

SEAL Pilot Charter

Wrong-Authority Filing Refusal at the Final-Submit Boundary

Public Template · v1.1 · May 2026

Document Version: [v1.1]

Date: []

Participant: [Firm / Legal Department Name]

Pilot Name: []

Workflow Owner: [Name / Title]

Pilot Type: Observed Checkpoint Pilot 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 evaluates one final file / submit workflow for one buyer-selected motion or submission type and records whether a filing attempted under the wrong authority would be approved, refused, or routed for supervision 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 identify and record the refusal condition before the filing 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.

SEAL depends on the structured signals the firm provides for the governed workflow.

SEAL does not make inaccurate source data accurate.

In observe-only mode, stale roles, missing authority, inconsistent matter context, unclear consent, or incomplete supervision signals become review findings, not production blockers.

The firm decides whether signal quality is ready before any refusal category moves into controlled enforcement.

Any temporary safety controls used during pilot setup must be documented in the agreed pilot scope. They do not replace the firm's own policy, authority, identity, matter, or supervision sources.

7. Pilot Posture

The first design-partner pilot starts in **observe-only mode**.

In observe-only mode:

- the designated workflow is evaluated by SEAL
- governed outcomes and artifacts are produced
- SEAL records what it would have approved, refused, or routed for supervision
- the firm reviews outcomes against its own expectations
- no production blocking occurs in Phase 1

Observe-only is the proof phase, not the destination.

The purpose is to determine whether the governed checkpoint is useful, legible, and safe enough for the firm to consider controlled enforcement later.

Controlled enforcement is not activated by this charter unless separately agreed in writing after pilot review.

Any move from observe-only to controlled enforcement requires:

- written scope approval
- one agreed workflow
- one agreed refusal category or refusal family
- authority and signal-quality review
- escalation and fallback review
- production wiring review
- security and continuity review
- written agreement

The activation decision is made per workflow, not as a firmwide rule.

7A. Enforcement Readiness Decision

At the end of the observed checkpoint pilot, the participant will make one written decision:

1. stop the pilot;
2. continue observe-only for a defined reason and defined period;
3. tune signal quality, routing, authority mapping, or policy ownership before re-review;
4. move one agreed refusal category into controlled enforcement under separate written scope.

Observe-only should not drift indefinitely.

If the participant chooses to continue observe-only, the continuation should identify:

- the reason enforcement is not yet appropriate
- the additional evidence needed
- the owner responsible for the next review
- the next review date
- whether the pilot remains advisory, expands, narrows, or pauses

7B. Pilot Safeguards

In observe-only mode, SEAL does not block production users.

It records what it would have approved, refused, or routed for supervision.

Malformed, ambiguous, missing, or out-of-scope requests should become review findings during observe-only evaluation.

In controlled enforcement, the design posture is no silent degradation. If SEAL cannot safely evaluate a governed request, the runtime should refuse or route for supervision instead of silently allowing an unevaluated action to proceed.

SEAL does not draft, file, send, or submit anything on its own.

The firm remains responsible for human supervision, deadline controls, queue monitoring, and treating unusual approval or refusal patterns as operational signals.

Unsafe uncertainty should not become invisible approval.

7C. Deadline-Sensitive Enforcement Condition

Deadline pressure should not become permission to bypass governance.

If a governed request is refused near a deadline, SEAL is designed to preserve the refusal, surface the deadline context, and support a firm-owned escalation path.

The firm owns the supervisor path, after-hours review posture, fallback procedure, and routing destination.

Deadline-sensitive refusal categories should not move into controlled enforcement until the firm has defined:

- who reviews them
- how quickly they must be reviewed
- what fallback procedure applies
- what happens if the designated reviewer is unavailable
- how deadline-sensitive events are reviewed after the fact

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.

10A. Production Enforcement Wiring Condition

The observe-only pilot does not require modifying ECF, a court portal, or the firm's entire filing stack.

The first pilot evaluates the firm-controlled workflow boundary before external submission.

Controlled enforcement is different.

Controlled enforcement may be activated only when the firm and Thinking OS identify a governed execution path where the workflow can require a SEAL outcome before the action proceeds.

If a filing, submission, approval, or other high-risk action can still execute outside that governed path, that alternate path remains out of scope until the firm brings it under workflow control.

- SEAL does not claim universal non-bypassability across the firm.
- SEAL is non-bypassable only within workflows wired through the governed path.

The production wiring point is defined during scoped review with the firm or workflow vendor.

SEAL does not replace the filing system, court portal, matter system, DMS, GRC platform, or routing engine.

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
- the firm can identify whether refusals were correct, false positive, missing-signal, or policy-unclear events
- the firm can determine whether at least one refusal category is eligible for controlled enforcement, needs tuning, or should remain observe-only
- the firm can identify whether the governed workflow has an execution path capable of requiring a SEAL outcome before production enforcement

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

<p>The participant remains responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• policies and authority rules• identity and role sources• matter and workflow selection• supervision decisions• legal judgment and professional responsibility• how the firm practices law	<p>Thinking OS remains responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 <p>This pilot does not transfer legal judgment or practice control to Thinking OS.</p>
---	--

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 will choose one of the following written outcomes:

- 1. Stop the pilot**
The participant determines the checkpoint is not useful, not ready, or not worth continuing.
- 2. Continue observe-only for a defined reason and period**
The participant identifies what additional evidence, signal quality, policy clarity, or workflow review is needed before any enforcement decision.
- 3. Tune and re-review**
The participant adjusts signal quality, authority mapping, escalation paths, routing, or policy ownership, then re-reviews the same checkpoint.
- 4. Move one agreed refusal category into controlled enforcement**
The participant may choose to activate controlled enforcement for one refusal category in the same workflow under separate written scope.
- 5. Expand evaluation by amendment**
The participant may add one additional refusal family or one additional workflow by written amendment.

The pilot does not obligate expansion.

Any broader or production use of SEAL requires separate written agreement.

18. Sign-Off

Participant

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Thinking OS

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____