

FIELD COMPANION

TRANSFORMATIONAL LABORATORIES FIELD COMPANION v1.0

A Progressive-Disclosure Implementation Aid
for Inhabitable, Life-Grounded and Non-Dominating Praxis

A subordinate implementation aid to the deposited Transformational Laboratories Protocol v1.0

Bichara Sahely

Independent Scholar and Physician | ORCID 0000-0001-8671-532X

Version 1.0 | 3 September 2026 | CC BY 4.0

STATUS

Operational companion for testing. Protocol v1.0 remains unchanged and controlling. This document does not authorize a Transformational Laboratory or any material intervention.

Contents and reading pathways

Use the document navigation pane or the links below. The layers are designed for progressive disclosure; read only as deeply as your decision and role require.

[Status, authority and safe use](#)

[Progressive disclosure](#)

[The constitutional floor](#)

[Affected-community rights and authority](#)

[Role-specific pathways](#)

[Documentation proportionate to risk](#)

[Administrative-burden allocation](#)

[Responsible urgency](#)

[Active AI oversight](#)

[Dual-channel rupture and repair](#)

[Operational metabolism](#)

[Field pack](#)

[Canonical record, disclosure and versioning](#)

Status, authority and safe use

STATUS AND AUTHORITY

Transformational Laboratories Protocol v1.0 remains the governing constitutional and methodological record (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.22230642). This Field Companion is a subordinate implementation aid. It neither amends the Protocol nor independently authorizes a Transformational Laboratory. Where the two differ, Protocol v1.0 controls.

This Companion is not an eighth canonical work, a Transformational Study, a new logical level, a new risk tier, a new gate or an additional recursive grammar. The seven works remain F1–F3 and T1–T4. The nested logical architecture remains unchanged. Living coordination remains a necessary but insufficient cross-cutting affective-relational substrate.

Applicable law, research ethics, professional duties, Indigenous rights, environmental review and democratic authorization remain controlling. Every real proposal still requires the site-specific Charter, authority, safeguards, evidence, data and AI governance, remedy, stopping and closure arrangements required by Protocol v1.0.

What this Companion changes

It changes the accessibility and operational usability of the Protocol—not its constitutional floor. It helps people find what they need, understand rights and duties, allocate documentary labour, act responsibly under time pressure, oversee AI in practice, respond to rupture and measure the burden produced by the Protocol itself.

FIELD-USE RULE

A short card may orient a decision; it may never serve as consent, authorization, clearance or proof of readiness. Every consequential entry must point to the controlled underlying record.

Progressive disclosure

The following are reading depths, not architectural levels or procedural gates. Progressive disclosure reduces navigational burden; it does not dilute authority, rights, safeguards, evidence integrity, remedy or stopping capacity.

Reading depth	Purpose	Go here
30 seconds	See the non-negotiable floor, red lines and reason not to act.	Before-action card
3 minutes	Locate the present decision, authority, tier, urgency and next gate.	Decision orientation
30 minutes	Follow your role and select the required documentation depth.	Role and tier pathways

Reading depth	Purpose	Go here
Several hours	Allocate work, complete instruments and rehearse the workflow.	Field pack
Scholarly depth	Read the full constitutional, methodological and evidentiary record.	Protocol v1.0

30-second before-action card

NON-AUTHORIZATION WARNING

Nothing on this card authorizes material action. A red finding in a non-negotiable domain is no-go; amber in a non-negotiable domain cannot authorize action. G0 qualification is not G3 safe-to-act or G4 authorization.

- Name the avoidable life-grounded injury, supported by affected testimony and credible evidence.
- Bound the place, people, institutions, mechanism, intervention, duration, authority, data and consequence perimeter.
- Confirm legitimate, plural and resourced affected-community authority and an accountable duty-bearing institution.
- State the causal proposition, serious rivals and evidence that could weaken, falsify or stop it.
- Fund protective margins, safe refusal and exit, remedy, stopping capacity and residual duties before action.
- Constitute a fit boundary institution and genuinely independent safeguards and review function.
- Obtain distinct host and affected-community keys, plus individual consent, data authorization and external clearance where required.
- Make dissent, harm, null results, failure and anomaly capable of changing action and entering a versioned record.

3-minute decision orientation

1. Is this a preparatory candidate, or has it validly qualified at G0?
2. What is the present operating gate, G0–G6, and what decisions are available there?
3. What is the highest credible exposure and therefore the provisional risk tier?
4. Who is directly affected, who carries new burdens and who or what is absent from the room?
5. Who holds each distinct authorization, concurrence, consent, clearance and data decision?
6. What harms may follow from action, and what harms may follow from delay or inaction?
7. What protection is already owed under existing duties, regardless of experimental authorization?

8. What evidence is essential now, who prepares it, who verifies it, who pays and when does the decision expire?
9. Is AI involved; is the use consequential; can a genuinely equivalent non-AI route be used?
10. What would require protection, redesign, pause, termination, repair or a new G0 cycle?

The constitutional floor

Two recursive grammars—different functions

META-LEARNING / CIVILIZATIONAL LEARNING LOOP

Sense → Interpret → Evaluate → Act/Transform → Observe Consequences → Repair → Learn/Reconfigure ∪
The higher-order loop governs how a Laboratory and the wider project encounter consequences and revise themselves.

HEALING / INTERVENTION GRAMMAR

Recognition → Diagnosis → Protection → Repair → Transformation → Regeneration → Learning ∪
The inner praxis prevents transformation from bypassing recognition, protection or completed repair.

No third grammar is added here. Phases, gates, cards and worksheets are operating aids inside the two existing grammars; they are not changes to the architecture.

Living coordination

Living coordination is the recurrent, embodied and power-aware capacity to preserve dignity and standing, surface conflict truthfully, coordinate care and action across difference, and revise the coordination itself in light of consequences. It is necessary but insufficient: material resources, enforceable rights, competent institutions, ecological viability and legitimate authority remain indispensable.

- **It is not consensus or harmony.** Anger, grief, refusal and visible conflict may mean suppressed reality has gained standing.
- **It is not compulsory trust.** Institutions bear the burden of becoming demonstrably trustworthy.
- **It is not therapy or coercive civility.** Structural injustice is not a communication defect; justified anger must not be tone-policed.
- **It is not friendliness without change.** Evidence must reach conduct, authority, resource flows, protection or institutions.
- **It is not a score.** Assess a disaggregated profile; warmth cannot compensate for coercion, retaliation, rights loss or domination.

ANTI-COERCION RULE

Never classify a person or constituency as unready because of anger, mistrust, refusal, disability, communication style, internal disagreement, unwillingness to forgive or preference for distance. Locate the repair need in the institutional, material, power or procedural condition and name the duty-bearer.

Q1–Q10 qualification criteria applied at G0

Criterion	Minimum question for the field record
Q1 • Life-grounded problem	Is a named avoidable injury or organized life-disconnection supported by affected testimony and credible evidence?
Q2 • Bounded setting	Are place, people, institutions, mechanism, intervention, duration, authority, data and consequence perimeter sufficiently defined?
Q3 • Affected-community authority	Can a legitimate, plural and resourced affected body shape framing, burdens, indicators, interpretation, pause, remedy and renewal?
Q4 • Duty-bearing institution	Does at least one responsible institution possess relevant authority, resources, obligations and operational capacity?
Q5 • Inquiry/intervention fitness	Are the bounded causal proposition, serious rivals, feasible action and supporting, weakening and falsifying observations explicit?
Q6 • Protective margins	Are material, legal, relational, ecological, epistemic and institutional buffers specified and funded before intervention?
Q7 • Refusal, exit, grievance, remedy	Are the routes understandable, safe, independent where needed and usable without disproportionate penalty?
Q8 • Living-coordination readiness	Do minimum conditions for truthful participation exist, or is only a protection-first preparatory phase authorized?
Q9a • Boundary institution fitness	Are translation, record carriage, accessibility and cross-boundary coordination mandated, funded, correctable and accountable?
Q9b • Independent review fitness	Does an independent reviewer have protected funding, direct access, confidential channels, appeal and temporary-pause authority?
Q10 • Corrigibility/public learning	Will evidence, dissent, null findings, harms, repairs, closure and theory revision enter a versioned record?

THRESHOLD, NOT SCORE

Q1–Q10 are qualification criteria applied at G0. They are not ten gates and cannot be averaged. A candidate remains preparatory until every essential criterion is met.

G0–G6 operating gate map

Gate	Question	Available decision
G0 • Qualification	Do Q1–Q10 and the red-line screen justify candidature?	Qualify / remediate / decline
G1 • Readiness	Are authority, Charter, representation, boundary and review arrangements constituted?	Go / repair / no-go

Gate	Question	Available decision
G2 • Diagnostic sufficiency	Are mechanism, rivals, baseline, no-intervention path and uncertainties adequate?	Investigate / redesign / proceed
G3 • Safe-to-act	Are protective margins, remedy, approvals and every non-negotiable domain green?	Authorize staging / condition / stop
G4 • Act	Is the final specified intervention trained, dry-run, bounded and authorized?	Begin / modify / reject
G5 • Consequence review	Do current effects, grievances, margins, deviations and burden shifts permit continuation?	Continue / adapt / pause / terminate
G6 • Close/reconfigure	Are closure, handback, residual duties and learning complete?	Close / new candidate / new G0

G3 certifies that the proposed action could be safe under the specified conditions. G4 authorizes the final specified intervention and no other action. A G0 qualification finding never substitutes for either decision.

Red lines and non-negotiable domains

- Coerced, deceived or materially compelled participation; withholding established protection, care, rights or necessities for leverage.
- Plausible catastrophic, uncontrollable or substantially irreversible harm; retaliation, intimidation, forced disclosure or unsafe exit.
- Covert manipulation, surveillance, psychographic targeting or biometric emotion inference.
- Predetermined success, suppressed adverse findings or sponsor control of publication.
- No accountable duty-bearer or credible remedy; no meaningful protection for dissenters, internal minorities or absent interests.
- Diagnosis of an essentialized people, identity or culture as the pathology.
- Predictable export of severe avoidable burdens to other groups, places, species or generations.
- Proprietary limits preventing audit, correction, remedy, exit or safety disclosure.
- AI holding political, ethical, diagnostic, consent, grievance, sanction or continuation authority.
- Continuation after authorization is lost, a mandatory pause threshold is crossed or the cycle sunsets.

NO-GO DOMAINS

Red in affected-community authority, refusal and exit, protective margins, remedy, independent review or non-displacement cannot be offset. These domains must be green before material launch.

Affected-community rights and authority

Affected-Community Rights Card

If you are directly affected, you have the right to:

- Be recognized as a person or constituency with standing, never as an experimental object.
- Receive accessible, timely information in forms and languages you can use.
- Help define the injury, question, boundary, burden, indicator and remedy.
- Choose or affirm plural, recallable and compensated representatives, including internally marginalized and directly burdened groups.
- Receive accessibility support, care replacement and independent legal or technical advice where participation is burdensome.
- Correct facts, contest interpretation and append an unedited dissent or minority report.
- Give, withhold or withdraw individual consent where required; withhold or withdraw collective authorization within a verified mandate.
- Refuse, exit or complain without losing ordinary services, employment, benefits, rights or remedy.
- Raise an alert and obtain documented review; use a representative's authorized temporary-pause route.
- Use free, confidential, assisted and non-digital grievance routes, with interim protection, written reasons, appeal and external remedies.
- Know when and how AI is used, obtain an accessible explanation, correct relevant records and use a non-AI route.
- Participate in renewal, closure, handback and residual-duty decisions within the applicable mandate.

CONSENT WARNING

Attendance, silence, dependency, public notice, sponsor approval, essential-service use or an inaccessible signature is not consent. Refusing the Laboratory must not reduce ordinary care or protection.

Affected-Community Authority Card

Affected authority includes	Affected authority does not
Co-define the question and co-author the Charter.	Waive individual legal or ethical rights.
Shape budgets, burdens, protective margins, indicators and interpretation.	Replace individual consent for person-directed action or identifiable data.
Require correction, investigation or independent review.	Replace institutional, legal, ethics or safeguards authorization.

Affected authority includes	Affected authority does not
Trigger an authorized temporary pause.	Displace Indigenous governance or free, prior and informed consent.
Concur before a material burden is imposed on the constituency expected to bear it.	Bind people beyond the body's verified mandate.
Authorize or withhold renewal and closure within the mandate.	Absorb institutional duties, liability or administrative labour.

AUTHORITY IS NOT PAPERWORK

Affected people supply meaning, correction, authorization and judgment. Funded administrative support prepares, translates, formats and carries the record. Complexity follows power, resources and duty—not vulnerability.

Distinct and non-fungible authorizations

Decision source	What it governs	Cannot be replaced by
Individual informed consent	Direct participation, person-directed intervention and identifiable data where applicable.	Collective vote, host approval or attendance
Collective authorization	Changes affecting a community, institution or shared setting within a verified mandate.	Individual consent or sponsor permission
Burden-bearing concurrence	Acceptance of a material burden by the constituency expected to carry it.	Overall forum majority
Institutional/legal authorization	Lawful exercise of public, professional and organizational powers.	Community authorization alone
Independent clearance	Ethics and safeguards fitness proportionate to risk.	Implementer or sponsor self-review
Data/knowledge authorization	Collection, linkage, processing, AI use, publication, retention and deletion.	De-identification alone

A material intervention requires both the legitimate host/public-institution key and the properly constituted affected-community key. Direct participation may additionally require individual consent. Independent clearance remains separate.

Role-specific pathways

Read the row for your role first, then the rows for the roles that can challenge or constrain you. Small settings may combine compatible administrative functions, but community authority, implementation and independent review may not be concentrated.

Role	Act / decide	Must receive	Must not do
Directly affected participant	Decide participation; report consequences; correct records.	Accessible information, support, safe refusal, non-AI route, remedy.	Carry unpaid institutional administration or be compelled into relational disclosure.
Affected Constituencies Forum	Co-frame; authorize; shape burdens/indicators; interpret; pause; renew/close.	Compensation, access, advice, full decision record.	Waive individual rights or represent beyond mandate.
Responsible Institution	Hold lawful authority, resources, duties, repair and residual obligations.	Clear mandate and consequence record.	Transfer liability or ordinary duties to the project/community.
Stewardship Team	Implement only the authorized envelope; record decisions, deviations and effects.	Training, resources and operational authority.	Adjudicate complaints against itself or become sole evaluator.
Boundary Institution	Carry standing, knowledge, records, decisions, corrections and dissent across boundaries.	Mandate, funding, access and correction duties.	Certify itself, adjudicate its complaints or absorb unfunded institutional duty.
Independent Safeguards/Review	Inspect; hear appeals; require protection/repair; pause, suspend or terminate.	Protected funding, access, tenure and publication rights.	Depend on favourable results or implementer approval.
Inquiry/Evaluation Team	Maintain baseline, mechanisms, rivals, indicators and negative findings.	Access and independence sufficient to contradict sponsors.	Treat rank as evidence or claim unwarranted attribution.
Living-Coordination Convenor	Support voluntary power-aware participation and relational repair.	Independence, support and a bypass complaint route.	Police emotion, compel contact, manufacture consensus or adjudicate.
Data and AI Steward	Govern provenance, access, security, correction, retention and AI use.	Technical/procurement access and vendor independence.	Confer authority on AI or approve an unreviewed material change.
Future/Absent-Interests Guardian	Represent diffuse, ecological and intergenerational consequences.	Evidence access and challenge rights.	Claim to replace directly affected constituencies.
Sponsor/Funder	Resource the work through a non-interference firewall.	Transparent budgets and risk information.	Override refusal, pause, adverse publication or closure duty.
External Challenge Panel	Test rivals, burden shifts, capture, methods and transfer claims.	Timely evidence access and responses.	Substitute technical expertise for legitimacy.

Living-coordination pathway

- Ask whether less-powerful participants can contradict authority without losing service, status or livelihood.
- Track whose testimony changed a diagnosis, duty, resource, rule or interpretation—not only who attended.
- Make agenda, budget, pause, appeal and correction rights visible.
- Record relational, care, time and emotional labour and fund it; do not call uncompensated care ‘engagement.’
- Keep minority reports and unresolved disagreement attached to decisions.

- Treat broken commitments as triggers for acknowledgement, material repair and institutional change.
- Do not infer readiness, consent, credibility or safety from sentiment, emotion or biometric data.

Documentation proportionate to risk

INVARIANT FLOOR

Risk determines documentary depth, review intensity and monitoring frequency. It never changes the constitutional floor. 'Streamlined' means integrated, non-duplicative and proportionate—not missing authority, protection, remedy, evidence integrity, independent review or stopping capacity. 'Not applicable' requires a reason.

Tier	Highest credible exposure	Documentation and review depth
Tier 0	Observation, relationship-building, mapping or simulation; no material intervention beyond ordinary practice.	Public Candidate Note; preliminary affectedness/power/risk/living-coordination scan; Q1–Q10 profile; red-line screen; preliminary legal/ethics/regulatory classification; basic privacy/representation record; rehearsal log. Remains preparatory.
Tier 1	Low-risk, reversible process or coordination changes with limited material exposure.	Full site Charter and core controlled dossier; constituted authority; compact; power map; claim/rivals; safeguards/remedy/stop plan; evidence and data/AI records; gate, consequence, deviation and closure records; site review.
Tier 2	Moderate institutional, livelihood, service, relational, data or ecological effects; vulnerable groups or meaningful redistribution.	Tier 1 record plus domain risk analysis; enhanced quantified margins; independently verified remedy reserve; real-time sentinels; frequent gates; subgroup/distribution analysis; stronger ethics/legal review; adversarial analysis and expanded AI controls.
Tier 3	Potentially serious or partly irreversible rights, health, livelihood, conflict, ecological, infrastructure or high-stakes AI exposure.	Full specialist technical/legal/regulatory/ethics dossier; robust insurance or equivalent remedy; exceptional causal warrant; independent specialist monitoring; high-frequency review and detailed transition plan. Not eligible as an initial MVL.
Prohibited	Catastrophic, uncontrollable, substantially irreversible, coercive, retaliatory, covertly manipulative or machine-sovereign practice.	No implementation packet may authorize it. Record decline, reasons, immediate protection/referral duties, residual risks and non-experimental alternatives.

The highest credible exposure governs. Missing evidence cannot lower the tier and must raise it when the unresolved scenario includes serious or irreversible harm. Consequential AI still requires a per-use Appendix K record even when other documentation is integrated.

Decision packet by depth

Packet	Use	Minimum components
Orientation front	All readers	Status/authority warning; rights card; present decision; current gate/tier; contact and urgent protection route.
G0 candidate packet	Qualification or remediation	Candidate Note; Q1–Q10; red lines; affectedness and duty map; tier rationale; legal/ethics screen; burden/latency record; unresolved issues.
Core operating dossier	Tier 1+	Charter; authority matrix; living-coordination compact; mechanism/rivals; safeguards/remedy/stopping; evidence; data/AI; gate and consequence records.

Packet	Use	Minimum components
Enhanced risk annex	Tier 2+	Domain risk and subgroup analysis; quantified margins; sentinel plan; reserve; independent/adversarial reviews; frequent decision calendar.
Specialist dossier	Tier 3 only	Specialist approvals, technical assurance, insurance/remedy, transition and high-frequency independent monitoring.
Public learning record	Every cycle/decline	Decision, reasons, limits, dissent, anomaly, harms, repairs, unresolved issues, closure/handback and transfer bar.

Documentation simplification rules

1. Enter information once and carry it forward by controlled reference.
2. Use one versioned source of truth with visible ownership, changes, expiry and unresolved actions.
3. Collect testimony once where possible; never require repeated narration merely because institutions have separate systems.
4. Separate who supplies evidence, prepares, records, verifies and authorizes.
5. Provide assisted, oral, accessible and non-digital routes.
6. Use plain-language fronts and technical annexes; page count is not adequacy.
7. Log the time and cost of every record, including correction, translation and review.
8. Retire fields that do not alter a decision, protection, interpretation or public accountability, subject to Protocol and controlling requirements.

Administrative-burden allocation

ALLOCATION PRINCIPLE

The institution exercising authority and proposing change bears the default responsibility for funding and administration. Affected authority is decision power—not paperwork dumping. Unpaid or donated labour is never costed at zero.

Work item	Primary preparer / owner	Affected role	Independent check / payer
Candidate Note	Boundary secretariat; host supplies institutional evidence.	Paid correction of injury framing and scope; no drafting duty.	Safeguards review; host/sponsor firewall funds.
Affectedness and power map	Boundary staff + independent community organizer/evaluator.	Identify omissions and burden pathways through accessible paid participation.	Affected body + safeguards verify; host funds.
Rights/authority card	Safeguards office + accessible-communications specialist.	Approve language, formats, translations and routes.	Affected body verifies; host funds.
Charter and authority matrix	Stewardship/boundary support drafts controlled record.	Co-author and separately authorize within mandate.	Legal/safeguards review; host funds advice and access.

Work item	Primary preparer / owner	Affected role	Independent check / payer
Q1–Q10 packet	Secretariat assembles; each institution supplies its evidence.	Challenge claims and retain authorization—not institutional clerical work.	Independent reviewer; duty-bearing institutions fund.
Living-Coordination Compact	Convenor + boundary support provide accessible drafting.	Voluntarily co-author safety, dissent, labour and repair conditions.	Safeguards review; host funds support.
Mechanism/rival/evidence registers	Evaluation team.	Shape meaningful outcomes and contest interpretation.	External/independent challenge; research/host budget.
Safeguards/remedy/stopping	Host risk lead + stewardship support.	Define unacceptable burdens and usable routes.	Independent approval; ring-fenced remedy funds.
Data/AI use record	Data and AI steward; provider supplies technical facts.	Review accessible summary; authorize applicable use; test non-AI route.	Independent technical/safeguards check; AI-using institution pays.
Meeting/minority records	Boundary secretariat.	Correct own contribution; append dissent; no minutes duty by default.	Convenor/forum verifies; host funds.
Grievance/remedy file	Independent grievance administrator.	Oral, assisted, confidential and non-digital entry; report once.	Appeal authority; ring-fenced administration/remedy.
Operational Metabolism Ledger	Boundary secretariat collects; evaluator analyzes.	Interpret burden patterns; optional low-burden reporting.	Independent audit; Laboratory budget.
Public learning/closure	Boundary + evaluation + responsible institution.	Factual review; interpretation/dissent; closure decision within mandate.	Independent publication/closure check; host funds.

Required ownership fields

Every controlled work item names: source-holder; preparer; recorder; accountable duty-bearer; affected-community verifier or co-author; independent verifier; required approver; administrative support; expected time and burden; funding; version; expiry; confidentiality; and unresolved actions.

Burden escalation and redesign triggers

- Affected people or caregivers become the default bridge, recorder, error-corrector or repeated narrator.
- A reviewer lacks protected time, source access or authority to disagree.
- Administration displaces ordinary care, service, community work or independent review.
- The same fact, consent, testimony or authorization is requested by multiple owners without need.
- Translation, disability access, care replacement or non-digital access adds unowned queue time.
- A gate condition has no owner, evidence requirement, deadline, expiry or escalation route.
- Paperwork grows without a documented decision, safeguard or public-accountability contribution.

RESPONSE TO OVERLOAD

Redesign, integrate records, add support, resource the duty-bearer or revise timing. Do not pressure affected people, frontline staff or reviewers to absorb the excess. A simplified form must not remove a constitutional requirement.

Responsible urgency

Responsible urgency applies Protocol §17 dual-error governance and §25 protection/pause duties under time pressure. It is not a new gate, tier or grammar. Delay can protect against overreach but also preserve preventable injury; speed can reduce status-quo harm but also bypass authority and safeguards.

Protection clock	Authorization clock	Learning clock
Starts when credible harm or urgent need becomes known. Existing care, rights, emergency response and professional duties continue.	Starts when a complete request for a novel material change reaches the authorized gate. Queue, review, repair and decision time are separated.	Tracks consequences of action, inaction and procedural delay, including who bears them and whether interim protection worked.

Responsible-urgency rules

1. **Continue established protection.** Care, rights, services, emergency response and professional duties are never withheld while a Laboratory decision is pending.
2. **Stabilize before experimenting.** Use lawful ordinary-duty protection for immediate harm; do not relabel it experimental authorization.
3. **Expedite the same safeguards.** Shorten queues and handoffs, not authority, two-key entry, independent review, no-go rules, G3 or G4.
4. **Prefer the least-dominating reversible measure.** Choose the narrowest lawful interim action with explicit scope, review and sunset.
5. **Start a visible clock.** Record first awareness, complete submission, queue, active review, evidence repair, decision and accountable owner.
6. **Let affected people invoke both directions.** Those endangered by action may slow or pause it; those harmed by inaction may accelerate protection and review.
7. **Do not buy speed with hidden labour.** No expedited pathway may depend on unpaid participant administration, inaccessible deadlines or reviewer overload.
8. **Prevent stalling.** Non-response triggers escalation, a reason, a new deadline, delay-harm review and substitute capacity where lawful.

9. **Measure delay harm.** The no-intervention trajectory and injuries accumulating during review enter the decision record.
10. **Review after urgency.** Interim action receives retrospective independent review, correction, remedy and public reasons.

PROTOCOL REMEDY TIMES REMAIN CONTROLLING

Urgent protection requests must be acted on within 24 hours; other claims acknowledged within two business days; an initial reasoned determination issued within ten business days unless law requires sooner. Any other time target in a site plan is testable local guidance, not a Protocol amendment.

Responsible-Urgency Record

Field	Entry
Harm / exposure	What prompted urgency; who is exposed; who requested action; date/time first known.
Existing duty	Care, legal, professional or protection duty that proceeds without experimental authorization.
Proposed change	What is novel or material; risk tier; required gates and authorizers.
Dual-error comparison	Harm of action; harm of inaction/delay; who bears each; uncertainty.
Interim protection	Narrowest lawful measure; why least dominating; service-continuity plan.
Clock	Queue time; active review; evidence-repair time; owner; deadline; escalation; expiry.
Delay consequences	Observed or credible harm while waiting; interim mitigation; causal uncertainty.
Decision	Reasons; dissent; conditions; sunset; next review; correction/remedy.

Active AI oversight

CAPABILITY WITHOUT AUTHORITY

AI may assist synthesis, translation, pattern detection, scenario modelling, accessibility, institutional memory, anomaly detection, burden-shift analysis and adversarial testing. It cannot determine consent, standing, legitimacy, acceptable burden, grievance, remedy, risk acceptance, a gate decision or treatment of a person.

Before consequential use

- Classify whether the output could influence diagnosis, prioritization, resources, burden, eligibility, risk, monitoring, evaluation, gate evidence, reporting or treatment.
- Create one Appendix K record per dataset–system–version–use case; name the accountable person and institution.

- Confirm data authority, security, purpose, provenance, retention, deletion, portability and collective-harm protections.
- State the decision AI may inform and every decision it may never make.
- Establish an equivalent, funded and usable non-AI route; compare time, access, quality and consequence.
- Give reviewers competence, source access, protected time, workload limits and authority to disagree.
- Predefine serious rivals, subgroup/failure modes, sampling, reconstruction and incident triggers.
- Use synthetic or known-answer sandbox tests. Never seed false variables into live records.

During use

- Inspect authoritative source evidence; a signature on polished output is not meaningful control.
- Require at least one serious counter-hypothesis, including institutional, infrastructural and burden-displacement mechanisms.
- Directly verify critical health, rights, service, identity and resource fields.
- Independently reconstruct a risk-based sample; expand sampling after serious anomaly.
- Log significant outputs, corrections, overrides, unresolved disagreement, reviewer time and resulting decisions.
- Monitor automation bias, disparate error, reviewer fatigue, queue pressure and burden shifted to affected people.
- Provide accessible explanation, correction, appeal and non-AI participation.
- Suspend use if traceability, review capacity, security, authorization or non-AI access fails.

After use, incident or change

- Assess errors, affected challenges, burdens, energy/material implications and harms already caused.
- Repair model, data, workflow, vendor relationship and institutional incentive where causally relevant.
- Test export, deletion, record portability and vendor exit.
- Automatically suspend consequential use after a material model, provider, data-source, retrieval, prompt-workflow or deployment change until renewed Appendix K review.

Functional non-sovereignty test

Test	Evidence required
Answerability	A named person and institution can explain and answer for the consequential use.
Meaningful control	Reviewer has knowledge, source evidence, protected time, workload capacity and power to disagree.
Public counter-capacity	Affected people can understand, correct, appeal and use a genuinely equivalent non-AI path.
Non-delegation	AI does not decide rights, legitimacy, consent, burden, grievance, remedy, pause, continuation or closure.
Reconstructability	The decision can be reconstructed from authoritative evidence without hidden machine judgment.
Exit	Authorized institutions can stop the system without losing the public record or essential service.

Dual-channel rupture and repair

This pathway operationalizes existing protection, grievance, remedy and repair duties. It is not an additional grammar. A person may choose either channel, both, move between them or use external remedies. Relational work never displaces protection, due process, liability or structural correction.

Voluntary relational channel	Formal protection and remedy channel
Separately consented; participant chooses whether, when, with whom and in what format.	Free, accessible and independently administered; confidential and non-digital routes available.
May support listening, acknowledgment, changed interaction, re-negotiated roles and relational restitution.	Provides interim protection, investigation, reasoned decision, correction/remedy and appeal.
No forced contact, disclosure, recording, mediation, apology, forgiveness, reconciliation or emotional performance.	Compatible with courts, regulators, professional bodies and other external remedies.
Convenor supports process but never adjudicates; complaints about convenor bypass convenor.	Complained-against party and relational convenor cannot adjudicate.
Minimal record: consent, safeguards, agreed material changes and status.	Protected record sufficient for due process, accountability, recurrence prevention and appeal.

Shared safeguards

- Safety and protection triage occurs regardless of channel choice; urgent protection and filing deadlines are never delayed.
- Using one route never waives the other, ordinary rights, claims or external remedies.
- Information crosses channels only with explicit authority, except where a controlling safety duty requires disclosure.
- Serious harm, retaliation, mandatory-pause conditions and systemic hazards cannot be hidden through private settlement.

- Relational repair is incomplete when the injury requires resource, role, policy, data, authority or institutional change.
- Agreement is not the only valid outcome: safe separation, protective distance and recorded unresolved disagreement may be appropriate.

Affected-person choice card

A rupture has occurred. What do you want now?

- Immediate safety or interim protection.
- Confidential advice before choosing a route.
- Voluntary relational response.
- Formal grievance, investigation and remedy.
- Both routes, with stated information boundaries.
- External legal, regulatory, professional or community remedy.
- No further contact except essential notices.

CHOICE REMAINS REVISABLE

You may change your route. The decision must not affect ordinary services, rights, standing or protection. Serious safety information may still trigger controlling protection and reporting duties, which must be explained.

Operational metabolism

The Protocol's procedures are themselves interventions. They consume time, money, attention, care, data and institutional capacity. They may protect people, but may also delay action, displace labour or reproduce domination. Their burden and safeguard contribution therefore enter the evidence cube across time, scale and perspective.

NO EFFICIENCY SCORE

Report a disaggregated operational-burden profile. Never use a total score, apparent low safeguard yield or time pressure to compensate for a rights, authority, remedy or protective-margin failure.

Measure	Minimum record	Burden guard
Time	Contact, preparation, administration, review, meeting, rework and waiting hours by role and paid/unpaid status.	System/staff logs; do not ask affected people to reconstruct institutional delay.
Cost	Direct spend; valued labour; compensation; access/translation; travel; care replacement; technology; review; remedy; opportunity cost.	Donated/unpaid labour is recorded, never priced at zero.
Comprehension	Item-level explain-back, format/language, time/help required, unclear points and redesign.	Unclear means institution must redesign —not person is unfit.

Measure	Minimum record	Burden guard
Paperwork ownership	Record, preparer, verifier, approver, hours, duplication, rework, assistance and compensation.	Report affected/uncompensated share separately.
Participant burden	Meetings, time, travel, income/care disruption, digital/access load, retelling, emotional/relational labour, attrition.	One optional low-burden reporting route; no penalty for declining.
Reviewer workload	Cases/pages/sources, active hours, protected time, context switches, queue/backlog and clarification cycles.	Workload ceiling and escalation; reviewer must be able to refuse unsafe load.
Gate latency	Submission, completeness, queue, review, repair and decision times with cause and owner.	Separate protective deliberation from stalling/obstruction.
Safeguard value	Defect/hazard/rights failure caught; severity; decision changed; protection added; false alarm; resource cost; participant judgment.	Narrative severity retained; not monetized return on investment.
Unresolved disagreement	Issue, standing, positions, power, evidence, decision effect, minority report, status and next review.	No forced consensus or silent closure.
Harm caused by delay	Continuing injury, exposed group, duration, severity, reversibility, confidence and interim protection.	Track status-quo and procedure-caused harm separately.
AI oversight burden	Review minutes, source checks, reconstruction, corrections, overrides, disagreements, appeals and change-control time.	Affected person is not the AI quality-control worker.
Rupture/remedy	Time to protection, route chosen, retelling, remedy completion, recurrence and retaliation signals.	Relational/formal channels reported separately.

Evidence-status tag

Tag	Meaning
Directly observed	Recorded during the stated rehearsal or activity with source and timestamp.
Scenario-estimated	Explicit planning assumption or modeled range; not treated as empirical observation.
Proxy-derived	Calculated from an identified proxy whose limits are stated.
Not measured	No valid evidence exists; do not infer or replace with simulated testimony.

Comprehension prompts

Use explain-back, not a literacy or compliance test. Ask the person, if they wish, to explain:

1. What is being considered now, and what has not been authorized?
2. What can you shape, approve, refuse, challenge or pause?
3. What happens if you say no, leave or complain?
4. What are the principal risks of action and delay?
5. Is AI used; what does it not decide; can you use a non-AI route?
6. Who makes the next decision, by when and through which appeal route?
7. Who completes the paperwork and pays the participation costs?

Record each item as clear / partial / unclear / prefers not to answer, plus assistance and redesign. Disaggregate by role, language, disability, dependency and burden exposure. Do not average away the least-understood or most-burdened group.

Burden profile without a composite score

Status	Meaning
Green	Bounded, resourced, compensated where appropriate, accessible, fairly allocated and linked to identifiable decision/safeguard value.
Amber	Rising, concentrated on less-resourced roles, duplicative, unclear or delaying; owner, repair, resource and review date required.
Red	Obstructs rights or understanding; makes authority ceremonial; coerces unpaid work; overwhelms review; displaces care; conceals delay harm; or blocks refusal/remedy.

Field pack

Copy or reproduce these compact sheets inside the site's controlled record. Each sheet is a front to the relevant Protocol appendix, not a substitute. Add recorder, owner, verifier, approver, date, version, expiry, confidentiality and unresolved actions to every completed record.

Sheet A • Tier 0 tabletop rehearsal

Item	Rehearsal entry
Candidate	Working name; injury; setting; explicit Tier 0 exclusions.
Decision episodes	Invitation/affectedness; G0 Q1–Q10; urgency event; AI use; rupture; illustrative disposition; burden review.
For each episode	Decision; authorized roles; records used; time/cost; comprehension; paperwork owner; participant/reviewer burden; safeguard contribution; delay/harm; disagreement.
Evidence status	Directly observed / scenario-estimated / proxy-derived / not measured.
Verdict boundary	Interface stress test only; no affected testimony, clearance, qualification or material authorization.

Sheet B • Administrative-burden record

Record / task	Source-holder	Preparer / recorder	Verifier / approver	Hours, cost, burden, support

Sheet C • Gate-latency and delay-harm record

Event	Time / owner	Reason / evidence	Who bears delay	Protection / escalation
First known				
Complete submission				
Queue				
Active review				
Evidence repair				
Decision / expiry				

Sheet D • AI active-oversight record

Control	Evidence / owner	Status and action
Dataset-system-version-use case		
Consequential-use classification		
Named human/institutional responsibility		
Source traceability and critical-field checks		
Reviewer competence, protected time and workload		
Rivals / counter-hypothesis		
Sampled reconstruction and incident triggers		
Accessible explanation, correction, appeal		
Equivalent non-AI route test		
Material-change suspension		

Sheet E • Rupture and repair choice / linkage

Field	Entry
Immediate protection requested/provided	

Field	Entry
Confidential advice requested	
Relational channel choice and consent	
Formal channel choice and intake	
External remedy / essential notice only	
Information allowed to cross channels	
Changed conduct, role, resource, rule or remedy	
Unresolved disagreement / next review	

Sheet F • Operational Metabolism Ledger

Measure	Status tag	Result by role/group	Owner / action
Time			
Cost			
Comprehension			
Paperwork ownership			
Participant burden			
Reviewer workload			
Gate latency			
Safeguard contribution			
Unresolved disagreement			
Harm caused by delay			
AI oversight burden			
Rupture / remedy			

Canonical record, disclosure and versioning

Canonical Protocol

Sahely, B. (2026). *Transformational Laboratories Protocol v1.0: From Civilizational Healing Theory to Bounded, Life-Grounded Praxis—with Living Coordination as the Necessary Affective-Relational Substrate*. Zenodo.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22230642>

This DOI identifies the deposited Protocol v1.0, not this Companion. Cite and preserve the canonical record when using any field sheet.

AI DISCLOSURE

The Field Companion was drafted and stress-tested with AI assistance under human direction. AI supported synthesis, adversarial role rehearsal, structure and document production; it did not provide affected-community testimony, consent, authorization, independent clearance or empirical validation. Bichara Sahely retains responsibility for scholarly judgment, publication and any future use. AI capability confers no political, ethical, legal or gate authority.

Versioning and evidence threshold

Companion v1.0 may be corrected and reissued as an implementation aid while keeping a visible version history. No change to Protocol v1.0 is proposed by this document. Protocol v1.1 should be considered only after real affected-community use, human comprehension testing, operational burden evidence, independent review and consequence data—not on synthetic rehearsal alone.

CLOSING TEST

This Companion succeeds only if it makes rigor more inhabitable without weakening protection; gives affected people effective standing without transferring institutional labour onto them; accelerates protection without authorizing reckless intervention; keeps AI capable but non-sovereign; preserves formal remedy alongside voluntary relational repair; and lets its own burdens and failures reconfigure practice.