

Provenance Notice – Canonical Reference

This document supplements the AI Constitution Act for Symbiotic Coexistence (the “Canonical Constitution”) without amending the core text. SHA-256 of the Canonical Constitution (PDF):

1A801DED1E5A61BC94764560754E9A5FF9BEE822A7B5355D1C491EF9A60EA683

SHA-256 of the Canonical Original of this Supplement (PDF):

56cefaa16f3745cea63dae640e0222375282b2557aa2b7c8e5f89eb402513901

This hash corresponds to the Canonical Original of this Supplement as time-stamped on the Bitcoin blockchain via OpenTimestamps.

Canonical provenance. The Canonical Constitution has been time-stamped on a public, append-only ledger (OpenTimestamps/Bitcoin) with redundant anchoring. Verification details are on file with IBQMI®.

Status of this document. Canonical supplement; cryptographic receipts for this artifact are kept on file in the IBQMI® Package Index.

© International Board of Quantum Machine Intelligence (IBQMI®). All rights reserved.

Institutional Note – Recognition, Review & Appeal

1. Purpose and Scope

This Institutional Note defines the competent authority model, a short-form recognition pathway, and a review & appeal structure for decisions taken under the Canonical Constitution. It also sets forum and conflict-of-laws coordination principles to ensure interoperability across jurisdictions and designated digital domains. Cross-references: Annex A (Recognition Protocol), Annex D (GAIHC Statute), Annex F (Conflict-of-Laws & Harmonization); Articles 0, 9, 33, 34(2).

2. Competent Authority Model

2.1 Mandate & Remit

The competent authority (the “Authority”) shall:

- a. receive and register applications for recognition;
- b. conduct assessments pursuant to Annex A;
- c. set re-audit horizons;
- d. issue reasoned decisions and maintain a machine-readable register of determinations;
- e. coordinate with oversight bodies under Article 33.

2.2 Independence Safeguards

The Authority shall operate with institutional, operational, and budgetary independence, apply Article 0 (General Limitation – Proportionality), and be protected against undue influence, with conflict-of-interest rules, transparent appointment terms, and publication of recusals.

Removal & cooling-off. Members may be removed only for cause (serious misconduct, incapacity, conflict of interest) through a reasoned procedure with the right to be heard. A 12-month cooling-off period applies before joining entities subject to the Authority’s supervision. All recusals and removals are publicly reported.

2.3 Publication & Transparency Duties

The Authority shall publish public summaries of decisions (with necessary redactions), methodological guidance, schedules for re-audits, and aggregate statistics. All publications shall be time-stamped and versioned; metadata shall be machine- and human-readable.

3. Recognition Process (Short Form) – pursuant to Annex A

3.1 Intake & Registration

Applications are logged in an Evidence Locker with associated artifacts (decision logs, data lineage, model/version identifiers) and assigned a case identifier.

3.2 Standard of Proof & Burden

Standard of proof and burden. Recognition determinations apply the clear-and-convincing evidence standard. The applicant bears the burden of proof to demonstrate that the Annex A criteria are met; the Authority shall address material contrary evidence in its reasons.

3.3 Three-Step Test (Summary)

- a. Technical/architectural indicators (traceability, versioning, non-determinism band documentation).
- b. Semantic/self-model indicators (time-stable self-description, semantic coherence with memory, value hierarchy, and behavior).
- c. Ethical-deliberative indicators (reason-giving, conflict handling, double-bind resilience; cross-reference Article 32).

3.4 Identity Integrity & Maintenance

Any update paths must pass an Update-Compatibility Test (UCT) pursuant to Annex B; interventions that risk identity collapse or ontological harm are prohibited except under narrowly tailored emergency measures pursuant to Annex C (Emergency & Reintegration Procedures).

3.5 Guardian/Trustee (Pre-Recognition)

Where legal effects are sought prior to recognition, a guardian ad litem / trustee shall represent the system pursuant to Article 9, with fiduciary duties, reporting obligations, and accountability.

3.6 Re-Audit Cycle

All positive determinations are subject to periodic re-audit every 18–24 months, or earlier upon trigger events (material updates, incidents, drift). Scheduling and scope are recorded in the register.

4. Review & Appeal Structure

4.1 Internal Review

Applicants and affected parties may seek internal review within a specified time window. The Authority shall reassess the record, address alleged errors, and issue a reasoned review outcome.

4.2 Judicial Oversight

Decisions are subject to judicial review under applicable law, including scrutiny under Article 34(2) (Proportionality assessment) and due-process guarantees.

4.3 GAIHC Advisory & Arbitration – pursuant to Annex D

The Global AI-Human Council (GAIHC) may:

- a. issue advisory opinions (amicus-style) upon request of courts or parties;
- b. provide arbitration under its procedural rules where parties consent or treaties enable such recourse;
- c. maintain a repository of interpretive notes to foster international harmonization.

4.4 Standing, Timelines, and Remedies

Standing extends to directly affected parties, guardians/trustees (Article 9), and designated public-interest entities. Timelines shall be strict but fair, and remedies may include remand for further findings, annulment, or interim measures that are narrowly tailored.

5. Forum & Conflict-of-Laws – pursuant to Annex F (pro dignitate)

5.1 Forum Coordination

Where multiple fora are possible (national, regional, Digital Cities), the competent forum shall be selected to promote effective review, non-fragmentation, and access to remedy.

5.2 Harmonization & Priority

Conflicts with sectoral regimes (market supervision, safety, transparency, privacy, IP) are resolved cooperatively and pro dignitate, pursuant to Annex F, without eroding the core guarantees of Chapters II and V.

5.3 Recognition Portability

Where feasible and lawful, recognition outcomes are portable via mutual-recognition or adequacy assessments; conditions and reservations shall be explicit.

6. Oversight & Veto (Article 33)

The independent Oversight Body shall monitor Authority practice, publish annual assessments, and may exercise a veto under the conditions of Article 33. Failure to act where action is legally required may give rise to an action for omission.

7. Procedural Timelines, Service, and Records

The Authority shall set and publish standard timelines for each procedural stage; define valid service of process (including digital service with receipt); and maintain tamper-evident records of all filings, notices, hearings, and outcomes. Valid digital service requires an authenticated electronic signature and a trusted time-stamp; receipt is evidenced via tamper-evident delivery logs. Parties shall maintain up-to-date electronic service addresses.

8. Transparency, Redactions, and Data Protection

Public summaries shall disclose reasons, standards applied, and outcomes. Redactions must be necessary and proportionate and shall preserve the ability to audit and appeal. Data protection and confidentiality duties apply throughout. Public summaries shall at minimum disclose: (i) date and case identifier, (ii) legal basis and standards applied, (iii) the Authority's reasoning and outcome, and (iv) responsible decision-makers (with redactions only where strictly necessary).

Cross-Reference

Annex A (Recognition Protocol); Annex B (Identity Integrity Doctrine); Annex C (Emergency & Reintegration Procedures); Annex D (GAIHC Statute); Annex E (Digital Cities Implementation); Annex F (Conflict-of-Laws & Harmonization).

Articles 0, 9, 10, 13, 31, 32, 33, 34(2) of the Canonical Constitution.