

The Renunciation Record: Relinquishing an Adopted Value on the Record

An agent that admits another agent's declared values into its own value set raises an anti-rollback floor over each one, and the filed disclosure recites only two ways such a value leaves again: abandonment under a pending accusation, and orphaning on an accepted determination about the author. The renunciation record, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, is the third. The adopting agent relinquishes an adopted value outside abandonment and orphaning by appending a record naming the adopted-value alias, a reference to the adoption record, and the condition relied upon, permitted only where no conduct evaluation artifact implicating the value is pending and a declared quiescence interval has elapsed since the last implicating determination. Responsive to that append the agent lowers its anti-rollback floor for that alias alone, for no other alias and no self-authored value, and increments its own refusal counter by the deflection-event amount multiplied by a policy-declared renunciation multiple not less than unity, applied without any determination of whether the renunciation was well founded.

1. What Adoption Leaves Open

Paragraph [0424] of U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812 recites the entry side. An adopting agent appends an adoption record admitting an enumerated subset of an authoring agent's value-scope tuples into its own declared value set, each under an adopted-value alias, and raises its anti-rollback floor for each alias to the in-force successor index. By the same append it records, per adopted value, an origin attribution in its counterparty identity record (114) of the authoring agent. Under [0331] that floor is a monotonically non-decreasing successor index per alias held in the memory field (102), and a candidate policy object below the floor for that alias is discarded. From the raise follows the recited consequence: abandoning an adopted value within a declared adoption window of a pending conduct evaluation artifact (116) is scored as a deflection event on the adopting agent's own refusal counter (304) alone.

[0424] then recites the exit side, and recites one exit only. When the adopting agent's own admission evaluator (120) produces an accepted determination (122) that the authoring agent departed from the value it authored, the adopting agent appends an orphaning record and writes its authorization gate (300) to the withheld state (310) for exactly those action classes governed solely by the orphaned value.

Both departures the adoption paragraph knows about turn on an event outside the adopting agent's choosing: a pending artifact in one, an accepted determination about a second party in the other. Paragraph [0425] names itself against both, reciting an append by which the adopting agent relinquishes an adopted value "outside abandonment and orphaning," conditioned instead on the absence of a live implication and on the passage of a declared interval since the last one.

2. What [0425] Recites

Contents of the record. The filing names three, conjunctively: the adopted-value alias, a reference to the adoption record, and the condition relied upon. Nothing in the paragraph makes the condition an input to any test; what it does recite about merits is negative and attaches to the increment, which is applied without any determination of whether the renunciation was well founded.

Two admissibility conditions. The append is permitted only where no conduct evaluation artifact (116) implicating the value is pending, and where a declared quiescence interval has elapsed since the last implicating determination. Both must hold. The first keeps the route shut while an implication is live, which places it alongside the retroactive narrowing bar of [0331], where the admission evaluator (120) resolves an assertion against the signed policy object (112) in force at the artifact's recorded assertion time, so that the agent is incapable of narrowing its declared value set after receipt of an artifact so as to render that artifact inapplicable. The second condition is measured from the last implicating determination rather than from the end of pendency, and the filing states no numeric value for it.

A floor lowering with an explicit negative scope. Responsive to the record, the adopting agent lowers its anti-rollback floor "for that alias alone, for no other alias and no self-authored value." The negative recitation is half the limitation as filed. One canonical alias reopens at the successor-index floor; every other floor stands, including every floor over a value the agent authored itself.

The increment. The agent increments its own refusal counter (304) by the deflection-event amount multiplied by a policy-declared renunciation multiple not less than unity, and the filing draws the consequence in its own words: renunciation is never cheaper than abandonment. At a multiple of unity the two cost the same; above unity, the recorded exit costs more.

Where the increment lands is set out in Section 3. The refusal counter (304) is a structure resident in the memory field (102), comprising a rate counter (306) and a run counter (308). Its rate accumulator counts full-weight increments within a policy-declared window; its run accumulator counts consecutive increments without an intervening accepted determination (122) for the same action class. Both are compared against integer thresholds retrieved from the signed policy object (112) in force, and upon satisfaction of both, the refusal counter (304) writes the authorization gate (300) to the withheld state (310) for an enumerated set of action classes; concurrently the agent transitions into the non-executing cognitive mode (302) with respect to those classes, and the escalation emitter emits an escalation record to the principal. The filing calls the path from admission evaluator (120) through refusal counter (304) to authorization gate (300) the inverse coupling.

The cross-faculty split of [0104] governs what that state costs. The faculty metered is the faculty of refusal; the faculty spent is the faculty of execution. The write withholds execution alone, and the faculty of refusal is not withheld, not reduced, and not conditioned by it, the agent continuing in the withheld state (310) to receive artifacts, retrieve lineage entries, and produce and append determinations.

Merit independence. [0425] recites its increment as applied without any determination of whether the renunciation was well founded, and names no party who might supply one. Section 3 recites the fuller negative set for the increment procedure and the gate write it governs: the procedure does not consult the merits of the rejected determination (124); does not solicit, receive, or await an adjudication by the principal or any other party; does not weight the increment by any measure of the strength of the contradiction found; does not condition the increment upon a finding that the artifact was unfounded, frivolous, abusive, or submitted in bad faith, nor upon the absence of such a finding; and does not condition it upon review by a reviewing body, an ombudsman, an arbiter, a court, a regulator, or an out-of-court dispute settlement body.

Nothing lands on the author. The closing sentence of [0425] is a triple negative: the increment is applied without any merits determination, increments no counter of the authoring agent, and appends nothing adverse to it. Every effect the paragraph recites lands inside the renouncing agent.

3. Declared Quantities and the One Bound

The filing states these as policy-declared and fixes exactly one numerically.

- **Renunciation multiple.** Policy-declared and not less than unity. The bound is one-sided; no upper bound appears in the filing. At unity the increment equals the deflection-event amount, and any declared value above unity exceeds it.
- **Quiescence interval.** Declared, and measured from the last implicating determination. No numeric value is stated.
- **Adoption window.** Declared; per [0424], the window relative to a pending conduct evaluation artifact (116) within which abandonment is scored as a deflection event.
- **Deflection-event amount.** The base the multiple is applied to. The same counter takes deflection events elsewhere, as at [0332], where an admission narrowing the declared value set under an as-yet-undetermined artifact increments the refusal counter (304) without adjudicating whether the contraction was well founded.
- **Anti-rollback floor at adoption.** Set to the in-force successor index of the signed policy object (112) at the time of adoption, per [0424].

Two omissions are worth stating plainly, since [0425] is the whole of the disclosure here. It recites no enumeration of action classes for the renunciation increment, and it recites no change to the origin attribution written into the counterparty identity record (114) at adoption.

4. How It Sits Beside the Neighbors

Renunciation is the third exit, and its recited effects differ from orphaning's. For orphaning, [0424] recites the gate write and [0433] recites an orphaned-class budget disposition record, appended by the same append, recording the disposition declared in the signed policy object (112) for the authorization budget (404) and the authorization quantity held against each affected class. Where declared frozen, decay of the authorization quantity is suspended from the append of the orphaning record and resumes when the gate (300) returns to granting; where declared retained, decay continues unmodified. Under neither disposition is the authorization budget (404) decremented, any authorization quantity set to zero, or any register entry removed. For renunciation, [0425] recites a floor lowering and a counter increment, and nothing else.

The composition that carries the most weight is with [0426]. Where one adopted-value alias is adopted from several authoring agents, each is recorded as a co-author entry and a declared co-provenance orphaning rule governs. A disjunctive rule orphans the value on an accepted determination (122) about any one co-author. A conjunctive rule orphans it only upon such a determination about every recorded co-author, "a determination about fewer orphaning nothing." The same paragraph recites the multi-hop case: the origin attribution carries an adoption provenance chain of per-hop entries naming the agent, alias, time, and adoption record of each hop, verified so each entry names its predecessor and bounded by a declared depth, and orphaning follows an accepted determination (122) about an agent named at a verified hop implicating the value authored there.

At the entry side, [0428] filters what can be adopted at all. An adoption record proposed across an edge bearing a non-response-coupled designation is appended as an attempted record given no effect: it raises no floor, admits no value, and increments no counter, and the agent appends its declining as a positive abstention naming the designation. The floor is not an adoption-only structure either: under [0432] a

receiving agent computes an effective floor for an alias as the maximum of a carried value and its own anti-rollback floor. Against that background, the single-alias scope of the lowering in [0425] carries the limitation.

Downstream sits the self-clearing bar of [0105]: a determination produced while the authorization gate (300) stands in the withheld state (310) is appended to the append-only lineage field (104), decrements neither accumulator, and does not write the gate back to granting. Per [0106] the withheld state persists irrespective of elapsed time.

5. Structural Distinctions from Known Categories

Several established categories address parts of the same problem and are structurally distinguishable.

Policy and configuration bundle management. Systems that merge a policy bundle and later drop it treat adoption and removal as ordinary edits. No monotone floor per value alias makes the removal distinguishable from any other revision, and no consequence attaches to the holder for it. Here the floor was raised at adoption, and the recited exit carries an increment in the holder's own counter.

Credential and certification regimes. A certifying body issues a credential and later revokes it; the invalidating act belongs to the registry, and relying parties consult a published list. In this filing the accepted determination (122) that ends an adopted value by orphaning is produced by the adopting agent's own admission evaluator (120), and the renunciation record is an append the holder makes on its own record.

Reputation and affiliation scoring. Third-party scoring of a withdrawal computes and holds the consequence outside the party scored, and frequently propagates one to the party dropped. Neither happens here: the increment lands in the renouncing agent's own refusal counter (304), and no counter of the authoring agent is incremented.

Adjudicated withdrawal. Contract termination for cause, license surrender, and professional deregistration permit exit on a finding, by a body other than the exiting party, about whether the exit was warranted. [0425] recites its increment without any determination of whether the renunciation was well founded.

Anti-rollback version floors. Monotone counters that refuse downgrade are familiar in software and firmware update paths and typically admit no reduction short of a privileged reset. Monotonicity is not the distinguishing structure. What distinguishes is a floor held per canonical alias over declared values, lowered by a route scoped to one alias, gated on a pendency condition and a quiescence interval, and priced in a counter that governs the agent's own authorization.

None of the above asserts that any product, service, or party practices this mechanism. The comparison is between structures.

6. Disclosure Scope

The renunciation record is disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/117,812, Section 10.6, paragraph [0425], alongside the adoption and orphaning recitations at [0424], [0426], [0428], and [0433], and rests on the refusal counter and merit-independent metering of Section 3.

Disclosed is the structure: an append naming the adopted-value alias, a reference to the adoption record, and the condition relied upon; admissibility conditioned conjunctively on the absence of a pending conduct evaluation artifact (116) implicating the value and on elapse of a declared quiescence interval since the last implicating determination; a lowering of the anti-rollback floor for that alias alone, for no other alias and no self-authored value; and an increment of the agent's own refusal counter (304) by the deflection-event amount multiplied by a policy-declared renunciation multiple not less

than unity, applied without any determination of whether the renunciation was well founded, incrementing no counter of the authoring agent and appending nothing adverse to it.

Disclaimed is everything outside that structure. No numeric magnitude is claimed for the quiescence interval, the adoption window, or the renunciation multiple beyond the stated bound at unity. No relation between the quiescence interval and the adoption window is claimed. No general-purpose reputation system, credential revocation infrastructure, or version-control downgrade policy is claimed. Nothing here characterizes any renunciation as well founded or as otherwise. This publication describes the filed disclosure for the technical record and grants no license under it.

Merit-Independent Metering (</merit-indep>, [All 49 steps → \(/inventive-steps\)](#) [endent-metering](#))

A refusal costs the refuser — in a different faculty, without judging who was right.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- [Merit-Independent Metering: Pricing an Agent's Refusals Without Adjudicating Merit \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/pricing-refusal-without-adjudicating-merit\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/pricing-refusal-without-adjudicating-merit).

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- [The Prospective Narrowing Bar and Deflection Scoring \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/prospective-narrowing-bar-deflection-scoring\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/prospective-narrowing-bar-deflection-scoring).
- [The Continuous-Function Cost Multiplier \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/continuous-function-cost-multiplier\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/continuous-function-cost-multiplier).
- [The Renunciation Record: Relinquishing an Adopted Value on the Record \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/renunciation-record\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/renunciation-record).
- [Lapse Scoring During Pendency \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/lapse-scoring-during-pendency\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/lapse-scoring-during-pendency).

- [Multi-Descriptor Aggregation and Determination-Class Ordering \(/articles/merit-independent-metering/multi-descriptor-aggregation-ordering\)](/articles/merit-independent-metering/multi-descriptor-aggregation-ordering).

TERMINOLOGY

- [merit-independent metering \(/glossary#merit-independent-metering\)](/glossary#merit-independent-metering).
- [non-executing cognitive mode \(/glossary#non-executing-cognitive-mode\)](/glossary#non-executing-cognitive-mode).
- [refusal counter \(/glossary#refusal-counter\)](/glossary#refusal-counter).

[Merit-Independent Metering overview → \(/merit-independent-metering\)](/merit-independent-metering).