THINKING OS™

Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms

How to Pilot SEAL at the Final Submit Boundary Without Workflow Paralysis

Minimum Wiring • Refusal Recovery • Formal Overrides • Deadline-Safe Escalation • Observe-Only Rollout • Pilot Metrics

Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

How to read this addendum

This addendum is written for evaluation conversations, **not implementation design**. It explains how a firm can pilot SEAL without paralyzing legal work.

It does not include client-specific policy files, routing targets, system credentials, webhook endpoints, runtime internals, or implementation details. Those belong in a private implementation appendix after scope and security review.

The purpose here is simple: show how SEAL starts narrow, how refusals recover, how overrides stay legitimate, how deadlines route, and how leadership measures whether the pilot is helping.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

THINKING OS™

Table Of Contents

Sections

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The Six Adoption Mechanics

How a firm starts narrow without workflow paralysis

Most legal controls fail for a simple reason: they make the safe path feel slower than the risky path.

SEAL is designed differently.

SEAL does not ask a firm to turn on firmwide enforcement on day one. It does not ask lawyers to change every workflow, abandon their matter systems, or wait on a new internal help desk. It starts at one governed action boundary, such as a final filing or submission step, and gives the firm a controlled way to observe, measure, escalate, and enforce over time.

The adoption question is not only:

> *“Can SEAL approve or refuse a legal action?”*

The real buyer question is:

> *“Can SEAL reduce legal risk without paralyzing the practice?”*

The six adoption mechanics below are the answer.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

1. Refusals include a “Get to Yes” path

A refusal should not feel like a dead end.

When SEAL refuses a request, the artifact should explain what happened, why it happened, and what corrected signal is needed for a valid re-run. The point is not to punish the user. The point is to make the next correct action obvious.

A SEAL refusal can surface a structured handoff such as:

- action: provide corrected authority, evidence, consent, training, or matter signal
- owner: firm-owned governance / matter / supervising workflow
- required inputs: the specific missing or corrected signals
- link: firm-owned destination when configured

This turns refusal from “the system blocked me” into “the system opened the right correction path.”

For a GC or managing partner, that means refusals become reviewable governance events, not mystery failures.

For a CIO or innovation lead, it means SEAL can fit into existing systems without becoming the firm’s workflow engine.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

2. Overrides are legitimate only through the Formal Override Path

Partner judgment matters. So does auditability.

SEAL does not treat override as an informal bypass. A valid override must be linked to the refused parent decision and supported by a signed authority or callback path. **The override story must show, at minimum:**

- parent decision id
- override actor
- override actor role
- override reason
- signed authority or verified callback status
- final override outcome

This prevents shadow override culture.

No screenshot approvals.
No unexplained email bypasses.
No “partner said it was fine” with no linkage.

The firm can preserve supervisory discretion while still keeping a clean record of who overrode what, why, and under which authority.

3. Deadline-sensitive refusals route to a governed lane

Legal work has deadlines. A governance system that ignores urgency will be routed around.

SEAL's deadline-safe pattern is simple:

> *If a request is refused and the deadline is near, the refusal should not become "blocked, good luck."*

Instead, SEAL can produce the governed refusal, preserve the deadline context, and send a firm-owned escalation record that the firm can route to the correct supervisor queue, matter team, docketing process, or governance lane.

SEAL does not choose the firm's queue.
SEAL does not create tickets by itself.
SEAL does not become the matter system.

SEAL produces the decision record. The firm owns the routing destination.

That distinction matters. It keeps SEAL disciplined while still allowing the firm to move quickly when time is real.

4. A first pilot can start with minimum wiring fields

A firm should not need a giant integration program before it can evaluate SEAL.

For a first controlled pilot, the minimum wiring conversation should be simple:

1. Who is acting?
2. What role or group are they acting under?
3. What legal environment or workflow is involved?
4. What legal action or motion is being attempted?
5. Is there consent, authority, or required evidence?
6. Is there deadline or urgency information?

That is the adoption wedge.

More signals can be added later: matter ID, jurisdiction, case stage, policy reference, proof of authority, DMS context, ethical wall status, training status, sensitivity label, and routing targets.

But the first conversation should not sound like a multi-year transformation project. It should sound like a narrow legal control at one action boundary.

5. Quiet mode lets the firm observe before enforcing

The safest rollout path is usually not immediate enforcement.

SEAL can run in observe-only mode first. In that posture, governance still evaluates the request. Refusal artifacts and events sent to the firm's systems, such as webhook events, can still be generated. Leadership can see what SEAL would have blocked. But the firm can review false positives, adjust routing, tune policy ownership, and build confidence before switching a workflow into enforcement.

Quiet mode answers the adoption fear directly:

> *"Can we see what this would do before it starts blocking lawyers?"*

Yes.

The firm can begin with advisory visibility, then move to enforcement only when the workflow owner, risk lead, and technical owner are comfortable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

6. Metrics prove SEAL is not paralyzing the firm

A governance system should be measurable.

The key pilot metrics are simple:

1. **% auto-approved**
   How often does normal work pass without friction?

2. **% refused with successful escalation or resolution within N minutes**
   When SEAL refuses something, does the firm have a timely path to resolution?

3. **Override rate**
   How often are refusals overridden, by whom, and for what reason?

These metrics help leadership distinguish safety from paralysis.

A healthy pilot should show that most ordinary work continues, risky actions are caught before they become irreversible, escalations are visible, and overrides are governed rather than hidden.

SEAL does not need to own the firm's dashboard. It needs to produce the decision artifacts and events that let the firm measure the system honestly.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What this means for a first evaluation

The goal is not to boil the ocean.

The goal is to pick one workflow, one governed action boundary, and one narrow legal risk. **Then run SEAL in a way that proves:**

- This will not paralyze the firm.
- Refusals recover through a clear handoff.
- Overrides remain legitimate and auditable.
- Deadline pressure has a governed route.
- The firm can start in observe-only mode.
- Leadership can measure whether the system helps or hurts.

That is the adoption model.

SEAL is not asking the firm to trust a black box. It is giving the firm a controlled way to see, measure, and govern legal action before risk becomes irreversible.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Minimum Wiring Fields

“If you can only wire six fields, wire these.”

A first SEAL pilot should not feel like a systems transformation project.

The goal is not to connect every firm system on day one. The goal is to give SEAL enough context to evaluate one governed legal action at one action boundary, such as a filing, submission, client communication, AI-assisted output, or supervised legal task.

For a first pilot, the minimum wiring question is simple:

> *“What does SEAL need to know before this action leaves the firm?”*

The answer is six signal families.

The six minimum fields

1. Who is acting?

SEAL needs to know the actor behind the request.

This may come from an identity provider, SSO claim, matter-system user, API header, or trusted firm-supplied payload.

Plain English:
Which lawyer, staff member, agent, or system user is trying to take the action?

Typical examples:

- reviewer ID
- user ID
- actor ID
- attorney ID
- submitted-by field

Why it matters:

A legal action cannot be governed responsibly if the system does not know who is acting.

---

2. What role or group are they acting under?

Identity alone is not enough. SEAL also needs the actor's role or entitlement context.

Plain English:
Is this person an attorney, partner, paralegal, reviewer, supervisor, vendor user, or other authorized role?

Typical examples:

• role • legal role • groups	• entitlements • reviewer role

Why it matters:

Many legal controls depend on authority, supervision, and role boundaries. A partner, associate, paralegal, outside vendor, and automated agent may not be allowed to take the same action under the same conditions.

---

3. What legal environment or workflow is involved?

SEAL needs to know the legal context.

Plain English:
What practice area, workflow, jurisdictional lane, or legal environment does this action belong to?

Typical examples:

• legal environment • practice area • workflow	• vertical • jurisdiction • policy set

Why it matters:

A safe action in one legal environment may be unsafe in another. Administrative law, civil litigation, bankruptcy, procurement, employment, and regulatory workflows can have different rules, authority requirements, and refusal reasons.

---

4. What action is being attempted?

SEAL needs to know the specific legal action or motion.

Plain English:

What is the user trying to do?

Typical examples:

• motion type • legal task • filing type	• action type • specific legal task • submission type

Examples:

• Motion to Extend Time • Motion for Summary Judgment • Agency Filing	• Client Communication • AI Draft for Filing • Settlement Submission

Why it matters:

SEAL governs actions, not vibes. The system needs to know the attempted action so it can evaluate the right rule, artifact, escalation lane, or override path.

5. Is consent, authority, or required evidence present?

SEAL needs the authority posture for the action.

Plain English:
Does this action have the required client consent, supervisory authority, signed authority record or verified callback, rule-basis evidence, or matter authorization?

Typical examples:

- consent status
- proof of authority
- rule-basis evidence
- signed authority record or verified callback
- matter authorization
- approval reference

Why it matters:

Many risky legal actions are not wrong because the motion type is forbidden. They are wrong because the required authority, consent, or evidence is missing.

This is also where the firm can distinguish:

- missing authority
- invalid authority
- expired authority
- authority for the wrong matter
- authority for the wrong decision
- authority present and verified

That distinction is what makes a refusal recoverable instead of frustrating.

6. Is there a deadline or urgency signal?

SEAL needs to know whether time pressure changes routing.

Plain English:

Is there a deadline, filing window, escalation deadline, or urgency level attached to this action?

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Typical examples:

• deadline • time remaining • urgency	• requested turnaround • filing deadline • response due at

Why it matters:

Deadline pressure is one of the main reasons lawyers route around controls.

SEAL should not treat urgency as permission to bypass governance. But it should help the firm route urgent refusals into the correct supervisor or deadline-safe lane.

The safe posture is:

- Govern the action.
- Preserve the refusal.
- Surface the deadline.
- Route the handoff through firm-owned escalation.

What this means for integration

A first pilot does not require the firm to wire every system.

The minimum pilot wiring can be as small as:

- actor identity
- role or group
- legal environment
- action type
- consent / authority posture
- deadline / urgency

Everything else can be added later.

Optional enrichments may include:

- client or matter identifier
- case stage
- docket identifier
- jurisdiction
- policy reference
- policy version
- data-loss, confidentiality, or sensitivity label, where applicable
- training status
- ethical wall status
- bar status
- destination system
- matter confidentiality class
- AI usage policy

Those enrichments improve precision, audit quality, and routing. But they should not make the first evaluation feel impossible.

The buyer-friendly wiring model

For a first evaluation, the question is not:

> *"Can we integrate SEAL with every firm system?"*

The better question is:

> *"Can we send SEAL the six signals needed to govern one narrow action?"*

That is a much smaller lift.

A pilot can begin with one workflow, one action type, one client or practice group, and one routing destination. The firm can start in observe-only mode, inspect artifacts and events sent to the firm's systems, then decide whether to enforce.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

This reduces the adoption risk for each stakeholder:

GC / Risk:
Can see whether SEAL catches risky actions before harm.

Managing Partner:
Can confirm the system does not freeze ordinary work.

CIO / Security:
Can evaluate a narrow API contract before broader integration.

Innovation Lead:
Can demonstrate value without boiling the ocean.

Legal Ops:
Can route refusals, overrides, and deadline-sensitive handoffs into existing workflows.

What SEAL does not require on day one

- SEAL does not require the firm to replace its matter system.
- SEAL does not require a new ticketing platform.
- SEAL does not require the firm to expose all documents.
- SEAL does not require model training on firm data.
- SEAL does not require every practice group to participate.
- SEAL does not require enforcement on day one.

The first pilot can be narrow, observable, reversible, and measured.

The point of minimum wiring

Minimum wiring is not about lowering governance standards.

It is about making the first evaluation practical.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

SEAL can become richer as more systems connect. **But a firm should be able to begin with the six signals that matter most:**

- Who is acting?
- What role are they acting under?
- What workflow is this?
- What action is being attempted?
- Is authority or consent present?
- Is there deadline pressure?

That is enough to start a serious evaluation.

Not a toy demo.
Not a theoretical architecture.
A controlled legal action governance pilot.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Refusal Is Not a Dead End

The Get-to-Yes Handoff

A legal governance system cannot just say “no.”

In a law firm, a refusal that does not explain how to recover will create frustration, delay, and workarounds. Lawyers will route around it. Partners will escalate informally. Staff will look for another way to get the work out the door.

SEAL is designed so a refusal becomes a governed handoff, not a dead end.

The question after a refusal should not be:	The better question is:
“Why did the machine block me?”	*“What corrected signal is needed so this can be safely re-run, escalated, or approved through the right path?”*

That is the purpose of the Get-to-Yes handoff.

What every refusal should answer

A SEAL refusal should make five things clear in one sitting:

- What happened?
- Why was it refused?
- What corrected signal is needed?
- Who owns the next step?
- Where should the firm route it?

This matters because legal work does not stop just because a control fires. The firm still needs a path forward. The difference is that SEAL makes the path forward visible, governed, and auditable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The Get-to-Yes shape

The refusal artifact or event sent to the firm's systems can include a structured next step.

In plain English, that handoff should include:

Action
What needs to happen next?

Owner
Who owns the corrected signal or review path?

Required inputs
What information, authority, consent, evidence, or correction is needed?

Firm-owned route
Where should the person or system go next, if the firm has configured a route?

Source
Was this handoff declared by the firm, supplied by firm policy, or generated as a neutral SEAL default?

The goal is not to prescribe the firm's internal workflow. The goal is to make the missing or corrected signal obvious.

Example: missing consent

A refusal should not just say:

> *"Consent missing."*

It should say, in effect:

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

This action was refused because the required consent signal was missing or not verified.

To re-run safely, provide the required client authorization, consent record, or firm-approved consent evidence.

The firm owns how that consent is obtained, reviewed, stored, and re-submitted.

That is a very different experience.

The first version feels like a blockade.
The second version feels like a controlled recovery path.

Example: missing authority

A refusal should not just say:

> *"Authority invalid."*

It should explain the authority defect:

- authority missing
- authority expired
- authority for the wrong matter
- authority for the wrong decision
- authority not signed
- authority not verified
- authority does not match the requested action

That distinction matters.

If the user knows exactly what is missing, the firm can correct the signal without guessing, emailing screenshots, or creating an informal bypass.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What SEAL provides

SEAL provides the governed decision record.

SEAL can identify:

- the refusal code
- the reason for refusal
- the policy or rule basis
- the missing or invalid signal category
- the audit trace
- the next-step handoff record
- the artifact or event sent to the firm's systems

SEAL can make the refusal explainable, structured, and measurable.

That is the control layer.

What the firm owns

The firm owns the actual recovery workflow.

That may include:

- obtaining client consent
- submitting a signed authority record or verified callback
- routing to a supervising attorney
- reviewing matter-system records
- updating DMS or GRC data
- opening a ServiceNow, Jira, or internal ticket
- re-running the request with corrected evidence

SEAL should not become the firm's matter system, ticketing system, consent system, GRC platform, or supervisory queue.

SEAL produces the governed handoff. The firm decides how that handoff moves through its own systems.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Why this reduces adoption friction

The fear is not just that SEAL will refuse something.

The fear is that SEAL will refuse something and leave people stuck.

The Get-to-Yes handoff answers that fear directly:

- A refusal has a reason.
- A refusal has a category.
- A refusal has a corrected-signal path.
- A refusal can route into the firm's systems.
- A refusal can be measured.
- A refusal can be re-run after correction.

That makes SEAL feel less like workflow policing and more like workflow protection.

What this means for lawyers

For the lawyer or staff member, the refusal artifact should answer:

- What do I need to fix?
- What evidence or authority is missing?
- Do I need consent?
- Do I need a supervisor?
- Is this deadline-sensitive?
- Where does this go next?

The lawyer should not need to reverse-engineer the system. The artifact should tell them the recovery path in normal language.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What this means for leadership

For the GC, managing partner, CIO, or innovation lead, the Get-to-Yes handoff creates a record of recoverability.

Leadership can see:

- how many refusals occurred
- why they occurred
- how many were corrected
- how many escalated
- how many became supervised overrides
- how long resolution took
- whether certain workflows, roles, or practice groups need policy tuning

This is how a refusal becomes operational intelligence, not just a blocked action.

What this means for the first pilot

In a first pilot, the firm does not need every possible remediation path wired.

The minimum viable Get-to-Yes handoff is:

- refusal reason
- corrected signal needed
- firm owner category
- optional link or routing target
- audit trace / artifact id

That is enough to start.

The firm can later add richer routes, such as

- supervisor review
- consent collection
- authority callback
- matter-system correction
- deadline escalation
- GRC review

But the first pilot should still make every refusal understandable and recoverable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The adoption principle

SEAL should never make safe work harder than unsafe work.

A refusal is not the end of the workflow. It is the moment where the firm learns what must be corrected, who owns the correction, and how the request can return through a governed path.

That is the Get-to-Yes model:

- Refuse when required.
- Explain clearly.
- Route without taking over.
- Preserve the audit trail.
- Let the firm recover safely.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Formal Override Path

Supervision stays available. Shadow bypasses do not.

Legal work needs judgment.

There will be moments when a system refuses an action and a supervising partner, authorized reviewer, or firm-governance process needs to approve a path forward. SEAL does not eliminate that reality.

SEAL's position is narrower and more practical:

> *Overrides are allowed only when the firm can prove who overrode the refusal, why, under what authority, and which refused decision was overridden.*

That is the Formal Override Path.

The core rule

A SEAL override only counts when it is:

- linked to the refused decision
- supported by signed or verified authority
- recorded with actor and reason
- preserved in a decision artifact

Plain English:

> *Overrides only count when a signed authority record or verified callback path is recorded and linked to the refused parent decision.*

That means an override should always show:

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Parent decision ID
The refused decision being overridden.

Override actor
The person or authority source responsible for the override.

Override actor role
The capacity in which the actor approved the override.

Override reason
The reason the override was granted.

Signed authority required
Whether the workflow required signed or verified authority.

Signed authority recorded
Whether signed authority or verified callback evidence was actually recorded.

Override outcome
Whether the override was approved, refused, not applicable, or unknown.

Implementation teams can map these labels to specific API or event fields during pilot setup.

The purpose is not to embarrass lawyers or remove partner discretion. The purpose is to make supervision legitimate, visible, and defensible.

No shadow overrides

SEAL should not allow a refusal to disappear through informal channels.

The public rule is simple:

- No shadow overrides.

- No screenshot approvals.
- No unexplained email-only bypass.
- No “partner said it was fine” without linkage.

Supervision is valid only when it is:

- linked to the refused decision
- signed or verified through an authority path
- recorded with actor and reason
- preserved in the artifact trail

That is how a firm keeps partner judgment without losing governance.

Why this matters to law firms

Most firms already have informal override behavior.

A partner approves something by email.
Someone screenshots a message.
A staff member re-runs a request with different wording.
A risky filing moves forward because the deadline is close.
Later, the firm has to reconstruct what happened.

That is fragile.

SEAL turns override from an informal workaround into a governed event.

The firm can still say:

> *“A supervisor approved this.”*

But now it can also show:

- which refusal was overridden
- who approved it
- why they approved it

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

- what authority was recorded
- when it happened
- what final decision was issued

That is the difference between discretion and uncontrolled bypass.

What happens after a refusal?

A refusal can follow multiple paths.

Some refusals are corrected and re-run.
Some remain blocked.
Some are routed to a deadline-safe lane.
Some require supervisor review.
Some may become formal overrides.

The key is that the override path must not erase the original refusal.

A healthy override story looks like this:

1. SEAL refuses the original action.
2. The refusal artifact records the reason and decision id.
3. The firm-owned supervisor or authority process reviews the issue.
4. A signed authority record or verified callback path is recorded.
5. The override references the refused parent decision.
6. SEAL records the final override outcome with actor, reason, and linkage.

That gives the firm a complete story.

Not just “approved.”
Not just “refused.”
A governed chain.

What the override record should show

The Formal Override Path should make the override understandable without needing a forensic reconstruction.

At minimum, the artifact or event should expose:

Parent decision ID
The refused decision being overridden.

Override actor / name
The person or authority source responsible for the override.

Override actor role
The capacity in which the actor approved the override.

Override reason
The reason the override was granted.

Signed authority required
Whether the workflow required signed authority.

Signed authority recorded
Whether signed authority or callback evidence was actually recorded.

Override outcome
Whether the override was approved, refused, not applicable, or unknown.

This makes overrides measurable and auditable instead of hidden.

What SEAL records

SEAL records the override evidence trail inside the governed decision record.

SEAL can preserve:

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

- the original refusal code
- the refused parent decision id
- the override actor fields
- the override reason
- the signed authority posture
- the final override outcome
- the audit trace
- the artifact or event sent to the firm's systems

SEAL makes the override visible.

It does not silently turn a refusal into an unexplained approval.

What the firm owns

The firm owns the actual supervisory workflow.

That may include:

- who is allowed to override
- which roles can approve
- which workflows permit override
- which matters require partner review
- which system records the signed authority or verified callback
- where the supervisor queue lives
- how the firm stores its authority record

SEAL does not decide firm hierarchy.
SEAL does not create the supervisor queue.
SEAL does not become the firm's GRC or matter system.
SEAL does not invent authority.

SEAL records and enforces the fact that a valid override must be linked, signed, and auditable.

Why this reduces adoption friction

One fear buyers have is:

> *"Will SEAL block experienced lawyers from exercising judgment?"*

The answer is no.

The better answer is:

> *"SEAL preserves judgment, but requires the judgment to travel through a defensible path."*

That matters to each stakeholder:

GC / Risk:
Can distinguish legitimate supervision from hidden bypass.

Managing Partner:
Can preserve partner discretion without creating audit gaps.

CIO / Security:
Can require signed authority instead of informal approvals.

Innovation Lead:
Can explain that SEAL supports escalation, not rigid automation.

Legal Ops:
Can route override requests through existing firm-owned workflows.

This is why the Formal Override Path is adoption-friendly. It does not tell lawyers, "You can never override." It says, "If you override, the firm gets a clean record."

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What this means for a first pilot

A first pilot does not need every override workflow fully automated.

The minimum viable override path is:

- refused parent decision id
- authorized override actor
- override reason
- signed authority record or verified callback record
- final override outcome
- artifact / audit trace

That is enough to evaluate whether the firm's supervision model can work with SEAL.

Later, the firm can enrich the path with:

- matter-system approvals
- ServiceNow or Jira routing
- DMS authority records
- partner queue assignment
- GRC approval records
- policy-specific override rules

But the first principle remains the same:

> *Supervision is valid only when linked, signed or verified, and preserved in the decision record.*

The adoption principle

SEAL should not force firms into brittle automation.

It should make high-risk judgment visible before the action becomes irreversible.

The Formal Override Path gives firms the best of both worlds:

- lawyers keep supervised discretion
- risk teams get a defensible record
- IT gets a clean contract
- leadership sees override patterns
- shadow bypasses become harder to hide

That is the point.

Not “the machine always wins.”
Not “partners can bypass anything.”

A better model:

- Govern the refusal.
- Allow legitimate supervision.
- Require signed authority.
- Link the parent decision.
- Preserve the record.
- Measure the override rate.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Deadline-Safe Escalation Lane

Urgency does not mean ungoverned.

Deadlines are where governance systems often lose trust.

A lawyer may accept a control in theory, but when a filing deadline is close, the practical question becomes:

> *"Is this system going to help me route the problem, or is it going to block me and leave me exposed?"*

SEAL's deadline-safe escalation pattern is designed for that moment.

If a refusal is deadline-sensitive, SEAL should not say:

> *"Blocked. Good luck."*

It should produce a governed refusal, preserve the deadline context, and provide a firm-owned escalation handoff so the firm can route the issue to the right supervisor, matter team, docketing process, or governance lane.

The principle is simple:

- Urgency does not bypass governance.
- Urgency changes routing.

The deadline problem

Law firms live under time pressure.

Filing deadlines, court orders, agency windows, client commitments, and response deadlines can all create moments where delay feels more dangerous than risk.

That is where shadow behavior appears:

- someone bypasses the system
- someone rewords the request
- someone sends an informal email approval
- someone screenshots a partner message
- someone files first and explains later

This is not because lawyers dislike governance. It is because the system did not give them a sanctioned fast path.

Deadline-safe escalation gives them one.

What SEAL does when deadline pressure exists

When a deadline-sensitive request is refused, SEAL can preserve three things together:

- the governed refusal
- the deadline or urgency context
- the firm-owned escalation handoff

That means the firm can see:

- what was refused
- why it was refused
- how urgent it is
- where it should route next
- which firm-owned system or supervisor lane should handle it

The refusal remains governed. The deadline remains visible. The next step becomes routable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What SEAL does not do

- SEAL does not decide the firm's internal queue.
- SEAL does not create tickets by itself.
- SEAL does not choose the supervising partner.
- SEAL does not override a refusal because time is short.
- SEAL does not turn urgency into permission.

The firm owns the escalation destination.

SEAL's job is to produce the decision record and the routing context needed for the firm's systems to route it correctly.

The safe routing model

A deadline-safe refusal should move like this:

1. A legal action is submitted to SEAL.
2. SEAL evaluates the request before the action becomes irreversible.
3. SEAL refuses the request because a required signal is missing, invalid, or not allowed.
4. SEAL preserves deadline context, such as deadline or time remaining.
5. SEAL produces a deadline-safe handoff record when the firm has configured one.
6. The firm routes the event to its own supervisor queue, matter team, docketing workflow, or governance lane.
7. Any later approval or override must still follow the formal signed authority path.

This is the important distinction:

- SEAL governs the decision.
- The firm owns the route.

What the deadline-safe handoff should show

A deadline-safe event should make the urgency and route clear without making SEAL the workflow owner.

Useful fields may include:

Deadline
When is the action due?

Time remaining
How much time remains?

Deadline safe lane
Was the firm-owned deadline lane triggered?

Handoff type
What kind of handoff is this?

Routing target
Where should the firm's system route the event?

Owner
Which firm-owned function is responsible?

Required inputs
What corrected signals are still needed?

Artifact ID or decision ID
Which refusal artifact or governed decision is being escalated?

Audit trace
How can the firm trace the event later?

Implementation teams can map these labels to technical field names during setup.

This gives the firm enough structure to act quickly without losing the audit trail.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Example: urgent filing with missing consent

A filing is due soon.

SEAL detects that the filing request is missing a required consent or authority signal.

A bad governance experience would be:

> *"Refused."*

A deadline-safe governance experience is:

> *This filing was refused because required consent or authority was missing.*
>
> *The request is deadline-sensitive.*
>
> *The refusal artifact and deadline context were produced.*
>
> *The firm-owned escalation lane should route this to the configured supervisor or matter workflow.*
>
> *The request can be re-run when the corrected authority, consent, or override evidence is supplied.*

That is not paralysis. That is controlled urgency.

Why this matters for partner adoption

Deadline pressure is one of the strongest arguments against ex-ante governance.

Partners and senior lawyers may worry:

- Will this slow down a filing?
- Will it trap my team at the worst possible time?
- Will it force lawyers to choose between compliance and deadlines?
- Will it create a support ticket instead of a legal path?

Deadline-safe escalation answers those fears.

It says:

> *The system will not silently allow risky work because time is short.*
>
> *But it also will not leave urgent work stranded.*
>
> *It will preserve the refusal and route the issue into the firm's sanctioned escalation path.*

That is the posture firms actually need.

What this means for a first pilot

A first pilot does not need a complex deadline workflow.

The minimum deadline-safe wiring is:

- deadline or time-remaining signal
- a firm-configured routing target or lane label
- a supervisor or governance owner category
- a refusal artifact / decision id
- a clear next-step handoff

That is enough to test whether urgent refusals can be handled without panic bypass.

The firm can later enrich the lane with:

- docketing system integration
- matter-team routing
- supervisor queue assignment
- ServiceNow or Jira routing
- SLA tracking
- on-call escalation rules
- practice-group-specific deadlines

But none of that is required to prove the adoption model.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

How this reduces buying friction

For a GC or risk leader, deadline-safe escalation shows that SEAL will not trade one risk for another.

It prevents:

- unauthorized filings
- unrecorded partner approvals
- last-minute informal bypasses
- untraceable deadline decisions

For a managing partner, it protects productivity:

- urgent work gets a sanctioned route
- supervision remains available
- the firm can see where bottlenecks occur

For a CIO or legal operations lead, it is practical:

- SEAL produces the governed decision event
- the firm's systems route the event
- no new firmwide workflow engine is required

For an innovation lead, it makes the pilot easier to defend:

- we are not blocking deadlines blindly
- we are testing whether governed routing improves deadline handling

How leadership measures it

Deadline-safe escalation should be measurable.

The firm can track:

- how many deadline-sensitive refusals occurred
- which refusal codes triggered deadline-safe routing
- how many were resolved within N minutes
- how many became formal overrides
- which workflows generated repeat deadline escalations
- which routing lanes were effective
- where policy or wiring needs adjustment

This is how leadership can tell the difference between:

a governance system that creates bottlenecks

and:

a governance system that catches risk and routes urgency cleanly

The adoption principle

SEAL should not make lawyers choose between governance and deadlines.

The right model is:

- Refuse when governance requires refusal.
- Preserve deadline context.
- Produce a firm-owned escalation handoff.
- Route urgency without erasing the audit trail.
- Require formal authority for any later override.
- Measure whether the lane works.

Deadline-safe escalation is not a loophole.

It is the governed path for urgent work.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Observe-Only Rollout

How the firm sees what SEAL would do before enforcement begins

The safest first step is usually not immediate enforcement.

A firm may want to see how SEAL behaves before asking lawyers to rely on it as an active gate. That is the purpose of observe-only rollout.

In observe-only mode, SEAL still evaluates the governed action. It can still produce decision artifacts and events sent to the firm's systems, such as webhook events where configured. Leadership can still see which requests would have been approved, refused, escalated, or routed for supervision.

The difference is simple:

> *The firm can review what SEAL would have done before switching the workflow into enforcement.*

This answers one of the most important adoption questions:

> *"Can we see what this would do before it starts blocking lawyers?"*

Yes.

A firm can go live in observe-only first. SEAL can generate artifacts and events sent to the firm's systems without enforcing the block. Enforcement is a workflow-specific switch after the firm is comfortable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

How observe-only rollout works

Observe-only rollout lets the firm evaluate SEAL in a controlled way.

A typical rollout looks like this:

1. Select one workflow.
2. Select one final file or submit boundary.
3. Send SEAL the minimum required signals.
4. Let SEAL evaluate the action.
5. Review the resulting artifacts and events sent to the firm's systems.
6. Identify false positives, missing inputs, routing gaps, or policy questions.
7. Decide when, whether, and how to move that workflow into enforcement.

This lets the firm learn before it enforces.

The goal is not to avoid governance. The goal is to make enforcement safer, clearer, and easier to defend.

What SEAL provides in observe-only mode

SEAL can provide the same basic evaluation record leadership needs to understand the workflow.

That record may show:

- what action was evaluated
- who attempted the action
- what legal context applied
- whether SEAL would have approved, refused, or routed the action
- why the decision occurred
- what corrected signal would have been needed
- whether a deadline-safe route would have applied
- whether a formal override path would have been required
- what artifact or event was produced for review

This gives the firm a practical view of how the control behaves before the control becomes mandatory.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What the firm owns

The firm owns the rollout decision.

That includes:

- which workflow starts in observe-only mode
- who reviews the results
- how often results are reviewed
- which false positives require policy tuning
- which missing inputs require better wiring
- which routes or owners need adjustment
- when observe-only should become enforcement

SEAL does not force a firmwide switch.

The firm decides when a workflow is ready.

What this means for lawyers

Observe-only rollout reduces the fear that SEAL will suddenly interrupt work.

Lawyers and staff can keep working in the systems they already use while the firm studies what SEAL would have done at the governed action boundary.

This gives the firm a way to answer practical questions before enforcement:

- Are ordinary requests passing cleanly?
- Are refusals understandable?
- Are the missing signals reasonable?
- Are deadline-sensitive issues visible?
- Are override paths clear?
- Are artifacts useful?
- Is the workflow ready for active enforcement?

That is a safer adoption path than turning on blocking first and explaining later.

What this means for leadership

Observe-only rollout turns adoption anxiety into evidence.

Leadership can review:

- total governed requests
- requests SEAL would have approved
- requests SEAL would have refused
- top refusal reasons
- false positives
- missing wiring fields
- deadline-sensitive refusals
- formal override candidates
- routing gaps
- workflows ready for enforcement

This makes the first evaluation concrete.

The firm does not have to guess whether SEAL will paralyze the practice. It can inspect the operating record first.

Why this reduces adoption friction

Observe-only rollout lowers the emotional and operational risk of trying SEAL.

- **For a GC or risk leader,** it shows whether the control catches real risk before enforcement begins.
- **For a managing partner, it shows whether ordinary work keeps moving.**
- **For a CIO or security leader,** it allows narrow integration review before broader deployment.
- **For legal operations**, it reveals routing, ownership, and escalation gaps before they become production problems.
- **For innovation leadership,** it creates a safe path from evaluation to enforcement.

The buyer question is not just:

> *“Does SEAL work?”*

The better question is:

> *“Can we prove SEAL works in our workflow before we ask lawyers to rely on it?”*

Observe-only rollout makes that possible.

What this means for a first pilot

A first pilot can start with advisory visibility.

That means the firm can evaluate SEAL without requiring every lawyer, practice group, and system to change at once.

The first pilot can be:

- one workflow
- one final submit boundary
- one action type
- one owner
- one review cadence
- one observe-only evaluation period

Then, after review, the firm can decide whether to:

• keep observing • tune wiring • adjust routing	• update policy ownership • expand the pilot • switch that workflow into enforcement

This keeps the pilot narrow, reversible, and measurable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The adoption principle

SEAL should not require blind trust on day one.

The better path is:

- Start narrow.
- Observe first.
- Review artifacts.
- Tune wiring and routing.
- Confirm the workflow is safe.
- Then enforce when the firm is ready.

Observe-only rollout is not weaker governance.

It is how a firm builds confidence before enforcement.

Pilot Metrics That Prove the Gate Is Not Paralyzing

How leadership measures whether SEAL is helping or slowing the practice

A pilot should not rely on opinion.

If SEAL is working, the firm should be able to see it in the operating record: what passed, what was refused, what escalated, what was overridden, and whether ordinary work continued.

This is the point of the SEAL Risk Ledger described in the Economic Brief: governed requests become measurable evidence, including approvals, refusals, supervised overrides, refusal reason codes, policy coverage, and exception patterns over time.

The adoption question is simple:

> *"Is SEAL reducing risk without paralyzing the practice?"*

The pilot metrics should answer that directly.

The three leadership metrics

For a first pilot, leadership does not need a complicated analytics program.

It needs three plain metrics.

1. Auto-approved rate
2. Refused and resolved within N minutes
3. Override rate

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

Together, these answer the core adoption fear:

- Is normal work still moving?
- Are refusals recoverable?
- Are overrides visible instead of hidden?

1. Auto-approved rate

What it answers

"How often does ordinary work pass without friction?"

Definition

- Auto-approved rate =
- ordinary approvals / total governed requests

An ordinary approval means the request passed without needing a refusal recovery path, deadline escalation, or formal override.

Why it matters

If the auto-approved rate is healthy, SEAL is not blocking normal work. It is quietly allowing routine, properly supported actions to continue.

This helps a managing partner or practice leader see that SEAL is not a blanket slowdown. It is a targeted control.

What leadership should review

- How many requests were governed?
- How many were approved without escalation?
- Which workflows had the highest clean-pass rate?
- Which roles or action types moved through without issue?

A strong pilot should show that most properly supported work continues normally.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

2. Refused and resolved within N minutes

What it answers

“When SEAL refuses something, does the firm have a timely path forward?”

Definition

Refused and resolved within N minutes =
refusals linked to a later corrected approval or supervised approval within firm-defined N minutes
/
total refusals

The firm chooses N. It may be 15 minutes, 30 minutes, one hour, or another threshold depending on workflow urgency.

Why it matters

This is the metric that proves refusal is not paralysis.

A refusal is acceptable when it is clear, routable, and recoverable. The firm should be able to see whether refused requests are being resolved through proper channels instead of disappearing into email, hallway approvals, or manual workarounds.

What leadership should review

- How many refusals occurred?
- Which refusal reasons appeared most often?
- How many refusals were corrected and re-run?
- How many went to supervisor review?
- How many were resolved within the firm’s target time?
- Where did unresolved refusals get stuck?

This tells leadership whether SEAL is exposing real risk or creating avoidable bottlenecks.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

3. Override rate

What it answers

“How often are refusals overridden, and are those overrides visible?”

Definition

- Override rate =
- formal override approvals / total approvals

A formal override should be linked to the refused parent decision and should show who approved it, why, and under what authority.

Why it matters

Overrides are not bad by default. Hidden overrides are bad.

A healthy system should make override behavior visible enough for leadership to ask:

- Are overrides rare or routine?
- Are they concentrated with one approver?
- Are they happening because policy is too strict?
- Are they happening because users are missing required evidence?
- Are they emergency exceptions or convenience exceptions?

The point is not to eliminate judgment. The point is to make judgment attributable and reviewable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The pilot dashboard does not need to be complicated

For a first evaluation, the firm can review a simple weekly summary:

- Total governed requests
- Approved without escalation
- Refused
- Refused and resolved within N minutes
- Refused and unresolved
- Deadline-sensitive refusals
- Formal overrides
- Top refusal reasons
- Top workflows or action types creating friction

That is enough to understand whether SEAL is helping.

The firm can later add more detail by practice group, role, matter type, deadline lane, policy version, or business unit.

What SEAL provides

SEAL provides the governed records needed to measure the pilot.

Those records may include:

- decision outcome
- approval or refusal code
- decision or artifact ID
- audit trace
- actor and role
- legal workflow
- action type
- refusal reason
- next-step handoff
- deadline or urgency signal
- link to the refused parent decision, when applicable
- override actor
- override reason
- final outcome

This lets the firm build a practical operating view without asking lawyers to manually reconstruct what happened.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

What the firm owns

The firm owns the dashboard, reporting cadence, and escalation threshold.

The firm decides:

- what N minutes means
- who reviews the weekly metrics
- which workflows need tuning
- which refusal reasons are acceptable
- which exceptions require partner review
- when observe-only should become enforcement

SEAL produces the decision evidence. The firm decides how to supervise and act on it.

What a healthy pilot should show

A healthy pilot does not mean zero refusals.

Zero refusals may mean the control is not seeing enough risk.

A healthy pilot should show:

- ordinary work continues
- refusals have clear reasons
- deadline-sensitive issues route quickly
- formal overrides are visible
- repeat failure patterns are identifiable
- leadership can distinguish risk reduction from workflow friction

The goal is not to prove SEAL never blocks. The goal is to prove that when SEAL blocks, the block is explainable, recoverable, and measurable.

Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-AWA-v1.0-8f5e2j

Document: Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
Version: Public Evaluation Guide • v1.0 • April 2026
Owner: Thinking OS™
Use: May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

The adoption principle

The firm should not have to guess whether SEAL is working.

The first pilot should produce enough evidence to answer:

- Is normal work still moving?
- Are risky actions being caught before they leave the firm?
- Are refusals recoverable?
- Are urgent matters routed instead of stranded?
- Are overrides supervised instead of hidden?
- Can leadership see whether the control is helping?

That is how SEAL avoids the classic governance failure.

It does not just say:

> *"Trust the gate."*

It gives leadership the record to prove whether the gate is working.

This document describes evaluator-visible behavior and evidence surfaces only. It does not include non-public runtime details, implementation internals, client-specific policy files, routing targets, credentials, or system endpoints.

For information only. Not legal advice.