THINKING OS™

# Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms

*How to Run a 30-Day Observe-Only Review of One Final-Submit Workflow*

One workflow ▪ One final-submit step ▪ Reviewable authority findings ▪
No production filing disrupted, delayed, or altered

*Public Evaluation Guide · August 2026*



Doc ID: TOS-SEAL-PTP-v2.0

**Document:** Legal Action Governance Adoption Guide for Law Firms
**Version:** Public Evaluation Guide • v2.0 • August 2026
**Owner:** Thinking OS™
**Use:** May be shared externally. For information only; not legal advice.

THINKING OS™

## How to Read This Guide

This guide explains how a law firm can evaluate SEAL Legal Runtime in one filing workflow for **30 days without disrupting production filings**.

The review is intentionally narrow:

- one filing workflow;
- one final-submit step;
- one named workflow owner;
- one defined authority scope;
- one weekly review cadence;
- observe-only throughout the 30-day review.

During the review, SEAL records one of three findings:

| Would Have Approved | Would Have Refused | Routed for Supervision |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The agreed authority conditions appear satisfied. | One or more required authority conditions are not satisfied. | The firm has identified the condition for supervised review. |

**No production filing is blocked, delayed, or altered during the review.**

This guide explains:

- what information SEAL needs;
- what the firm remains responsible for;
- how authority issues appear in the review;
- how supervision and deadline-sensitive findings are handled;
- what leadership reviews each week;
- what evidence the firm receives after 30 days;
- and what would need to be true before any controlled enforcement is considered.

The first review should answer one practical question:

**Does one filing workflow benefit from a reviewable authority decision before the filing leaves the firm — without disrupting normal legal practice?**

THINKING OS™

## Table Of Contents

# 1. How the 30-Day Review Stays Narrow and Safe

A law firm should not have to redesign its filing environment or trust a new control blindly in order to evaluate it.

The first SEAL review is deliberately bounded.

## 1. One workflow

The review covers one designated filing or submission workflow.

It does not imply coverage across other practice groups, filing paths, filing or submission types, or firm systems.

## 2. One final-submit step

SEAL evaluates the selected workflow immediately before external submission.

The firm's existing systems remain the sources of truth for identity, role, matter context, authority, consent, supervision, and deadlines.

## 3. Observe-only for 30 days

SEAL records one of three review findings: Would Have Approved, Would Have Refused, or Routed for Supervision.

**It does not block, delay, or alter production filings during the review.**

## 4. Minimum information only

The review starts with only the structured information needed to evaluate the selected authority question.

It does not require broad document access, firmwide data integration, model prompts, privileged strategy, passwords, raw credentials, or private signing keys.

## 5. Authority issues stay reviewable

When SEAL identifies a missing, mismatched, or unclear authority condition, the finding is preserved in a decision record so the firm can understand what happened and why.

During the 30-day review, it remains a finding rather than a production block.

## 6. The firm decides what happens next

At the end of the review, leadership may:

- stop;
- continue observing for a defined reason;
- improve source information or authority rules and review again;
- or consider one narrow controlled-enforcement path under separate written scope.

**Nothing moves into enforcement automatically.**

## Practical takeaway

The first review is not intended to prove that SEAL must be deployed.

It is designed to give leadership enough evidence to make an informed decision.

# 2. Minimum Information Needed for the Review

A 30-day SEAL review should not feel like a systems-transformation project.

The firm and Thinking OS identify only the structured information needed to evaluate one filing action.

## The six core questions

### 1. Who is acting?

Which lawyer, staff member, service account, automation, workflow system, or AI/workflow agent is attempting the final-submit action?

### 2. What trusted role or group applies?

What role does the firm's trusted identity or role source recognize for that person or system?

A workflow label should not override the firm's trusted role information merely because the request says "Attorney."

### 3. Which workflow or matter is involved?

What filing workflow, matter, client, docket, legal area, or submission type does the action belong to?

Only the identifiers required for the selected review need to be included.

### 4. What action is being attempted?

What filing or submission is about to leave the firm?

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

Depending on the workflow, the firm may require:

- client authorization or consent;
- matter authority;
- supervisory authority;
- firm-approved evidence;
- or another authority condition.

### 6. Is deadline or urgency information relevant?

Where timing matters, the review can preserve the deadline or urgency information supplied by firm-controlled systems.

## What the review does not require

The 30-day review does not require the firm to:

- replace its matter system;
- replace its DMS, IAM, GRC, filing, or docketing tools;
- adopt a new ticketing platform;
- expose every document;
- provide model prompts or model traces;
- train models on firm data;
- involve every practice group;
- modify ECF or a court portal;
- or activate production enforcement.

## What happens when information is incomplete?

SEAL does not make inaccurate source information accurate.

If required identity, role, matter, authority, consent, evidence, or deadline information is missing, stale, conflicting, or unclear, that issue remains visible in the review.

Depending on the firm's agreed rules, SEAL may record **Would Have Refused** or **Routed for Supervision**.

**During the 30-day review, that finding does not block, delay, or alter the production filing.**

## Practical takeaway

The question is not:

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

The better question is:

**Can the firm provide enough trusted information to evaluate one final-submit action for 30 days?**

# 3. What Happens When SEAL Identifies an Authority Issue

During the 30-day review, SEAL does not stop the production filing.

Instead, it records the authority issue so the firm can review what happened.

## Would Have Refused

A **Would Have Refused** finding means one or more agreed authority conditions were not satisfied.

The decision record should make the finding understandable.

Leadership should be able to see:

1. **What was attempted?**
   Which filing or submission was involved?
2. **Who or what attempted it?**
   Which person, service account, automation, or workflow system attempted the action?
3. **Why did the authority condition fail?**
   Was authority missing, stale, mismatched, expired, tied to the wrong matter, unsupported by required consent, or otherwise outside the agreed rules?
4. **What information would need to change?**
   What source information, authority evidence, consent, or supervision condition would need to be reviewed or corrected?
5. **Who owns the next step?**
   Which firm function or person is responsible for reviewing the issue?

SEAL does not operate the firm's remediation workflow.

**The review makes the authority issue visible. The firm owns the correction path.**

## Example: required consent missing

A useful finding should not merely say:

> Consent missing.

It should make clear that:

- the filing action was evaluated;
- required consent was not present under the agreed rules;
- the finding was Would Have Refused;
- and the firm owns whatever correction or review process follows.

## Example: authority mismatch

A useful finding should distinguish between:

- authority missing;
- authority expired;
- authority for the wrong matter;
- authority for the wrong filing action;
- authority attached to the wrong actor;
- or another agreed mismatch.

The point is not to force the user to reverse-engineer why SEAL reached the finding.

The reason should be reviewable.

# Routed for Supervision

A **Routed for Supervision** finding means the firm has identified the condition as one that would require supervised review.

During the 30-day review:

- SEAL does not select the supervisor;
- SEAL does not create a ticket;
- SEAL does not operate a queue;
- SEAL does not assign work;
- SEAL does not approve an exception.

The firm owns its supervision process.

The purpose of the review is to show where supervision would have been required.

## If controlled enforcement is later considered

Any future authorized supervised path must be separately defined.

That later design should identify:

- who may supervise;
- which refusal conditions are eligible;
- what authority is required;
- what reason must be recorded;
- and how the later supervisory decision relates to the original refusal.

**Supervision should not become a silent bypass.**

The original refusal should remain visible, and any later authorized decision should be separately recorded.

# Deadline-Sensitive Findings

Legal work has deadlines.

Where deadline or urgency information is relevant and supplied by firm-controlled systems, SEAL can preserve that context in the decision record.

During the 30-day review:

- deadline-sensitive findings remain non-enforcing;
- the firm owns deadline calculation and calendaring;
- the firm owns review timing;
- the firm chooses supervisors;
- the firm owns after-hours procedures;
- the firm owns fallback and escalation.

SEAL does not turn urgency into permission.

## Before any deadline-sensitive refusal condition could move into controlled enforcement, the firm would need to define:

- who reviews it;
- how quickly it must be reviewed;
- what happens if that person is unavailable;
- what fallback applies;
- what happens if the issue remains unresolved;
- and whether any authorized supervised path is permitted.

**Deadline pressure does not become permission.**

# 4. Why the Review Starts Observe-Only

A firm should not have to trust a new authority control blindly.

The first SEAL review therefore starts observe-only.

For 30 days, SEAL evaluates one designated final-submit workflow and records:

- **Would Have Approved**
- **Would Have Refused**
- **Routed for Supervision**

Those findings produce reviewable evidence, but they do not control the production filing.

**They are not production-enforcing.**

No production filing is blocked, delayed, or altered.

## What leadership can review

During the 30-day review, leadership can examine:

- which filing actions were evaluated;
- who or what attempted them;
- what authority rules applied;
- which actions Would Have Approved;
- which actions Would Have Refused;
- which would have required supervision;
- why those findings occurred;
- missing or unreliable source information;
- false positives or questionable findings;
- deadline-sensitive findings;
- and whether the decision records are understandable.

# What the firm controls

The firm decides:

- which workflow is reviewed;
- which final-submit step is observed;
- which authority conditions apply;
- who reviews the findings;
- how often findings are reviewed;
- whether source information needs improvement;
- whether authority rules need clarification;
- and what happens at the end of the review.

SEAL does not force a firmwide deployment.

## At the end of 30 days, the firm chooses:

1. Stop
2. Continue observing for a defined reason and period
3. Improve source information or authority rules and review again
4. Consider one narrow controlled-enforcement path under separate written scope

**The review ends with a decision, not an automatic deployment.**

# 5. What Leadership Reviews Each Week

The 30-day review should not rely on opinion.

Leadership should be able to see whether the authority findings are useful, understandable, and supported by evidence.

A simple weekly review is enough.

## The core weekly view

### Would Have Approved

How many in-scope filing attempts appeared to satisfy the agreed authority conditions?

The purpose is not to maximize approvals.

The purpose is to understand whether ordinary work appears properly supported.

### Would Have Refused

Which filing attempts raised authority, role, consent, matter, or evidence issues?

Leadership should review:

- the reason;
- whether the finding appears correct;
- whether the issue came from source information or the firm's rules;
- and whether similar findings repeat.

### Routed for Supervision

Which filing attempts presented conditions the firm had identified for supervised review?

The review should show where supervision would have been needed without implying that SEAL operated the firm's supervision process.

## Source-information quality

Which findings were driven by:

- stale role information;
- missing authority;
- unclear consent;
- matter mismatches;
- incomplete deadline information;
- or other missing or conflicting source facts?

The review may expose data or workflow issues that need to be corrected before enforcement should ever be considered.

## Questionable findings and false positives

A SEAL finding may be wrong.

That is why the first review is observe-only.

Leadership should be able to distinguish between:

- a correct authority finding;
- incorrect source information;
- unclear policy;
- configuration issues;
- a possible problem in SEAL itself.

## Decision-record clarity

Can a legal, risk, or workflow reviewer understand:

- what was attempted;
- what SEAL recorded;
- why;
- and what evidence supported the finding

without requiring routine engineering interpretation?

### Workflow impact

Did the 30-day review produce useful evidence without interfering with normal legal work?

## What Leadership Should Know After 30 Days

A useful review should answer:

- Is the selected final-submit step being observed clearly?
- Are the authority findings understandable?
- Are wrong-authority conditions appearing?
- Are source-information gaps visible?
- Are supervision-required conditions understandable?
- Can leadership distinguish SEAL issues from source-information issues?
- Are the decision records useful?
- Does the firm already answer this same authority question sufficiently well through existing controls?
- Is anything worth evaluating further?

A legitimate result may be:

**No. We do not need to continue.**

That is still a valid evaluation outcome.

# 6. What the Firm Receives After 30 Days

The 30-Day Observe-Only Final-Submit Review is intended to produce a defined evidence package.

The firm receives:

### Review Scope Memo / Charter

One workflow, one final-submit step, named owners, agreed authority conditions, and explicit exclusions.

### Minimum Signal Map

The structured information, source systems, and owners needed for the selected review.

### Weekly Review Sessions

A structured review of findings, decision records, source-information issues, and emerging patterns.

### Reviewable Decision Artifacts

Decision evidence for filing attempts within the agreed review scope.

### Final Risk Ledger

A summary of:

- Would Have Approved findings;
- Would Have Refused findings;
- Routed for Supervision findings;
- reason patterns;
- material source-information gaps;
- and other findings relevant to leadership review.

## Leadership Recommendation

At the end of the 30 days:

- stop;
- continue observing for a defined reason;
- improve source information or authority rules;
- or consider one narrow controlled-enforcement path under separate written scope.

**The review produces evidence for a decision. It does not assume SEAL should be deployed.**

# 7. What the Firm Controls

The firm remains responsible for:

- policy and authority rules;
- identity and role sources;
- matter and workflow context;
- consent and authority sources;
- deadline and urgency sources;
- legal judgment;
- professional supervision;
- workflow routing and escalation;
- artifact retention, privilege, confidentiality, use, and disclosure;
- and whether anything beyond observe-only review is considered.

Thinking OS is responsible for:

- operating SEAL within the agreed review scope;
- returning the agreed review findings;
- producing reviewable decision artifacts;
- maintaining SEAL's security, integrity, and availability within agreed scope;
- supporting the agreed integration and review process;
- and supporting the agreed evidence package.

**The firm owns the rules and legal judgment. Thinking OS operates SEAL.**

.

# 8. What Must Be True Before Controlled Enforcement Is Considered

Controlled enforcement is **not** included in the 30-day review.

If the observe-only evidence supports further evaluation, the firm may choose to consider one narrow controlled-enforcement path.

Nothing moves automatically.

Before that could happen, the firm and Thinking OS would need to agree in writing on:

- the specific workflow;
- the specific refusal condition;
- the firm's authority rules;
- required source-information quality;
- the supervision process;
- fallback procedures;
- deadline treatment;
- security and continuity requirements;
- support responsibilities;
- the exact workflow path that would require a SEAL decision;
- and written firm approval.

Under controlled enforcement, SEAL's decision may control whether the action proceeds **only within the separately agreed workflow path**.

If another filing route can still proceed outside that agreed workflow path, SEAL does not claim to control it.

**Controlled enforcement is a separate decision, not the default destination of the review.**

# 9. Practical Next Step

The 30-day review is best suited to a firm with:

- one real filing workflow;
- delegated filing activity;
- a clearly identifiable final-submit step;
- a named workflow owner;
- usable identity and role information;
- and a reason to examine authority, consent, or supervision before the filing leaves.

The next step is a **20-minute fit conversation**.

The question is not whether the firm wants to adopt a new governance platform.

The question is:

**Is there one filing workflow where it would be useful to see which actions Would Have Approved, Would Have Refused, or Routed for Supervision before the filing left the firm?**

---

**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.**