

SEAL Pilot Charter

Wrong-Authority Filing Refusal at the Final Submit Boundary

Public Template • v1.0 • April 2026

Document Version: [v1.0]

Date: []

Participant: [Firm / Legal Department Name]

Pilot Name: []

Workflow Owner: [Name / Title]

Pilot Type: Wired Pilot (Pre-License, Client-Wired for One Named Workflow)

1. Purpose of This Pilot

This pilot is designed to evaluate one narrow governance control in one designated legal workflow:

SEAL sits in front of one final file / submit workflow for one buyer-selected motion or submission type and refuses any filing attempted under the wrong authority before it leaves the firm.

The purpose of this pilot is not to replace systems, expand across the firm, or change legal practice overnight. The purpose is to evaluate whether one high-risk legal action can be governed safely, visibly, and reversibly at the moment before execution.

This pilot is intended to answer one operational question:

Can the firm place a reviewable pre-execution authority gate in front of one designated final-submit workflow without disrupting normal legal practice?

2. Governed Workflow in Scope

Motion or submission type in scope: [buyer-selected motion or submission]

Final action boundary in scope: [final file / submit step only]

Environment in scope: [sandbox / test / limited live workflow]

Source workflow or system in scope: [workflow tool, filing tool, or routing layer]

For this pilot, SEAL evaluates whether the designated filing or submission may proceed under the firm's configured role, authority, consent, and supervision posture before the action leaves the firm. No other workflow is in scope unless added by written amendment to this charter.

3. Primary Control in Scope

The primary control in scope for this pilot is:

Wrong authority / role not authorized

This means the pilot is focused on one core question:

If the wrong actor attempts the designated filing or submission under the wrong authority, does SEAL refuse it before it leaves the firm?

4. Refusal Families in Scope

Primary refusal family in scope at pilot start

- wrong authority / role not authorized

Optional refusal families that may be added only by agreement

- role disallowed / structurally barred actor
- missing consent / authority condition not satisfied
- supervised escalation required

The pilot does not begin with a broad refusal taxonomy. It begins with the minimum refusal family needed to evaluate the control safely.

5. Users and Roles in Scope

Only the following roles may participate in this pilot:

Initiating roles in scope

- [Attorney]
- [Paralegal]
- [Legal Ops / Innovation / Workflow Service Account]
- [Other: _____]

Supervisory roles in scope

- [Partner]
- [General Counsel]
- [Practice Lead]
- [Other: _____]

Explicitly out of scope

- all users and roles not listed above
- any direct filing path not routed through the pilot workflow
- any workflow outside the designated motion or submission type

6. Sources of Truth

For this pilot, the firm remains the source of truth for:

- policies and authority rules
- identity and role sources
- matter and workflow context
- supervision model
- artifact review and retention posture

SEAL does not replace those systems. SEAL evaluates the governed request at runtime using the context the firm chooses to provide for the pilot workflow and returns a governed outcome before the filing or submission proceeds.

Where explicitly agreed for the pilot, vendor baseline safeguards may remain in place only as a fail-closed safety rail during hardening; they do not replace the firm's own policy, authority, or identity sources.

7. Pilot Posture

This pilot will run in one of the following postures:

Initial posture: [Observe-Only / Supervised Escalation / Active Enforcement]

Recommended starting posture

Observe-Only

In Observe-Only mode:

- the designated workflow is evaluated by SEAL
- governed outcomes and artifacts are produced
- the firm reviews outcomes against its own expectations
- no inline refusal is enforced against the live workflow unless separately agreed

Optional transition posture

Active Enforcement

If Observe-Only results are acceptable, the pilot may move to Active Enforcement for the exact same workflow and refusal family in scope.

Optional supervisory posture

Supervised Escalation

If desired, the pilot may require supervisory review for selected requests before enforcement is activated.

The activation mode is chosen per workflow, not as a firm-wide rule.

7A. Pilot Safeguards

For this pilot, malformed, ambiguous, missing, or out-of-scope requests are expected to fail closed rather than pass silently. SEAL may govern the designated workflow, but it does not draft, file, or submit anything on its own. The firm remains responsible for monitoring its own queues and treating unexpected approval or refusal patterns as signals to investigate, not as a substitute for human supervision.

8. What This Pilot Does Not Do

This pilot does not:

- replace drafting tools
- replace matter, identity, or GRC systems
- grant Thinking OS control over legal judgment
- authorize SEAL to file, send, or submit anything on its own
- expand beyond the designated workflow without written agreement

SEAL can govern the action boundary. It does not practice law. It does not replace attorney judgment.

9. Workflow Owner and Pilot Contacts

Named workflow owner: [Name / Title]

This person is accountable for operational scope, escalation, and pilot review on the participant side.

Executive sponsor: [Name / Title]

Risk / GC / Compliance contact: [Name / Title]

IT / Security / Workflow contact: [Name / Title]

Thinking OS pilot lead: [Name / Title]

No pilot should run without one named workflow owner.

10. Systems and Integration Scope

In scope

- one designated workflow or integration path
- one designated final file / submit boundary
- one designated motion or submission type
- agreed metadata and authority inputs for the pilot

Out of scope

- broad production rollout
- direct replacement of filing systems
- unrelated practice groups
- unrelated motion families
- blanket firm-wide enforcement

The pilot is intended to be bounded, not transformative.

11. Governed Outcomes

For requests in scope, SEAL may return:

- **Approve**
- **Refuse**
- **Supervised Override**

Each governed outcome produces a reviewable decision artifact for the pilot workflow.

12. Pilot Success Metrics

Success will be evaluated against a small, disciplined set of criteria:

- the firm can clearly identify whether the in-scope workflow was approved, refused, or supervised
- wrong-authority / role-not-authorized requests are consistently identified in the pilot workflow
- decision artifacts are legible to the workflow owner and risk reviewers
- the artifact story and observed workflow behavior tell the same story
- no uncontrolled expansion of scope occurs during the pilot
- the participant can make a clear go / no-go decision on whether to continue, enforce, narrow, or stop

Optional participant-specific metrics may be added below:

- _____

13. Artifact Review Cadence

Recommended cadence: [Weekly]

Each review should examine:

- governed approvals in scope
- governed refusals in scope
- supervised outcomes, if used
- any mismatches between expected and returned outcome
- any operational issues affecting the designated workflow

Primary reviewers

- workflow owner
- risk / GC / compliance contact
- practice lead or designee
- Thinking OS pilot lead

The goal of review is not to inspect runtime internals. The goal is to determine whether the governed outcomes match the firm's intended authority posture for the pilot workflow.

14. Rollback and Pause Conditions

The participant may pause, narrow, or stop the pilot if any of the following occurs:

- the pilot begins affecting workflows outside agreed scope
- the participant determines the designated workflow is not ready for the selected posture
- artifact outputs are not sufficient for pilot review
- the participant wants to revert from enforcement to observe-only
- operational risk is judged too high by the workflow owner or executive sponsor
- either party determines continued pilot operation is no longer appropriate within agreed scope

On rollback or pause:

- the pilot workflow returns to the participant's prior process
- no broader workflow change is implied
- no firm-wide dependency is created by pilot participation

Rollback is treated as controlled containment, not as a breach or failure.

15. Responsibilities

The participant remains responsible for:

- policies and authority rules
- identity and role sources
- matter and workflow selection
- supervision decisions
- legal judgment and professional responsibility
- how the firm practices law

Thinking OS remains responsible for:

- operation of the governance runtime within agreed pilot scope
- faithful return of governed outcomes for the pilot workflow
- production of reviewable decision artifacts
- runtime security, integrity, and availability within agreed scope
- bounded support for the pilot integration path

This pilot does not transfer legal judgment or practice control to Thinking OS.

16. Duration

Pilot start date: []

Pilot review date: []

Pilot end date or renewal decision date: [_____]

The pilot is temporary, bounded, and reversible. Any broader or ongoing use requires separate agreement.

17. Pilot Outcome Decision

At the end of the pilot, the participant may choose one of the following:

- stop the pilot
- continue in observe-only mode

- continue in active enforcement for the same workflow
- add one additional refusal family
- expand to one additional workflow under a separate amendment
- move to a broader licensed enforcement discussion

The pilot does not obligate expansion.

Any broader or production use of SEAL requires a separate licensed enforcement agreement and formal review.

18. Sign-Off

Participant

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Thinking OS

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____