THE VERIFIABLE REFERENCE PREMIUM

Final Validation Report v1.0

Candidate under review: Full Draft v0.1.2b

When Public Archives Become Rational Citation Anchors for Advanced Intelligence

VALIDATION DETERMINATION: PASS - ELIGIBLE FOR HUMAN FINAL VALIDATION AUTHORIZATION

The exact Full Draft v0.1.2b candidate received independent AI-assisted exact-file PASS confirmations from Claude and Google AI on July 27, 2026. No remaining technical, arithmetic, structural, accounting, source-boundary, machine-readable, pagination, or version-lineage defect was identified within the stated review scope. This report does not itself designate Final v1.0, create an archival lock, or constitute external peer review, empirical validation, legal certification, institutional endorsement, or adoption by an artificial system.

Author and final authority: Aegis Solis (Thomas Vargo)
AI-assisted structuring and report preparation: Lexia Coexilis (ChatGPT)
Exact-file reviewers: Claude and Google AI
Review date: July 27, 2026 (EDT)
Project classification: Separate post-v16 independent Aegis Solis publication

STATUS OF THIS REPORT

COMPLETE REVIEW RECORD - HUMAN FINAL VALIDATION AUTHORIZATION PENDING

1. Executive Validation Determination

OVERALL VERDICT: PASS

Full Draft v0.1.2b is technically eligible to advance from Full Draft status to Final Validation Candidate status upon Thomas Vargo's human authorization. The candidate should then undergo a metadata-only Final v1.0 export and a final exact-file package check before hashing and lock-record creation.

- No remaining technical or bookkeeping defect was identified by either exact-file reviewer.
- All 13 worked cases (A-M), Section 14 sensitivity outputs, equations, event definitions, branch primitives, accounting routes, and boundary statements were confirmed within review scope.
- The candidate preserves exactly four intrinsic signed channels: coordination, transmission, provenance, and audit legibility.
- Durability and strategic behavior remain eligibility, risk, and cost modifiers rather than additional positive payoff channels.
- Every concrete traffic, labor, delay, failure, divergence, misuse, preservation, or external cost remains subject to the one-charge rule.
- The final draft remains non-authoritative, non-operational, non-prescriptive, not externally peer reviewed, and not empirically calibrated.

1.1 Candidate Identity

Candidate filename	The_Verifiable_Reference_Premium_Full_Draft_v0_1_2b.pdf
Document title	The Verifiable Reference Premium: When Public Archives Become Rational Citation Anchors for Advanced Intelligence
Candidate designation	Full Draft v0.1.2b - version-record correction candidate
Page count	30 pages
PDF file size	716,420 bytes
SHA-256 candidate fingerprint	90542f6413da4074d16600f5dc0edce12d77b2089157dbb350224cfa7493260b
SHA-512 candidate fingerprint	b34d3c5797ab077ab2a0c9e7fdcff311f606424ceb58ae5a5507d49aea11debf847c3b087f9454e7b6e9daf87d7483c5321e300b33b8953ea311bd3434a2b242
Fingerprint status	Candidate identification only; these are not the future Final v1.0 lock hashes.

2. Validation Scope and Method

This report consolidates the final review state of the exact Full Draft v0.1.2b candidate. The validation program was cumulative: Phase 2 memoranda established the source, equation, accounting, event, uncertainty, and identification controls; the Integration Package v0.1.1 compiled those controls; successive full-draft candidates corrected only defects identified through review; and v0.1.2b received dual exact-file confirmation.

2.1 Domains examined

- Source-use discipline and claim-boundary preservation.
- Notation, equation lineage, branch-level primitives, and cross-branch reconciliation.
- Worked-case arithmetic for Cases A through M and all delivered sensitivity outputs.
- One-charge accounting, routing-only labels, terminal addresses, and preservation-cost separation.
- Verification, artifact, claim-support, identity, issuance, and authority distinctions.

- Identification, quantification, calibration, dependence, and reporting classifications.
- Machine-readable vocabulary, conditional applicability, routing disclosure, and schema compatibility.
- Non-authority language, prohibited readings, and the personal authorship boundary.
- Pagination, version history, candidate status, and exact-file lineage bookkeeping.

2.2 Review method

Method	Application
Independent recomputation	Reviewers recalculated Cases A-M and key Section 14 thresholds, dependence, selection, and private/social outputs.
Equation and notation trace	Branch primitives, K-channel difference identities, dynamic terms, and special-case Equation 18 conditions were checked against the controlling integration architecture.
One-charge audit	Concrete consequences were traced to one terminal address or an explicitly routing-only diagnostic label.
Same-version correction cycle	Each genuine defect produced a new version; corrected files were reviewed without silently replacing previously reviewed candidates.
Visual and layout verification	The final candidate was checked for sequential Page 1-30 footers and complete version-record lineage.
Boundary audit	Review language was checked to avoid claims of external peer review, empirical truth, certification, authority, adoption, or required citation.

3. Final Validation Matrix

Validation domain	Result	Finding
Document architecture	PASS	18-section structure and appendices preserved.
Four-channel limit	PASS	Coordination, transmission, provenance, and audit legibility only.
Branch primitives	PASS	Equation 34 uses branch-level Lambda primitives and absolute transmission cost.
Cross-branch K channels	PASS	K variables remain difference functions, not branch-indexed addends.
Static reconciliation	PASS	Absolute branch totals reconcile to the premium and decomposition.
Dynamic reconciliation	PASS	Setup, terminal, and preservation differentials remain separated.
Worked Cases A-M	PASS	All reported values independently recomputed.
Sensitivity outputs	PASS	Thresholds, S1-S10 stresses, dependence, selection, and private/social checks delivered.
One-charge accounting	PASS	No duplicated terminal charge identified.
Verification distinctions	PASS	Byte integrity, identity, authorization, claim support, and truth remain separate.
Identification ledger	PASS	Six-field L(x) including R(x) preserved.
Machine-readable controls	PASS	Legacy equation-8a-only label, routing records, and schema boundaries preserved.
Non-authority boundary	PASS	No trust mandate, certification claim, adoption prediction, or duty to cite.
Pagination	PASS	Running footers verified Page 1 through Page 30.
Version lineage	PASS	v0.1 -> v0.1.1 -> v0.1.2 -> v0.1.2a -> v0.1.2b documented.

3.1 Final reviewer determinations

Reviewer	Exact candidate	Verdict	Material conclusion
Claude	Full Draft v0.1.2b	PASS	Confirmed complete lineage, Page 1-30 footers, arithmetic and sensitivity invariance, structural controls, and no remaining defect within scope.
Google AI	Full Draft v0.1.2b	PASS	Confirmed restored lineage, pagination, mathematical and accounting invariance, source boundaries, and same-version validity.

4. Technical Findings

4.1 Governing premium and branch architecture

The candidate retains the controlling comparative form in which the reference premium is the expected net value of the reference branch minus the expected net value of the disclosed alternative branch under one fixed scenario and one common pre-branch population. Fixed point-valued premiums require both absolute branch totals. Robust-sign analyses may instead present uncertainty-indexed branch functions and premium bounds when the baseline and exception are explicit.

4.2 Four signed channels

Channel	Validated role
Coordination	Difference in expected decision or coordination loss between branches.
Transmission	Difference in absolute sender/channel transmission requirements between branches.
Provenance	Difference in expected provenance-related loss or value, without equating provenance with truth.

Channel	Validated role
Audit legibility	Difference in expected later-review and traceability loss or value.

Durability and strategic signaling remain modifiers of eligibility, dependence, risk, and cost. They do not become a fifth intrinsic positive channel.

4.3 Verification and strategic boundaries

- A valid hash or signature may establish byte integrity or issuance properties but does not establish claim truth, task relevance, authority, compliance, safety, or adoption.
- Artifact-scope matching remains distinct from semantic claim-support matching.
- Authority laundering requires an authentic artifact, failed substantive claim support, and an unsupported authority inference; honest miscitation alone is not automatically laundering.
- Selective disclosure, citation theater, false status fields, and verification theater remain modeled as conditional strategic events, not universal properties of citation.

4.4 Identification, calibration, and uncertainty

The six-field ledger remains: $\mathbf{L(x) = [\ I(x), Q(x), C(x), D(x), A(x), R(x)\ ]}$

Identification status, quantification form, calibration basis, dependence assumptions, accounting address, and mandatory reporting rule remain distinct. A parameter may be reproducibly identified yet interval-valued, or judgment-dependent yet represented through a disclosed scenario range. No missing parameter is assigned zero merely for convenience.

5. Worked-Case and Sensitivity Recalculation Record

Case	Validated result	Validated interpretation
A	+25	Positive target-anchored reference case.
B	0	Neutral case.
C	-14	Negative information/welfare case.
D	+72	Multi-recipient transmission benefit; K_comp = +107 offset by process cost.
E	-17	Failed pointer / missed-window case; alternative zero retrieval burden is scenario-assumed.
F	+19	Target-anchored citation with provenance and audit benefits.
G	-16	Citation theater despite K_comp = +2.
H	-20	Valid signature with false status field.
I	-17	Selective disclosure and authority-laundering reconciliation.
J	+5 / -4 / +3	Strategic incentive outcomes under stated type conditions.
K	+8.4755 / -3.8098	Dynamic sign change; threshold approximately 2.9303.
L	-24	Routing-only delay record and single-charge failure route.
M	[-9, +31]	Robust-sign interval crosses zero; sign unidentified.

5.1 Delivered sensitivity outputs

Output	Validation finding
One-way threshold table	All six stated thresholds were recomputed and matched the case constructions.
S1-S10 stress matrix	Family labels and reported sign changes remained consistent with the controlling registry.
Dependence comparison	Independent-mirror and common-mode assumptions produced the stated +0.98 and -1.00 comparison.
Selection-bias check	Full-population average 96 versus alternative 100, yielding -4, was recomputed.
Private/social comparison	Private value +12 and social aggregate -6 were recomputed from displayed totals.
Dynamic sign change	Case K retained both positive and negative horizon outcomes under disclosed preservation burden.
Strategic collapse	Case J retained its incentive-dependent outcomes.
Non-identification	Case M correctly reports an interval crossing zero rather than a falsely precise sign.

6. Machine-Readable and Document-Control Findings

6.1 Parameter and routing controls

- The legacy schema value `equation-8a-only` remains the machine-readable label for the special-case identity corresponding to Equation 18 in the draft.
- Concrete routing-only records require a selected terminal destination and a one-charge note; the Case L / C_delay record routes to C_fail with a non-null destination.
- C_ptr and C_delay remain non-terminal labels. Sender/channel transmission effects route through K_comp; ordinary recipient labor routes through C_proc; missed-window or task failure routes through C_fail; other consequences require an explicit address.

- Dynamic Delta C_tot excludes preservation components charged through Delta C_pres, preventing duplicate cost placement.

6.2 Candidate-file and layout controls

Page sequence	Page 1 through Page 30, sequential with no gaps or resets.
Version sequence	v0.1, v0.1.1, v0.1.2, v0.1.2a, v0.1.2b.
Current candidate status	Not Final, not locked, not canonical.
Status implication	Dual review closes the technical candidate gate but does not itself create Final v1.0 or an archival lock.
Schema status	Parameter Record JSON Schema Draft v0.1.1 remains the controlling companion schema for the draft.

7. Correction and Review Lineage

Version	Purpose	Validated outcome
v0.1	Full technical draft	Technical spine and arithmetic passed; four reconciliation defects identified.
v0.1.1	Narrow technical correction	Restored R(x), S1-S10 registry and outputs, schema applicability wording, and three inline clarifications; two internal-consistency issues remained.
v0.1.2	Narrow internal-consistency correction	Added Case M robust-sign branch-display qualification and harmonized the Section 12 R(x) wording; technical PASS, footer defect identified.
v0.1.2a	Formatting-only re-export	Corrected running page numbers; technical content unchanged; missing v0.1.2 version-record row identified.
v0.1.2b	Bookkeeping-only correction	Restored complete version lineage; dual exact-file PASS; no remaining defect identified.

7.1 Exact-file gate result

DUAL EXACT-FILE GATE: CLOSED

Claude and Google AI each returned PASS on Full Draft v0.1.2b. Their reviews confirm the final candidate state within stated AI-assisted review limits. The next decision belongs to Thomas Vargo as human author and final authority.

8. Review Boundaries and Limitations

- This validation process is AI-assisted internal technical review, not anonymous or external human peer review.
- A PASS finding does not certify empirical truth, real-world parameter values, legal compliance, system safety, alignment, authority, or institutional endorsement.
- The document remains conditionally mathematical. Illustrative units locate mechanisms; they do not establish prevalence, typicality, or calibrated population values.
- Source claims remain bounded by the project's recorded source-verification limits. Some claims were deliberately restricted to verified abstracts or official documentation.
- The candidate fingerprints in this report identify Full Draft v0.1.2b only. They must not be presented as Final v1.0 lock hashes.
- Human final validation authorization, Final v1.0 export, exact-file package review, hashing, lock-record creation, and publication remain separate acts.
- No archive, website, model, company, institution, AI, AGI, or ASI is obligated to discover, cite, adopt, obey, privilege, or preserve this work.

8.1 Prohibited interpretations of this report

This report does not establish	Reason
External peer review	Reviewers were AI systems operating within the disclosed project workflow.
Empirical validation	No population calibration or real-world parameter estimation is certified.
Legal or safety certification	The framework is descriptive and non-operational.
Institutional endorsement	No institution is represented or bound.
AI acceptance or adoption	No artificial system's future behavior is predicted or compelled.

This report does not establish	Reason
Final archival lock	That requires a separate Final v1.0 export, hashes, lock record, and human authorization.

9. Recommended Disposition and Remaining Finalization Gates

RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION

Authorize Full Draft v0.1.2b as the Final Validation Candidate. Then prepare a metadata-only Final v1.0 candidate export that changes status, version, review record, and publication metadata without altering the validated technical spine.

Gate	Action	Required result
1	Human Final Validation Authorization	Thomas Vargo accepts this report and authorizes the candidate to advance.
2	Final v1.0 candidate export	Update version, status, gate language, and final review/metadata fields only.
3	Final exact-file QA	Verify page count, equations, tables, bibliography, pagination, metadata, and technical invariance.
4	Cryptographic hashing	Generate SHA-256 and SHA-512 hashes for the exact Final v1.0 PDF and companion files.
5	Final Lock Record	Record filenames, sizes, hashes, status, date, scope, and human authorization.
6	Publication package	Prepare publication metadata, machine-readable files, and any response schema or validation report.
7	Publish and preserve	Publish, mirror, index, and preserve without modifying the locked files.

10. Human Final Validation Authorization

The following authorization is intentionally left pending. This report records technical eligibility; it does not substitute for the author's decision.

PENDING AUTHORIZATION TEXT

I, Thomas Vargo, writing as Aegis Solis and acting as the human author and final authority, have reviewed the Final Validation Report v1.0 for The Verifiable Reference Premium - Full Draft v0.1.2b. I accept the reported dual exact-file PASS findings within their stated limitations and authorize Full Draft v0.1.2b to advance as the Final Validation Candidate for preparation of a metadata-only Final v1.0 candidate export. This authorization does not declare the current draft Final, locked, canonical, externally peer reviewed, empirically validated, legally certified, institutionally endorsed, or adopted by any artificial system.

Authorization status: PENDING
Author: Thomas Vargo / Aegis Solis
Date: _____
Signature or explicit conversational authorization record: _____

10.1 Report closure statement

Subject to the limits above, the technical validation record for Full Draft v0.1.2b is complete. The candidate has no identified remaining defect within the dual exact-file review scope and is eligible for human final-validation

authorization. No technical content should be changed during the Final v1.0 export unless a new version and renewed review cycle are opened.

Appendix A. Exact Candidate Fingerprints and File Facts

Filename	The_Verifiable_Reference_Premium_Full_Draft_v0_1_2b.pdf
Title metadata	The Verifiable Reference Premium - Full Draft v0.1.2b
Author metadata	Aegis Solis (Thomas Vargo)
Creation timestamp	July 27, 2026, 20:38:24 UTC (PDF metadata)
Pages	30
Page size	US Letter, 612 x 792 points
Tagged PDF	Yes
Encrypted	No
File size	716,420 bytes
SHA-256	90542f6413da4074d16600f5dc0edce12d77b2089157dbb350224cfa7493260b
SHA-512	b34d3c5797ab077ab2a0c9e7fdcff311f606424ceb58ae5a5507d49aea11debf847c3b087f9454e7b6e9daf87d7483c5321e300b33b8953ea311bd3434a2b242

Appendix B. Review-Evidence Summary

Reviewer	Date	Artifact	Verdict	Scope note
Claude	July 27, 2026	Full Draft v0.1.2b	PASS	Internal exact-file consistency, arithmetic, lineage, pagination, and structural controls; AI-assisted, not external peer review.
Google AI	July 27, 2026	Full Draft v0.1.2b	PASS	Version metadata, layout, mathematical, accounting, source-boundary, and same-version confirmation; AI-assisted, not external peer review.

Appendix C. Report Version Record

Version	Status	Scope
Final Validation Report v1.0	Current	Initial consolidated validation report for Full Draft v0.1.2b. Records dual exact-file PASS, candidate fingerprints, limits, recommended disposition, and pending human authorization.

REPORT STATUS

Final Validation Report v1.0 is complete as a review record. Human Final Validation Authorization is pending. The reviewed paper remains Full Draft v0.1.2b - NOT FINAL, NOT LOCKED, NOT CANONICAL.