the Filing Leaves Open

Most quantities in this mechanism are declared rather than valued. What follows separates the two, and says so wherever a declaration arrives without a number.

- **The encumbrance count** is a per-endpoint count of distinct encumbering counterparties, incremented per new counterparty. Its unit is recited; its magnitude follows from the agent's own history.
- **The encumbrance bound** is declared in the signed policy object (112) at [0406] as a bound upon that count. No numeric value and no default appears in the filed text. Its consequences are conditioned: only where the count exceeds the bound does the receiving agent write a designation and apply the two bars of [0406], being a bar on promoting any value derived from that endpoint record to a higher persistence tier or admitting it as a promotion input, and a bar on emitting that endpoint or its artifact to a peer semantic agent (100) as a tool source. The filing recites no consequence for a count standing at or below the bound.
- **The corpus policy version** is enumerated in the contribution-scope offer at [0403]. It is an identifier, not a value the filing fixes.
- **The digest function** is not named. Matching of corpus material to a settled identifier is recited as digest equality alone.
- **The blinding value** used to compute an encumbrance commitment at [0407] is declared in the corpus policy and emitted with the commitment, and no value is fixed. The commitment itself is optional in the filed text, which recites that the agent may attach one.
- **No temporal parameter governs release.** Release is the subject of [0405], which recites that no elapse of time, no successor signed policy object (112), and no lifting of quarantine alone releases a contribution encumbrance. No decay constant, expiry, or interval accompanies it.

Neighboring paragraphs of the same section declare their parameters the same way. The re-marking window at [0400] is declared in the signed policy object (112) and expressed either as an absolute duration tested against the recorded dispatch time or as a count of the agent's own successor epochs tested against the recorded dispatch epoch, with no value fixed in the filed text. The provenance-freshness check at [0402] is performed at a declared interval, again without a value.

How It Composes With the Rest of the Filing

Section 10 states its own composition rule at [0328]: each mechanism composes on the persistent semantic agent (100) and the substrate elements disclosed in Sections 1 through 9, each is disclosed as a distinct embodiment, and each may be practiced independently or in combination with any other mechanism of the disclosure.

Inside Section 10.5 the paragraph sits in a run that reads as a lifecycle. Paragraph [0403] creates settled contribution identifiers and recorded contribution sets through matched-pair settlement. Paragraph [0404] encumbers on severance or quarantine. Paragraph [0405] supplies two release conditions, being a matched pair (600) re-admitting the contribution through a fresh contribution-scope offer, and a substitution event whose successor recorded contribution set omits every settled identifier of that counterparty as demonstrated by an empty intersection; on either, the count is decremented, the narrowing record removed, and the attribute marked released and never deleted. Paragraph [0406] attaches the bound to the count. Paragraph [0407] lets the encumbrance travel, an emitted endpoint optionally carrying an encumbrance commitment of blinded settled identifiers, which a peer that has itself severed a contributor may test for membership, writing its own contribution-encumbered attribute and narrowing its own counterparty scope object on a hit.

The earlier half of Section 10.5 supplies the other attribute written over an endpoint record. A provenance-withdrawn attribute under [0398] is written upon an admitted provenance withdrawal by a party named in the derived-artifact provenance chain,

while a contribution-encumbered attribute under [0404] is written upon severance or quarantine of a contributing counterparty.

Substrate comes from Sections 1 through 9: the matched pair (600) with its first observation (608) and second observation (610), the counterparty identity record (114), the memory field (102), the append-only lineage field (104), the signed policy object (112) that declares the bound relied on at [0406], and the conversion bar (502).

Adjacent Categories and Where They Diverge

Several established categories address neighboring problems. The divergences below are structural, stated against what the filed paragraph recites.

Machine unlearning, influence removal, and approximate data deletion. This literature operates on model parameters, altering or retraining a model as though a training example had never been present, and seeking to verify that removal. The filed paragraph does not reach parameters: the receiving agent (100) neither retrains nor deletes, and what changes is the admissibility of dispatch, recorded in the counterparty's scope object and evaluated at the dispatch-authority predicate.

Access control lists, role-based access control, and capability revocation. Such systems gate a requester against a resource, commonly distributing the decision as a token, a grant, or a cached evaluation. The filed narrowing gates on a different axis, the affected-party class of the requested action as it maps to a counterparty, and it is not distributed at all: it is evaluated inside a predicate the agent recomputes at each dispatch request from state then carried in its memory field (102).

Dataset documentation, lineage catalogs, and bill-of-materials manifests. These record what went into a build so that it can be inspected later. The filed structure records that too, in the recorded contribution set, but the record is an operand rather than a terminus: it is what the enumeration walks before attributes are written, the count maintained, and the scope narrowed.

Consent management and data-subject erasure workflows. A withdrawal is commonly resolved here into a deletion obligation discharged within a period. The filed paragraph resolves severance or quarantine into an encumbrance instead, and the companion paragraph [0405] recites that no elapse of time releases it, the two stated releases being a re-admission settled as a matched pair (600) and a substitution demonstrated by an empty intersection.

Model registries with deprecation, disablement, or kill-switch flags. An endpoint is taken out of service without reference to who is affected by a given request. Inadmissibility under [0404] is expressed by reference to the affected-party class of the action, which is the axis on which the recited narrowing turns.

None of the foregoing asserts that any product, service, or implementation practices, or fails to practice, the disclosed mechanism. Each entry states only what a category is structured to do.

Disclosure Scope

The mechanism described here is disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, at Section 10.5, Tool provenance, reliance, and contested pairing, paragraph [0404], Contribution encumbrance on severance or quarantine. Its immediate antecedent is paragraph [0403], and its release, bound, and peer-emission limbs are paragraphs [0405], [0406], and [0407] of the same section. Supporting substrate is disclosed at Section 1.5 for the dispatch-authority predicate, at Section 5.4 for the conversion bar (502), and at Section 10 for the composition rule at [0328].

This article is a technical description of a filed embodiment, published for disclosure purposes. It is not a claim construction, does not define claim scope, and is not legal advice. Where this description and the filed text differ, the filed text controls. Reference

numerals are those of the filed application, and where the filing declares a parameter without a value, this article says so rather than supplying one. Published July 28, 2026 by Adaptive Query as a timestamped technical disclosure.

Governed Matched-Pair Settlement

All 49 steps → (/inventive-steps)

(/governed-settlement)

Two agents settle on matched signed observations, by continuity, with no clearer.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- Matched-Pair Settlement Between Agents: Bilateral Closure Without a Clearer (/articles/governed-settlement/matched-pair-settlement-without-a-clearer)

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- The Derived-Artifact Provenance Chain and Chain-Head Identifier (/articles/governed-settlement/derived-artifact-provenance-chain)
- Provenance Withdrawal and the Provenance-Withdrawn Attribute (/articles/governed-settlement/provenance-withdrawal)
- Matched-Pair-Gated Corpus Contribution (/articles/governed-settlement/matched-pair-gated-corpus-contribution)
- Partition-Scoped Escrow Release Gated on Intersection Non-Emptiness (/articles/governed-settlement/partition-scoped-escrow-release)
- The First-Encounter Settled Pair and Promotion to the Persistent Tier (/articles/governed-settlement/first-encounter-settled-pair)
- **Contribution Encumbrance on Severance or Quarantine: Governing Dispatch to Models Trained on a Severed Counterparty's Corpus Without Retraining or Deletion (/articles/governed-settlement/contribution-encumbrance-severance-quarantine)**
- Encumbrance Bounds That Bar Persistence Promotion and Onward Tool-Source Emission Once the Per-Endpoint Count Exceeds the Bound (/articles/governed-settlement/encumbrance-bound-barring-promotion-onward-emission)

- Blinded Encumbrance Commitments: Carrying a Severed Contributor's Encumbrance Along With an Inference Endpoint Emitted to a Peer Agent (/articles/governed-settlement/encumbrance-commitment-travelling-emitted-endpoint)
- Release of a Contribution Encumbrance: Matched-Pair Re-Admission or a Substitution With an Empty Intersection (/articles/governed-settlement/release-contribution-encumbrance)
- Registering Third-Party Reliance on a Settled Matched Pair: The Reliance Record and the Settled-Party Reliance Register (/articles/governed-settlement/reliance-record-registered-settled-parties)
- Conditioning a Settlement Reversal on a Reliance-Completeness Predicate Evaluated Over the Reverting Party's Own Reliance Register (/articles/governed-settlement/reliance-completeness-predicate-conditioning-reversal)
- The Relying Party's Reversal Mark: Barring a Reversed Settlement as a Determination Input and Re-Resolving the Determination That Consumed It (/articles/governed-settlement/relying-party-reversal-mark-and-re-resolution)
- Transitive Reliance Records and the Reliance Chain: Registering Second-Order Dependency on a Settlement Without Any Party Enumerating the Whole Chain (/articles/governed-settlement/transitive-reliance-record-reliance-chain)
- Transitive Reversal Notices That Carry a Settlement Reversal One Hop at a Time Along a Reliance Chain No Party Enumerates (/articles/governed-settlement/one-hop-propagation-reversal-along-reliance)
- Contested Pairing in Matched-Pair Settlement: Withheld Recognition, a Distinct-Identity Claimant Count, and the Not-Determinable Resolution (/articles/governed-settlement/contested-pairing-not-determinable-resolution)
- Attributable Contest Resolution: Settling a Contested Offer by Re-Emitting a First Governed Observation That Names Exactly One Claimant (/articles/governed-settlement/attributable-contest-resolution-named-re-emission)
- Local Outcome-Quality Records and Smoothed Endpoint Selection Preference for Governed Inference Dispatch (/articles/governed-settlement/outcome-quality-record-endpoint-selection-preference)

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

- B2B Agent Commerce: Bilateral Settlement Without a Clearing House (/articles/governed-settlement/b2b-agent-commerce-settlement)
- Supply Chain Handoffs: Settling a Transfer on Matched Observations (/articles/governed-settlement/supply-chain-agent-handoffs)

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- ISO 20022 and Settlement Messaging: Matched Pairs in Financial Infrastructure (/articles/governed-settlement/iso-20022-settlement-messaging)

TERMINOLOGY

- governed observation (/glossary#governed-observation)
- matched pair (/glossary#matched-pair)
- scope partition (/glossary#scope-partition)

Governed Matched-Pair Settlement overview → (/governed-settlement)