Common Good News — Master Methodological Guide

The Register, the Classification Method, the Ask Index, and the Fulfilment Index

Version 2.1 — November 23, 2026

Status: Master reference edition (English). This document is the exhaustive methodological record of Common Good News. The methodology pages published on the Common Good News websites are summaries of this guide; where a summary and this guide differ, this guide governs, and the difference is recorded in the change log at §11.

Editor and publisher: Matthew Buechler, founder and editor, Common Good News, Russell, Ontario.

How to cite this guide: Common Good News. *Master Methodological Guide: The Register, the Classification Method, the Ask Index, and the Fulfilment Index.* Version 2.1, November 23, 2026. Russell, Ontario: Common Good News. Cite by section number (e.g., "Master Methodological Guide v2.1, §5.4"), because section numbers are stable across versions; page numbers are not.

How to submit a critique: Critiques, corrections, and challenges to any provision of this guide are invited. A critique should identify the section it addresses, state the provision as written, and give the evidence or authority relied on. Critiques are answered on the record; a critique that succeeds produces a dated correction in this guide and an entry in the change log (§11), never a silent edit. The standing address for methodological correspondence is the Common Good News contact address published on the website.

A note on register: This guide is written in a dry, technical register on purpose. It is the instrument, not the invitation. Public-facing explanations of the same method, written for neighbours, are published separately and carry no methodological authority.

Terminology discipline (standing rule): In this guide, every defined term is used in its full form, identically, every time. "Public Sector Universe" is never shortened. A defined term is never swapped for a near-synonym: *variable*, *category*, *indicator*, *flag*, and *weight* are five different things, and this guide does not interchange them.[1] Terms coined by Common Good News are entered as coinages and are never presented as canonical terms of any standards body (§8.4).

The editor's declaration, quoted at the head of this guide by the editor's ruling of November 22, 2026 (the About CGN adoption: the declaration stands on the About CGN front door directly under the blurb, and is quoted at the head of this guide). *For the Record — On Integrity*, dictated by Matthew Buechler, November 22, 2026:

> For the record.

> Common Good News is built in the open. Every question put to this house — how the website is built, how the money sits, how the music is chosen, what we call things and why — is answered the same way: through the lenses, on the record, with the workings shown.
>
> I have endeavoured in every way to bring the best integrity I can to those answers.
>
> The house itself is the experiment. What fruits it bears, it bears.

Contents

1. Purpose and scope
2. Sources of authority: the gold standards by discipline
3. The Docket: the register method
4. The classification method: the Public Sector Universe, the annex, Perimeter, and the Gray area flag
5. The Ask Index
6. The Fulfilment Index
7. The Three Questions: the layered framework
8. Adjacent named methods
9. Roles: the chairs, the Verifier, and the editor
10. Open points
11. Version and change control; the daily check; change log
12. The lenses and their standards
13. The methodology update of November 23, 2026 - Annex A. The Ask Index at a glance - Annex B. The classification variables at a glance - Annex C. Source documents for this guide

1. Purpose and scope

1.1 Purpose

This guide exists for three uses. First, it is the complete statement of method against which any Common Good News classification, grade, or index score can be audited: a reader holding this guide and the public record should be able to reproduce, or to refute, any judgement Common Good News has published. Second, it is the document handed to critics: the method is meant to be attacked in its strongest written form, and to improve under attack, on the record. Third, it is the reference that prevents drift: rulings made in working papers, conferrals, and the lexicon are consolidated here so that no nuance of the method lives only in a conversation.

1.2 Scope

This guide covers: (a) the Docket, the public register of questions, proposals, and council directives, and the grading of institutional responses (§3); (b) the classification method by which institutions are placed in relation to the Public Sector Universe (§4); (c) the Ask Index, which classifies asks by force and rates their quality at issuance (§5); (d) the Fulfilment Index, which grades what institutions did with the asks they received (§6); (e) the layered framework of the Three Questions within which all grading sits (§7); (f) adjacent named methods used inside the foregoing (§8); and (g) the roles and gates by which the method is operated (§9); and (h) the lenses and their standards — the chairs and their chains of authority, the weighting classes, the conferral rules, and the living-instrument provision (§12).

This guide does not cover editorial style, publishing operations, platform practice, or the internal organization of Common Good News, except where a rule governs method itself (for example, the proper-names verification check, §8.2, and the Lexicon Gate, §8.3).

Conformed November 22, 2026 (adoption conforming pass). Item (h) of the enumeration above was added at the adoption of §12; as first written, the enumeration ran through §9 only.

1.3 The standing posture

Common Good News works in the frame of **performance audit**, always. The independent examination of whether government undertakings, systems, operations, and organizations are performing in accordance with the principles of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness — and whether there is room for improvement. The unit of account is the undertaking: the mandate, the program, the promise. The citizen stands as principal; the institution is the agent; the verdict is read off the institution's own record — its mandate, its standards, its promises.[2] Of the three principles, effectiveness carries the weight, and its core question is the editor's: *effective for whom — the individual or the group?* The older frame, value-for-money audit, whose unit of account is the dollar and whose citizen is a customer checking a receipt, is not the frame of this house; the term appears in Common Good News copy only inside an institution's own name for its own work, quoted as titled.[3]

1.4 The register can fail in both directions

The classification method of §4 is built between two failures, and both are stated here because they govern every design choice that follows. Place a body where it does not belong, and every count it touches is corrupted. Leave a body off the map, and it answers to nobody — no entry, no door, no question that reaches it. Count a body twice, and the trail splits. The method's standing instruction is therefore double: miss nothing, and swallow nothing.

2. Sources of authority: the gold standards by discipline

2.1 The pillar structure

Common Good News does not invent its standards. For each discipline the method reconciles to a named control document — the discipline's gold standard — and, through it, to the wider framework. Where Common Good News departs from a pillar, the departure is recorded as a variance, never smoothed over (§8.3).

2.2 Statistics

The control document for statistical classification and government finance statistics is Statistics Canada's **Canadian Government Finance Statistics** framework. Common Good News concepts reconcile to the Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework first — it is the framework of the division in which the classification method's lineage sits — and only through it to the **Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014** of the International Monetary Fund and to the **System of National Accounts** of the United Nations.[4] The classification spine itself is Statistics Canada's **Guide to the Public Sector of Canada** (catalogue 12-589-X) and the published **Public Sector Universe** list (catalogue 68-516-X). Quality practice follows Statistics Canada's **Quality Assurance Framework** (catalogue 12-586-X) and **Quality Guidelines** (catalogue 12-539-X). Process practice follows the Generic Statistical Business Process Model, the international standard that names each step of statistical work so that every entry can say how it got there.

2.3 Auditing

The pillar order for auditing is: **INTOSAI** (the global pillar — the world body of supreme audit institutions, whose ISSAI framework is the global standards repository) → the **Auditor General of Canada** → the **Auditor General of Ontario** → the **Federation of Canadian Municipalities** at the local level, as a best-practices repository.[5] The performance audit definition at §1.3 is that of ISSAI 300. Follow-up practice — the grading of what institutions did with recommendations — follows the legislative audit tradition: the Auditor General of Canada's follow-up of its recommendations, the Auditor General of Ontario's grading of recommended actions, the United States Government Accountability Office recommendations system, and the United Kingdom Treasury Minute system (§3.2, §6.3).

2.4 Evaluation

The control document for evaluation — the discipline's ultimate reference document, ruled November 21, 2026 — is the **Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE) Program Evaluation Standards**. Beneath it sits the Canadian practice layer: the **Canadian Evaluation Society Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice**, which govern the practitioner and carry the Credentialed Evaluator designation; and the Canadian Evaluation Society **Guidance for Ethical Evaluation Practice** (2023), an ethics instrument, not a second standards book.[6] Outcome questions, where the record carries outcome evidence, are framed by the OECD Development Assistance Committee evaluation criteria (2019 revision) and the Treasury Board of Canada *Policy on Results* (2016) (§7).

2.5 Journalism and records

Journalism *(entered November 22, 2026, at the adoption of §12; §2.5 as first written covered records only)*. The journalism chain is: the **UNESCO Media Development Indicators** — the global pillar — → the **Journalism Trust Initiative** → the **Canadian Association of Journalists Ethics Guidelines** → the **National NewsMedia Council** → the **Qualified Canadian Journalism Organization** criteria at the Canadian ground. The chain is carried in full at §12.3 (the Journalist).

The register's records discipline is drawn from ISO 15489 and the Association of Records Managers and Administrators' Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles, and its assurance discipline from assurance-engagement practice in the spirit of CSAE 3000 (§3.9). No accounting standard templates a register — the Public Sector Accounting Board governs financial statements, not registers — and this guide claims none.

Living references *(entered November 22, 2026, on the editor's ruling, from the UNESCO re-run conferral of the same day — panel 8.6/10)*. The frameworks this guide adopts from outside the house — the UNESCO Media Development Indicators and the Five Laws of Media and Information Literacy among them — are held as living references: adopted by the house's own act, from its Canadian ground, conferring nothing on the house, and re-checked against their sources as they evolve, with the re-check standing in the daily check's named duties.

2.6 Law

The control documents for law are the **Constitution of Canada, including the Charter**, as interpreted by the **Supreme Court of Canada** — the final legal authority in Canada — then federal statutes and the Federal Courts, provincial statutes and courts, and municipal bylaws where a question is genuinely local. The global instruments — the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**, and the **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights**, with the international courts and treaty-body views — stand advisory: Canada is a dualist state, and treaties do not bind domestically until incorporated by legislation. The chain is stated deciding level first, under the house's weighting ruling (§12.4A), and is carried in full at §12.3 (the Legal chair).

3. The Docket: the register method

3.1 What the Docket is

The Docket is a public register of questions and proposals filed with institutions, and of what those institutions did next. Every entry carries the question or proposal exactly as filed, the institution, the date, a running clock, a status, and a dated note that grows as events occur. Nothing is removed when it is answered; decided entries are archived as the record of what happened.[7]

3.2 Models

The Docket borrows its discipline from four established models: (a) **legislative audit follow-up** — the Auditor General of Canada follows up its recommendations and grades progress against the significance and complexity of the issue and the time elapsed; provincial auditors general publish annual follow-up reports with status categories; (b) the **Government Accountability Office recommendations database** — every recommendation numbered and tracked publicly as open, closed — implemented, or closed — not implemented, so that a recommendation nobody acts on stays visibly open; (c) **petition clocks** — under the Auditor General Act, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development numbers every environmental petition and ministers must respond within 120 days; under House of Commons Standing Order 109, the government has 120 days to respond to a committee report; the deadline is not decoration, it is the accountability mechanism; (d) the **Treasury Minute** — the government formally responds to every Public Accounts Committee recommendation and reports progress against its own commitments; the response creates the commitment, and the follow-up tests it.

3.3 Kinds of entries

- **Question** — asks an institution for information or an explanation. It is complete when it is answered.
- **Proposal** — asks an institution to decide or to act. It is complete when it is decided, and, if adopted, when the decision is carried out.
- **Council Directive** — the institution's own instruction to its administration, drawn from the institution's own record (in municipal practice, the adopted direction recorded in the minutes). The directive, not the motion that produced it, is the tracked unit: the motion is the directive's genealogy (§7, Layer 2).

3.4 The lifecycle and the clock

Every entry moves through the same states: **Draft → Prepared → Filed → Waiting → Acknowledged → Answered / Decided → Assessed → Closed.**

- **Draft** — the entry exists in the register's working papers but has not been filed. It carries no clock and no status claim; it is a not-yet state, never read as filed or as answered.[8]
- **Prepared** — the entry is complete and ready to file, awaiting the act of filing itself. Still not on the record; the clock has not started.
- **Filed** — the entry has been sent and the filing is on the record (email thread, form confirmation, or delivery receipt).
- **Waiting** — no substantive reply yet. The entry shows days outstanding, counted from the filing date. The clock never stops and never resets quietly; any reset is itself recorded in the note.
- **Acknowledged** — the institution has confirmed receipt.
- **Answered / Decided** — a substantive response (for a Question) or a decision (for a Proposal) is on the record.
- **Assessed** — the response or decision has been graded under §3.5–§3.7.
- **Closed** — the entry is complete and archived as the record of what happened.

3.5 The follow-up ladder

Silence is handled by a published ladder, not by discretion. The ladder is the same for every institution, large or small, and an institution can end it at any time by answering.

1. **Day 30** (or the institution's own published service standard, if it has one) — **Follow-up 1:** a dated, on-the-record reminder that cites the original filing and asks for a response date.
2. **Day 60** — **Follow-up 2:** sent again, with the recipient's direct superior copied — a standing Common Good News rule for all institutional correspondence.
3. **Day 90** — the entry's status becomes **No response — N days**, and the silence is itself reported as the finding. The entry stays open and the clock keeps counting. Each further follow-up is logged in the note.

3.6 Axis One — Responsiveness: did they answer?

A response is graded on whether it answers what was asked. Five grades:

- **Full answer** — every part of the question is addressed, in terms a reader can check.
- **Partial answer** — some, but not all, of the question is answered. Partial is a family, not a shrug; the note must say which kind:
- *Partial — scope:* some questions in a multi-part filing answered, others not. The note names the unanswered parts.
- *Partial — evidence:* the question is answered but without the documents, figures, or records that would let a reader verify it.
- *Partial — commitment:* the institution answers and promises action, but names no owner or no date (see the completeness check, §3.8).
- *Partial — redirect:* the institution answers a different, easier question than the one filed. The note quotes the question asked beside the answer given.
- **Acknowledgement only** — receipt confirmed; no substantive content yet.
- **Non-answer** — a reply arrived, but it does not address the filing at all (a form letter, a restatement of policy, a refusal without reasons).
- **Silence** — no reply; graded by the clock and the ladder (§3.5).

3.7 Axis Two — Implementation: did they do what they said?

Responding and implementing are different things, and the Docket grades them separately. A full answer that promises action earns no implementation credit until the action happens. Implementation is graded on the filled-circle scale the Auditor General's status reports made familiar:

- ○ **Not started** — the commitment exists; nothing has been done. This is an assessed finding: the register has looked and found nothing done.
- ◔ **Early steps** — preparatory work only: a study commissioned, a file opened, a meeting held.
- ◖ **Halfway** — the work is substantially underway; roughly half the commitment, by its own terms, is delivered.

- ◕ **Nearly complete** — the substance is delivered; only finishing elements remain.
- ● **Done as committed** — the action was carried out as promised.
- ●✓ **Verified done** — completion confirmed from a public source independent of the institution's own say-so (a published document, a decision in minutes, the thing itself in place).
- **Not yet assessed** (no circle) — a commitment exists on the record but the implementation axis has not yet been assessed for it. This is a not-yet state, distinct from Not started: an unassessed commitment must never wear the ○.[9]

Implementation grades are re-assessed whenever new public evidence appears, and the note carries the date and source of every change. A commitment with a date that passes unmet is re-graded downward and the missed date is recorded — the institution's own deadline is the measure.

For Proposals, the decision axis applies first: **Adopted** · **Adopted in part** (the note specifies which part) · **Declined, with reasons** (a reasoned no closes an entry honourably) · **Declined, without reasons** · **Deferred, with a date** (the clock runs to that date) · **No decision** (the follow-up ladder applies). If adopted, implementation is then graded on Axis Two.

3.8 The completeness check

Every substantive response is also tested against four points, recorded in the note:

1. **Answered the question asked** — not a neighbouring one.
2. **Evidence provided** — documents, figures, or records a reader can check.
3. **An owner named** — a person or office responsible for what happens next.
4. **A date given** — for the next step, the decision, or the promised action.

A response can be warm, prompt, and courteous and still score one of four. The check is about content, not tone.

3.9 Evidence, grading discipline, and assurance

Grades rest only on the public record or on documents the institution itself provided: the filing, the reply, published minutes, posted decisions, dated correspondence. Every grade change is dated and sourced in the entry's note; a reader must be able to retrace every grade to its evidence. Tone is never graded. Speed is recorded (days to acknowledge, days to answer) but a fast non-answer grades as a non-answer. If an institution disputes a grade, the dispute is recorded in the note, and the grade is corrected if the evidence warrants it. Corrections are shown, dated, and sourced — never silently overwritten.

The register audits itself, under controls drawn from the disciplines it cites:[10]

- **Maker and checker.** No entry, grade, or link is published on a single pass. Every item is prepared, then independently re-checked against its source before it appears: the quotation read character-for-character against the minutes, the date against the document, the grade against the evidence quoted for it. Where the checker and the maker disagree, the item does not publish until the disagreement is resolved against the source.
- **Reconciliation — the tie-out.** After every council meeting, the register reconciles to the minutes the way accounts reconcile to a bank statement: the number of directives the minutes contain is counted, the number of

entries created is counted, and the two totals must agree. Any difference is explained in writing in the register's working papers before the meeting's entries publish. The same tie-out runs for citizen filings against the outbox record.

- **False-positive controls.** No grade above its evidence (an acknowledgement is never recorded as an answer). No paraphrase presented as a quotation. No status carried forward from a previous check without re-verification — a stale "no reply" is treated as unverified, never repeated as fact.
- **False-negative controls.** A standing sweep of each meeting's minutes, agendas, and published reports for directives, report-backs, and responses touching open entries; a periodic re-sweep of closed entries for late-arriving evidence; and a missed-item log — every item found late is logged with the reason it was missed, and the sweep that should have caught it is amended.
- **Error taxonomy.** Every error found, by anyone, is classified — *source error* (the record itself was wrong), *submission error* (a filing or its description was wrong), or *register error* (Common Good News's own) — and corrected under the rule above. A public corrections log is part of the register.
- **The publication gate.** Nothing appears on the Docket until it has passed the checklist this section implies: entry complete, quotation verified, dates verified, link basis stated, grade tied to quoted evidence, tie-out clear. The gate is the same for a one-line acknowledgement as for a front-page finding.

3.10 Names and anonymity

Your question goes public. Your name doesn't — unless you want it to.

- **Publicly anonymous** — always allowed. Entries show the institution, the question, the dates, and the status; the petitioner appears only as a descriptor ("a Russell veteran").
- **Known to Common Good News, hidden from the public** — the institution receives a named letter; the Docket entry stays anonymous.
- **Anonymous to everyone** — a tip, not a petition. It enters the Docket only when it is adopted and filed in the publisher's own name.

Public naming, where a name is published with consent, is by first name only.

3.11 The follow-through ledger

The register's unanswered business is not buried inside individual entries. The follow-through ledger practice — ruled for the Veterans News landing on November 22, 2026, and stated here as general method — places the register's asked-and-followed items at the head of the presentation, with the unanswered items visible at the top, before answered business. An institution reading its own page sees first what it has not answered. The ledger states the register's current counts (items filed, answered, open) and links each open item to its Docket entry, its clock, and its place on the follow-up ladder.

3.12 What the Docket is not

The Docket is not a court, an audit, or an access-to-information request, and it claims none of their powers. It cannot compel an answer. What it can do — what the audit follow-up model does at national scale — is make the

question, the clock, the answer, and the gap between promise and delivery permanently visible, in one place, in the open. Institutions are graded on their own words, by a published method, with the evidence attached.

3.13 Filing discipline that governs method

Two standing rules govern the filings the register tracks, and are recorded here because they determine what the register can grade. First, institutional correspondence is copied to the recipient's direct superior where known — the follow-up ladder's second rung (§3.5) is an application of the same rule. Second, every response an institution makes to a Common Good News filing receives a gracious follow-up, drafted the same day: people always receive courtesy; disagreement is with the record, never with the person. The follow-up is drafted, not sent, until the editor approves it. Tone is never graded (§3.9); courtesy is nonetheless owed, because the register's subject is the record, not the person keeping it.

3.14 The documentation threshold: when an idea becomes a record — PROPOSED November 23, 2026

Proposed November 23, 2026; the editor's ruling is pending. This provision is not in force. The model below was produced by a full-sweep conferral (the five lenses plus the Legal chair, Continuous Improvement, the Secretary seat, and the Translator) on the editor's commission of that morning (02:55 EST: *"Do we document even pre-draft formalizations? When does an idea actually get written down as something? What's the tipping point to actually make an archive of this?"*). It is entered here **as proposed**, under the same discipline as the proposed amendment at §9.6: it takes effect only on the editor's ruling. Record: *Documentation_Threshold_Brief_Nov23_2026.md*.

The finding the model answers. The house's work products are filed; its registers lag. Audited against the files on November 23, 2026: the Decisions Register's last entry was November 22, 19:44, and the Institutional Memory Log's November 22, 19:12, while some 46 itemized rulings, commissions, and records of November 22, 20:25 – November 23, 02:55 stood unregistered — and one surface, the Filings & Records Calendar, was not merely stale but wrong (it carried a send the editor had since put on standby; corrected the same morning, outside this guide). The failure was not drafting but threshold: everything arrived at the Secretary's layer at the same claimed weight, so under surge nothing got entered. The model gives each kind of material its own weight, so the light kinds stop queueing behind the heavy ones.

The five states. An idea is promoted on an observable event, never on a feeling about its importance.

1. **Heard** — *it was said.* It lives in the conversation transcript only. No action is taken and none is owed. Play lives here, protected.
2. **Flagged** — *it was said, and it might matter.* One line in the Institutional Memory Log, marked PENDING: date and time, **the founder's words verbatim** (no paraphrase — the Journalist's amendment), a source pointer, and the **language of source** (the Translator's amendment). Third-party identifiers enter as initials or role only, substance redacted, until a privacy check clears a fuller entry (the Legal chair's amendment).
3. **Filed** — *work or weight has attached to it.* Its own record, carrying a header block: date, source quotation, status, what it supersedes and what supersedes it, one home (the Placement Check), and a French-counterpart line (link, or *not yet*).

4. **Ruled** — *the founder decided.* A Decisions Register entry. Only an explicit tap, or a calm and explicit confirmation, promotes to Ruled; anything ruled in riff or in the small hours sits at Filed, marked PROPOSED, until confirmed — the house's existing meta-rule (§12.9) given a state to sit in.
5. **Codified** — *it changes future behaviour.* Entered, dated, in this guide, the Lexicon, or the standing files. One-off decisions stop at Ruled; codifying them is how doctrine inflates.

The tipping tests. Any one event promotes, one state at a time. *Heard → Flagged:* the founder names it important or says "document this" · a commission attaches · a name or term is coined · it touches money, rights, publication, or another person · it is mentioned a second time. *Flagged → Filed:* a commissioned work product exists · a second sitting works on it · a deadline, money, or an external party attaches · the founder asks "where is X?" *Filed → Ruled:* the founder's explicit tap, or calm explicit confirmation. *Ruled → Codified:* the ruling changes future behaviour — a gate, a method, a term, a standing instruction.

The pre-draft rule. Pre-draft formalizations — the shape an idea takes in conversation before any draft exists — **are recorded, at Flagged only.** The flag records that the idea was voiced and its shape; it expressly does not record that it is adopted, true, or even still wanted. The flag is a coat hook, not a frame. Tonight is the proof in both directions: the night's largest project and the panel's own name (§12.5A, proposed) existed only in conversation for their first hours, and a lost conversation would have left no hole shaped like them; and the play that produced them was play first, which filing-as-doctrine would chill.

Never promoted past Heard: pure riffing with no commission and no second mention · material the founder marks private · another person's private information. The archive does not turn play into doctrine, and it does not keep what was never the house's to keep.

Housekeeping that rides with the model. PENDING flags are reviewed at the weekly Secretary session; a flag unconfirmed after 30 days is marked *"resting — not a finding"* — never deleted, never silently promoted (the Not-Yet Rule, §4.7, applied to the archive itself). **The surge rule:** when PENDING arrears exceed ten, a catch-up sweep runs before new promotions, and while arrears stand over ten, only money, rights, and deadline items advance to Filed. A **weekly missed-flag audit** — one evening's transcript sampled against the Log, the miss rate reported on the face of the review — stands as the model's patch for its own weak seam: nothing else catches a flag skipped in the moment. Flagged and Filed records are internal working records — not findings, not admissions, not publication-ready evidence. The brief's crew further recommended that no new Codified entry be made until the November 22–23 arrears (46 itemized rows, the brief's Appendix A) are entered or marked resting; that recommendation is recorded here as part of the proposal, for the editor's ruling with the rest.

Scores and dissents. The model scored, out of 10, never totalled: Editor 8 · Journalist 7 · Neighbour 9 · Auditor 7 · Legal 8 · Secretary 7 · Continuous Improvement 8 · Translator 6 · Verifier 8. The Translator's 6 was scored against the model *before* its language amendments were folded in, and stands against the unamended model. The Auditor and the Editor jointly hold the arrears condition above. The Secretary's costing is kept with the model: one keeper can maintain this trace at normal volume; it breaks at surge and at judgement calls — detecting a second mention, separating riff from calm ruling — not at transcription. A trace heavier than this is a promise the house cannot keep.

4. The classification method: the Public Sector Universe, the annex, Perimeter, and the Gray area flag

4.1 Overview: two variables, one flag, one annex

Every institution in the register carries two variables and, where its basket has been read, one flag state.

- The first variable is **Economy**: which sector of the economy the body sits in, under the sector scheme of the System of National Accounts as implemented in Canada (§4.3).
- The second variable is **Perimeter**: where the unit stands in relation to the Public Sector Universe (§4.4).
- The **Gray area flag** records whether the unit's basket of indicators points both ways (§4.5).
- The **scope annex** carries onto the map the bodies that serve the public beyond the classification line (§4.8).

4.2 The spine: the Public Sector Universe

The register's reference spine is Statistics Canada's **Public Sector Universe**: the published universe of public sector units, listed annually (catalogue 68-516-X; the 2025 edition lists 6,037 active units with entry and exit dates — 27 fewer than the 2024 edition's 6,064), with its methodology in the *Guide to the Public Sector of Canada* (catalogue 12-589-X).[11] The spine is named, versioned, and argued in the open. Statistics Canada publishes sector classification decisions for public sector entities on its Public Sector Universe tool, released progressively on a standardized template, for entities assessed for the public side; units never assessed have no official decision on record.[12]

The classification sequence is Statistics Canada's documented sequence, in order: Is the unit resident? Is it an institutional unit — capable in its own right of owning assets, incurring liabilities, and engaging in transactions, with complete financial statements as the practical prerequisite? Is it government-controlled? Only then does the market test separate general government from public corporations (government business enterprises).[13]

4.3 The first variable: Economy

Statistics Canada sorts all resident economic life into sectors: non-financial corporations; financial corporations; general government; households; and non-profit institutions serving households. The register's presentation makes one change to the textbook, and records it as a presentation choice, not a new sector and not a change to the classification test: government business enterprises — Crown corporations and public utilities that sell what they make — are pulled out of the corporations and counted as a group of their own, because a ministry and a Crown corporation do not behave alike, and lumping them together hides how far the public arm actually reaches.[14]

"Non-profit" is a legal and organizational form, not a sector. Non-profit institutions are sorted by control and market status: a market producer that is autonomous sits in the corporations sector; a non-market producer controlled by government is classified to general government — inside the Public Sector Universe, embedded under the controlling level of government; a non-market producer not controlled by government, serving households or the community, sits in the non-profit institutions serving households sector — outside the Public Sector Universe.[15]

4.4 The second variable: Perimeter

Perimeter states where a unit stands in relation to the Public Sector Universe. It has exactly three values. The three values are **examination states, not sectors** — each value states what the register has done with the unit, and the printed form is:

- **In** — the unit is classified inside the Public Sector Universe. Printed form: *In [PSU]*.
- **Out** — the unit is classified outside the Public Sector Universe, and it is in the register: a known unit, examined, placed on the far side of the line. Printed form: *Out [PSU]*.
- **Private sector** — the unit belongs to the economy but stands outside the register's classification exercise: the register has not examined it yet. The value's plain-language gloss, ruled November 21, 2026, is **"not examined yet."** "Yet" carries the flux: the value is a state, not a verdict, and any unit can leave it the day the register examines it.[16]

The term *Private sector* is Statistics Canada's, adopted as defined: "all resident institutional units not controlled by government" (Canadian System of National Accounts glossary), a special aggregate, not one of the main sectors of the Canadian economy; the *Guide to the Public Sector of Canada* (12-589-X, Appendix F glossary) defines it as "a larger domain of statistical observation that aggregates all resident units not controlled by governments," households and non-profit institutions serving households included. The register's use carries a recorded variance: Statistics Canada's aggregate covers all resident units not controlled by government, including units the register has examined and placed Out. The register's *Private sector* value is therefore the **not-yet-examined remainder** of Statistics Canada's aggregate: examined non-controlled units take Out; the value Private sector is taken only by units the register has not examined yet. The register thus splits Statistics Canada's single residual into examined and not examined yet, a distinction the two published domains (public sector, private sector) cannot express.[17]

The naming history is part of the method and is preserved in Annex B and the lexicon: the value was ruled *Rest of the Economy* on November 20, 2026; renamed *Never Examined* on November 21, 2026 (20:37); and renamed *Private sector* the same evening (20:43), superseding both, on the manuals evidence — "rest of the economy" is prose-only in the 2025 SNA (¶30.177) and the Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 (¶1.13) and defined in neither, while *Private sector* is defined by Statistics Canada; and *Never Examined* was false in the manuals' world, because Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 ¶2.50 allocates all resident units to the sectors, so "never" asserted more than the register could know.[18]

4.5 The basket of indicators and the control test

Placement turns on **control**: government control of a unit means the ability to determine the general policy or programme of the unit.[19] Control is read from a **basket of indicators**. An indicator is one yes-or-no fact about one unit: qualitative in content, countable in handling. Indicators *indicate*; the facts carry no numbers, and a weight — where weights are used in the weighting research program (§4.9) — is a number assigned to a fact, never a property of the fact itself.[20]

The register's working basket is the six indicators of control in the *Guide to the Public Sector of Canada* (12-589-X, §4.2.2.4), in order:

1. **Legislation** — the unit was created by government legislation.

2. **Incorporation** — the unit was created under existing laws of incorporation.
3. **Policy** — the government determines the general policy or program of the unit.
4. **Board appointments** — the government appoints members to the board of directors.
5. **Binding agreement** — the government controls through a legally binding agreement.
6. **Asset reversion** — on liquidation or dissolution, the assets revert to a government.

Standing interpretive rules, from the framework itself: a single indicator can be sufficient in some cases; in others, several indicators collectively establish control. **General regulation is not control** — rules that apply to every unit carrying on the same activity do not amount to control over an individual unit. **Financing alone is not control** — a mainly government-financed body that remains able to determine its own policy and programme to a significant extent is not government-controlled; sustained main financing *combined with* monitoring so close that it in fact steers policy is the indicator, not the financing alone.[21]

For units that are themselves a level of government — a municipality, a county, a province, a country — the control basket does not arise: such a unit is not *controlled by* government, it *is* government, and its placement is In by construction. Units that are not separate institutional units (a program of a government, a committee of a council) take the placement of the unit they belong to.

4.6 The basket test

The test, in the editor's approved phrasing, is:

> **Does the basket point both ways?**

The divided basket is the whole test, on either side of the line. Placement is a separate fact. There is **no directionality** to the mismatch: the test does not ask which way a divided basket leans, and no reading of it may import a direction the facts do not carry. Indicators are unweighted yes/no checks for the purposes of the test; where a basket splits, the placement call is qualitative judgement — the manuals' documented weak link, named here as such rather than disguised as arithmetic.[22]

4.7 The Gray area flag, and the Not-Yet Rule

The mixed basket is not a fourth value of Perimeter. It is a **flag**, and its name is **Gray area**.

- The flag is **set** when a unit's basket of indicators points both ways — operationalized on the six-indicator basket: a unit meeting **two, three, or four of the six** indicators pointing toward the Public Sector Universe carries the flag. Five or six is a clear basket; zero or one is a clear basket.
- The flag attaches to units placed **In** and to units placed **Out**. Placement and the flag are separate facts: a unit can be In and flagged, Out and flagged, In and clear, Out and clear.
- The flag is never **set** on a Private sector unit: the register does not analyse what it does not classify.
- The flag means: **flagged for further analysis.** It is a work order, not a verdict.

The flag is a variable with three states, adopted November 21, 2026 under the Not-Yet Rule:

1. **Flag set** — the basket was read and points both ways.
2. **Basket read, flag not set** — an affirmatively named positive record of a completed read. “Not set” is a record, never a blank; a blank field is not a state.
3. **Not yet determined** — the basket has never been read.

In display, a not-yet-determined unit carries the hollow circle alone, with no flag-like visual; and the (Perimeter value × flag state) pairing is written as a sentence in public copy, never as a code. “Flag set” and “flag state” remain distinct terms in methodology copy. Because the flag variable is defined for every unit, a not-yet-examined unit is completely described as **(Private sector × not yet determined)** — the standing description of the unexamined world until examination moves it.[23]

The **Not-Yet Rule**, ruled November 21, 2026 and in force system-wide, states: *every variable in a Common Good News classification system carries an explicit state for the not-yet-examined case; the absence of an examination is recorded as not yet determined — never as the negative value.* In plain words: if we have not looked, the record says we have not looked; it never says no. The rule forbids: a two-state mark whose negative state silently covers both “assessed and found negative” and “never assessed”; any count, total, or published figure whose denominator quietly includes unexamined units as if they had been examined and cleared; and any gloss that drops the “yet” — states under this rule are states, not verdicts. The rule applies to the Register and the Local Atlas, the Docket (§3.4, §3.7), the Ask Index (§5.8), and every future Common Good News marking system.[24]

Completeness. With both variables running over every unit, any unit is completely described as (Perimeter value × flag state). The completeness claim is worded **“every resident institutional unit,”** matching the scope of Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 ¶2.50. Two scope lines are not counterexamples: non-resident units belong to the rest of the world and are register units nowhere; and production that is not an institutional unit (the standing example is illicit drug production — inside the production boundary, never a register unit) is an activity, not a unit, and no pairing is owed to a non-unit. The grid’s completeness is a claim about *description*, never about the register’s *coverage*: that any unit placed in the grid is completely described does not assert that the register has enumerated all units.[25] Ceased units (the standing example is the former Russell Hydro) keep their last read Perimeter value and flag state as history; where no basket was ever read for a ceased unit, its flag state is not yet determined — never “no.” A unit mid-examination keeps the not-yet-determined state until its basket read completes; the state never flips indicator by indicator.

4.8 The annex: spine plus annex

The Public Sector Universe is the published reference spine. The **scope annex** reaches past the line: **anything that spends public money or holds a public mandate belongs in the register, control test or not.** Spine plus annex was approved November 20, 2026. The spine keeps the map honest; the annex keeps it useful. The pairing is what makes the frame robust in the plain sense used here: a robust frame leaves no gaps (every entity has a place on the map), tells things apart (no entity has two places, so nothing is counted twice), and does not break on the hard case.

The standing hard case is the **Russell Agricultural Society**: a member-governed, volunteer-run society that gives the community its Fair, constituted under the province’s agricultural and horticultural organizations statute framework, its board elected by its members. Its basket reads: legislation yes · incorporation yes · policy no · board

appointments no · binding agreement no · asset reversion no — two of six, so the basket points both ways: placed **Out**, **Gray area flag set**. Bend the control test and force the Society inside the Perimeter, and the count is corrupted — a body no government controls, recorded as though one did. Leave it out, and a body serving the public on public support answers to nobody. Spine plus annex does neither: the test says what it says, and the annex carries the Society onto the map on its own facts. The Society stands for a whole class — the community bodies that serve the public on public support and in public facilities, beyond every control test. At first mention in Common Good News copy, a community institution carried by the annex is honoured and its relevance articulated up front; that courtesy is a drafting rule of the house, recorded here because the annex's subjects are neighbours, not abstractions.

Annex entries are first-class: same table, same fields, same presence as spine entries. In the Local Atlas presentation they carry the label **"Beyond the Books"** (French: « Au-delà des livres »). Every annex entry carries three fields: the **label**; the **nominator**; and **the case** — one line, printed on the card, stating the public money or the public mandate the body holds. The annex is also the register's nomination layer — **the People's Annex**, ruled November 21, 2026: anyone can nominate an institution they believe is missing from the map, and the entry lands only with its case printed and its classification checked — the Perimeter placement and the basket read are done before the pin appears, not after.

4.9 The spine picture, the recheck, and the research program

Picture the register as a spine. On one side, units In the Public Sector Universe; on the other side, units Out. The centre of the spine is the full basket — six of six indicators. A unit's basket count is its distance from the centre: the flagged band, two to four, is the territory nearest the line on both sides.

Where an official classification decision on a register unit is **silent**, or where the published facts do not support it (**not acceptable** on the evidence), Common Good News performs its **own recheck**: a fresh classification review of the unit from open sources, documented indicator by indicator, with the basket, the placement, and the flag stated. The recheck follows the same rules for every unit: objective, not biased, on the record. Where an official decision does exist, the consistency audit (below) compares it against the basket the facts produce.

The flag makes a long-term research program possible, and the program is recorded here so that the flag's purpose is auditable:

1. **Directionality.** Track flagged units over time: which way do they move? A flagged unit that drifts toward the centre is becoming more public in fact; one that drifts away is becoming less. The register records movement, not only placement.
2. **Commonalities.** Compare the baskets of flagged units. Among units meeting only two indicators, are they the same two? A recurring pair is a pattern in how the boundary is actually drawn — by Statistics Canada, and by Common Good News.
3. **Consistency audit.** Every unit that enters the Docket receives an objective, unbiased, full review of its current classification status within the Public Sector Universe — indicator by indicator, on the record. Across all reviews, consistencies and inconsistencies in classification decisions become visible: where the same facts produced different placements, and where one fact quietly carried a decision.

4. **Weight validation.** Steps 1–3 are the empirical half of the weighting work: weights first assigned by judgement are then tested against the observed baskets — a weight-seeking, weight-validating procedure. A weight that never matches how baskets actually decide placements is revised or dropped.

The flag itself is cheap: it falls out of classification work the register already does. The deep program is research-heavy by design and is phased: flag at classification time; recheck flagged units first; let the commonality and weight-validation analyses accumulate as the flagged population grows.[26]

4.10 The lenses for weighing

Where an indicator's weight is in question, the weight is weighed through **lenses**. A lens is not a question; a lens is the perspective through which the question is asked — a standpoint. The seven lenses, each one perspective with its characteristic question:

1. **Decisiveness** — about the decision. "If this fact flipped, would the placement flip with it?" The principle underneath is materiality: a fact is material if reversing it would change the decision.
2. **Legal** — about the instrument. "What enforceable right does this fact create, and who can enforce it?"
3. **Economist's** — about the behaviour. "Because of this fact, who actually decides, day to day — whatever the paper says?"
4. **Empirical** — about the record. "How often has this fact decided real cases in the past?" Counted, not argued — from published classification decisions.
5. **Accountability** — about the forum. "Because of this fact, who can call this unit to account, and where?"
6. **Durability** — about time. "What would it take to undo this fact, and how long would it hold until then?"
7. **Verifiability** — about the evidence. "Can an outsider establish this fact from the public record, without asking anyone's permission?"

The list is not claimed to be exhaustive; it is claimed to be clean — seven perspectives, seven different objects, no two asking the same thing. **Decisiveness is the chosen lens for weighting**, for two reasons: only decisiveness answers the question the weighting itself poses (how much of this decision does this fact carry?); and materiality is performance audit's own test for what counts in a decision, so the lens is the home lens, applied at home. The other lenses are not discarded: where all seven agree on an indicator's weight, that is solid ground, and the work says so; where they split, the work shows the split. The choice of lens is declared before the weights, never after — a reader who prefers another lens can re-weigh the same facts and see exactly where the placements would move.[27]

5. The Ask Index

5.1 What the Ask Index is

The Ask Index is the companion instrument to the Fulfilment Index (§6). It does two things to an ask, at the time the ask is issued: first it **classifies the ask by force** (§5.2), then it **rates the quality of the ask itself** (§5.3). The Fulfilment Index grades what the institution did with the ask; the Ask Index grades the ask. The research base is

recorded plainly: no published instrument was found that scores or weights the quality of asks or recommendations at the time they are issued. The near misses all rate something else — follow-up taxonomies rate the response; the audit criteria are design checklists, not scales; priority-recommendation flags mark importance, not quality. An index that classifies asks by force and rates their quality at issuance appears to be unbuilt, and the Ask Index is Common Good News's construction, entered as such.[28]

5.2 The five force levels

Every ask carries one force level. The levels, in ascending order of force:

- **Asked** — a question or request. No obligation to act. Where an obligation exists, it is an obligation to answer, not to comply — parliamentary written questions and access-to-information requests carry statutory response clocks, but the force of the ask itself is reputational: it puts a matter on the public record and starts a clock the institution does not control. In the register's short form: no duty but the record; on the record, silence is an answer.
- **Recommended** — a formal recommendation (auditors general, ombuds, evaluators). Non-binding in law, but wrapped in the heaviest follow-up machinery in public life: a recommendation binds no one, but it cannot lawfully or conventionally be ignored in silence. An answer is owed, and follow-up is tracked.[29]
- **Directed** — a direction under a statute; binding on the body it names. Force comes from the enabling statute, not the issuer's persuasion.
- **Ordered** — an order of a court, tribunal, or body with order-making power; binding on the parties and enforceable through contempt and execution. The only lawful responses are compliance, variation, or appeal.
- **Duty** — the ceiling above Ordered, ruled November 21, 2026: an ask that binds because law or office requires it, whether or not an order was given; the ask is the law itself — a legislated duty to act, report, or respond, owed without anyone asking. Non-performance is not non-compliance; it is illegality. *Duty* is entered as a Common Good News coinage: no pillar instrument (JCSEE, Canadian Evaluation Society, Statistics Canada, ISSAI) names this class; the class was proposed by the research of November 20, 2026 and ruled by the editor.[30]

5.3 The eight quality criteria

Each ask is rated on eight criteria. Each criterion is scored **0** (absent), **1** (partial), or **2** (met). The criteria, with their published definitions:

Criterion	Definition
Evidence fidelity	The ask's factual claims faithfully carry the finding behind them — the findings under the ask are true and the conclusion follows.
Named owner	The ask is addressed to a named office or person who holds the power to act, and who is responsible for taking initiative.
Relevance	The ask addresses a matter of consequence to the public, not noise.
Clarity / accessibility	A reader can find the ask on the record, read it once, and know what is being asked.

Criterion	Definition
Feasibility	What is asked is practical and achievable within the owner's real authority and resources, and proportionate to the problem.
Measurability	A later checker can tell done from not-done without interviewing the asker.
Timeliness	The ask is made inside the window where action is still possible, with a stated clock.
Coherence	The ask is classified and worded consistently, so it can be compared with other asks across institutions and years.

The set is a Common Good News synthesis, every element sourced. Five criteria descend from Statistics Canada's Quality Assurance Framework dimensions, translated — honestly, with the strain recorded: *relevance* (strong fit); *accuracy*, renamed **evidence fidelity** because an ask is not an estimate (reinforced by JCSEE standard A1, conclusions explicitly justified); *timeliness* (adapted — release lag becomes the actionable window and a stated clock); *accessibility and clarity* (strong fit); *coherence and comparability* (the strongest fit for an index — asks worded and classified consistently can be compared across institutions and years, which is precisely what makes fulfilment rates meaningful). The audit literature supplies what the Quality Assurance Framework cannot: a named owner with the power to act (ISSAI 300) and feasibility (the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards criteria — recommendations are effective when the recommended actions are specific, feasible, cost-effective, and measurable). A well-formed ask, on the published record, is one that is relevant, true, addressed, legible, doable, checkable, timely, and comparable.[31]

A rater-discipline note, referred to rater guidance by the Auditor's conferral: the named-owner criterion holds two tests in one breath — *responsibility and competence* (ISSAI 300). An ask addressed by name to an office that exists but lacks the competence for the thing asked (the standing example: the Township Clerk named as owner of a decision that sits with the upper-tier municipality or the province) must not score 2 on naming alone; feasibility, scored on the ask's practicality in the abstract, will not reliably catch the mismatch if the two criteria are scored in isolation. Raters score named owner on responsibility *and* competence together.

5.4 The weights, the composite, and the profile rule

Two criteria carry double weight; six carry single weight, under the editor's ruling of November 21, 2026, **sustained November 22, 2026** (ruling 1, §5.10):

- **Evidence fidelity ×2**
- **Named owner ×2**
- Relevance, clarity / accessibility, feasibility, measurability, timeliness, coherence ×1 each

The maximum composite is **20**: (2 criteria × 2 points × weight 2) + (6 criteria × 2 points × weight 1) = 8 + 12 = 20. The composite is the weighted sum, published as a percentage of 20.

The profile rule — non-waivable (ruling 2, November 22, 2026): the full per-criterion profile is always printed beside the percentage, on every surface, including headlines, cards, and social copy — the surfaces where profiles are likeliest to be dropped. The percentage never travels alone. The rationale is structural and is recorded here because critics will meet it first: the composite cannot carry the instrument's meaning alone. Two asks can share a

composite and be opposites — evidence fidelity 0 with everything else met, and named owner 0 with everything else met, both compute to 16/20, 80 percent: one is a falsehood with an address, the other a truth with no one home. The profile, and the floor (§5.5), are where the instrument's sharpest judgements live; the percentage is a summary the profile authorizes only when the two are printed together.[32]

The weights are declared values, and the instrument discloses them as such: no pillar weights criteria into a composite, so there is no standard to violate, only a disclosure duty — met by publishing the weights, the arithmetic, and the rationale with the instrument. Doubling is a values declaration, not a statistical act: evidence fidelity and named owner together command 8 of 20 points, because an ask that distorts its own evidence poisons every downstream judgement including the Fulfilment Index's, and an ownerless ask fails twice — once when ignored, and again when no one can be asked why.

5.5 The floor rule

The floor rule, provisionally adopted November 21, 2026 and carried into force with the carve-out at §5.6: **a score of 0 on evidence fidelity or a score of 0 on named owner reports the ask "not well-formed," whatever the composite says.** The floor converts the composite into a two-part verdict — percentage, and well-formed / not well-formed — and the two parts can point in opposite directions in print ("80% — not well-formed"). That is not a contradiction, but it will be read as one unless the profile travels with it every single time (§5.4). "Not well-formed" is workshop language that will be quoted as an insult if it travels without its meaning; every publication of the verdict carries its one-line plain-words twin (for example: "this ask fails at the starting gate: no owner," or "a record that doesn't hold"). "Not well-formed" is used of the *ask*, never of the score; the floor governs the verdict, not the arithmetic. The floor does not apply to a not-yet-scored ask (§5.8): the floor converts a *finding* of absence into the verdict, and it must never convert the *absence of a finding* into that verdict.

5.6 The floor at Duty: the Auditor's carve-out

Adopted November 22, 2026 (ruling 3), verbatim as ruled:

> The named-owner branch of the floor does not apply where the ask's force level is **Duty** and the duty's statutory obligor is identified in the ask's text; in that case the criterion is scored on the obligor's identifiability, not on a named office. The evidence-fidelity branch of the floor stands without exception.

The defect the carve-out repairs: a Duty-level ask may have no single named owner because the law itself is the obligor — a statutory duty binds whether or not any office is named in the ask that cites it (the research memorandum's own example is the agency head's statement of action under 31 U.S.C. §720).[33] Scored 0 on named owner without the carve-out, a legislated duty would be reported "not well-formed" — inverting the ladder, so that the strongest class of ask becomes the easiest to fail on a formality. The Verifier's conferral independently confirmed the collision and classified it as a defect, not a style choice: a gate that can publish a false verdict on a foreseeable class must be answered. It was answered by this ruling.

5.7 The propriety gate and its fix loop

Adopted November 22, 2026 (ruling 4). The propriety gate stands **in front of the score**: an ask that fails propriety earns no quality score. It is a pass/fail gate beside the floor, not a ninth weighted criterion — propriety is not a quantity of quality, and scoring it 0–2 would let a mostly-proper impropriety average out. The gap it closes was the Evaluator's conferral finding: the eight criteria covered four of the five JCSEE families (utility, feasibility, accuracy, accountability) and propriety not at all, so an impeccable improper ask — well-evidenced, clearly worded, feasible, measurable, timely, coherent, addressed to a named owner with the power to act, demanding something the owner may not lawfully or properly do — would score 20/20, and the Fulfilment Index downstream would then grade the institution down for declining to do it. A propriety blind spot at issuance becomes a false accountability finding at follow-up.

The gate applies **three checks**, answered in one line each and recorded with the ask:

1. **Lawful** — standing to ask; answerable without breaking a law, a confidence, or a right.
2. **Fair to the person named — the right-person test:** the role covers it · the named person could in principle deliver it · they are the one who would know; burden proportionate to the role.
3. **Ethical** — no deception about who asks or why; nothing requiring harm to a third party; the read-aloud test (the ask could be defended with the person standing in the room).

An ask that fails the gate is reported **"not a proper ask,"** with the reason stated in words — which check failed, and why.

The fix loop, as ruled: the hold is recorded (check failed, reason, date) in a visible **"held at the gate"** state — no score, no burial. The fix matches the failure: wrong person → **re-aim** (the ask is re-addressed to whoever holds the duty); unlawful → **narrow** to what is lawfully askable; unethical → **rewrite plainly**. The corrected ask re-enters as a **new dated ask linked to the original**, its follow-up clock starting from the correction. The chain — asked → held → fixed → re-asked — is public. The gate belongs to the Verifier alone (§5.9, §9.2).

Amended November 22, 2026 (the fourth-check ruling; §12.5). From that ruling the gate applies **four checks**: the three above, and **True — the ask's premise is not contradicted by the record the house holds, and any premise the house has not checked is declared as a premise in the ask itself.** True runs on the record in hand, never on the Verifier's doubt: a premise contradicted by the record fails the gate; a premise merely unverified is declared, not failed. In the same ruling the third check's read-aloud test is widened — it runs to the person it names, **and to anyone it touches**. The battery is declared **closed at four**: any future addition must first pass the founding test, a family of failure that scoring structurally cannot catch. §5.9's reference to the gate's checks and Annex A's summary are read accordingly. The full record of the ruling — including the Legal chair's cited reading on the declined *Answerable* check and the Auditor's dissent — stands at §12.5.

5.8 The Not yet scored state and the standing sweep

Every catalogued ask enters the Index as **Not yet scored**, and carries that state until a rater has actually assessed all eight criteria. *Not yet scored* is not a 0: 0 (absent) is a finding — a rater looked and found the criterion absent — while Not yet scored records that nobody has looked yet. While an ask is not yet scored, no composite, no percentage, and no per-criterion profile of zeros may be rendered for it, and the floor rule does not apply to it

(§5.5). An unscored ask publishes with its force level only. In display, an unscored ask must never be dressed in a scored ask's clothes — no greyed percentage, no "pending score" teaser. Blank means blank.[34]

The standing sweep — adopted November 22, 2026 (ruling 5): every unscored ask shows its entry date into the state; a standing sweep works through them so none sits indefinitely; and every published aggregate carries its scored and unscored counts beside it. The discipline answers two recorded risks. First, the drawer risk: an ask that sits unscored while its follow-up clock runs is an assertion by silence of a different kind, and the immunity is asymmetric in a way that invites gaming by the Index's own operators — a politically hot ask could be left unscored to avoid a verdict; no rule would be broken, which is precisely the finding the sweep exists to close. Second, the denominator risk: any published aggregate ("the average quality of asks to the Township in 2026") silently excludes the unscored, and the unscored will not be a random sample — they will be the hard ones, the new ones, the embarrassing ones. Aggregates publish scored and unscored counts, or they do not publish.

5.9 The two-rater reliability pass; the Verifier at the gate

Adopted November 22, 2026 (ruling 6, with the editor's refinement). Before any aggregate statistic is published from the Index, a **two-rater reliability pass** is run on a sample of scored asks and its agreement rate published. The pass governs **scoring only**: two different lenses (§9.1) score the same ask blind, and splits are settled criterion by criterion on the record under a declared rule — never quietly averaged. The purpose is the Statistician's: to establish that the number measures the ask, not the rater. The recorded caution travels with the pass: the ratings are ordinal judgements (0 is worse than 1 is worse than 2, but nothing in the instrument establishes that the distance from 0 to 1 equals the distance from 1 to 2 on any criterion, or that one point of timeliness equals one point of coherence), and the pass is the instrument's empirical check on how much of the composite is judgement and how the judgement behaves across raters.

The gate belongs to the Verifier alone — one fixed chair, the same three propriety checks (§5.7) in the same order every time; no rotation, no randomization. The editor's reasoning is recorded: professional variance between lenses is information in scoring, where the two-rater pass measures it in the open; at a gate, the same variance would be inconsistency — two different lenses at the gate would give two different gates. **Matthew, as editor, is the appeal of last resort on a held ask; his ruling settles it on the record.**

5.10 The rulings of November 22, 2026 (consolidated)

The six decisions put to the editor after the shops' conferral of November 21, 2026, and his rulings, tap by tap, in order:

1. **Named owner ×2 — SUSTAINED.** The double weight stands. (The conferral had split three ways: the Auditor sustained named owner ×2 on ISSAI 300 ¶40; the Journalist would have doubled clarity / accessibility instead, arguing the floor already does ownership's work while an unfindable ask could certify at 90 percent; the Statistician would sooner have doubled coherence, the comparability criterion. The ruling settles for the Auditor's position, the ruling as adopted.)
2. **Percentage — KEPT, with the non-waivable profile rule** (§5.4). (Against the Statistician's amendment to publish bands instead of a percentage, and the Verifier's flag that the percentage is the instrument's one standing overclaim, contained only by the profile rule.)

3. **Floor at Duty — the Auditor's carve-out ADOPTED** (§5.6).
4. **Propriety gate — ADOPTED** (§5.7), with the three checks and the fix loop as ruled.
5. **Not-yet-scored sweep — ADOPTED** (§5.8).
6. **Two-rater reliability pass — ADOPTED, with the editor's refinement** (§5.9): the pass governs scoring only; the gate belongs to the Verifier alone; the editor is the appeal of last resort.

Evidence fidelity ×2 was sustained by every chair without a dissenting voice, and was not in play.

5.11 Pending review point

The floor rule's scheduled revisit stands: **Wednesday, November 25, 2026.** The revisit is a review point for the floor rule as a whole, in light of the carve-out and the gate now adopted around it. Until the revisit rules otherwise, §§5.5–5.7 state the law of the instrument. Recorded at §10, Open points, item 2.

---

6. The Fulfilment Index

6.1 What the Fulfilment Index is

The Fulfilment Index grades what an institution did with what it was asked. The Ask Index (§5) grades the ask; the Fulfilment Index grades the doing. Its premise, from its founding one-pager: audit reports run hundreds of pages, and people want one thing from them — how bad was it, how good was it; even Parliament only tracks whether a petition got a reply, never what the reply did. Nobody scores the doing. The Fulfilment Index does. The design was settled November 20, 2026; the public wording remains open (§10, Open points, item 6). The score is the index; the sentence beside it is the story.

6.2 The four steps

1. **Split the case into asks.** A case is never scored as one blob. (The founding example: a trail petition is two asks — replant the stretch; give notice next time.) Each ask is scored on its own.
2. **Note the kind of ask.** The ask's force level rides with the rating (§5.2). The heavier the ask, the heavier a "not done."
3. **Score each ask, on two tracks** (§6.3).
4. **Roll it up.** Add the points across every ask for one number out of 100 for the institution — plus one plain fact: the share of asks fully done within a year.

6.3 The two tracks

- **Did they answer?** Fully / Partly / Late / Never. (This track is the institution-facing companion of the Docket's Axis One, §3.6, which grades the same conduct at entry level in five grades.)

- **Did they do it? Done** 100 · **Mostly done** 75 · **Partly done** 50 · **Stalled** 10 · **Not done** 0 · **Still waiting** — not scored. An ask that no longer applies is retired and never counts.

The tracked unit is the **ask** — in audit practice, the recommended action, not the recommendation. The Auditor General of Ontario decomposes each recommendation into recommended actions, and the action is the unit rated (in that office's follow-up practice: Fully Implemented / In the Process of Being Implemented / Little or No Progress / Will Not Be Implemented / No Longer Applicable). The Fulfilment Index's scale is built from the best of the available models — the Auditor General of Ontario's five plain statuses, the Veterans Ombud's public report cards, the United Kingdom audit office's two-track tracker, the World Bank evaluators' points — because no profession hands down one shared scale: audit offices and evaluation societies all require follow-up, and each built its own labels.[35]

6.4 The evidence rule

Score on evidence, not on the institution's own say-so. The rule is borrowed from the Auditor General of Ontario's follow-up practice and is the Index's load-bearing discipline: of 545 actions organizations self-assessed as "fully implemented," that office accepted only 302 (55 percent) after reviewing evidence (2016–2020 cohorts). A self-assessment is a claim; the Index grades the claim against the record, and the claim's provenance is part of the grade's note.

6.5 Relation to the Docket axes

The Docket (§3.6, §3.7) and the Fulfilment Index grade the same conduct at two resolutions. The Docket works entry by entry, in public, in real time — responsiveness in five grades, implementation on the circle scale, with the completeness check (§3.8) on every substantive response. The Fulfilment Index works ask by ask, in points, and rolls up to the institution. Where the two disagree, the Docket's entry-level record is the evidence and the Index's score is the summary; the summary never outranks the record.

---

7. The Three Questions: the layered framework

Every grade Common Good News gives answers one of three questions. The layers are never blended: a beautiful record of an undone action is not a success, and a done action is not yet a working outcome. The framework was settled in principle November 18, 2026.

Layer 1 — Is the record true? (record quality)

Frameworks: the United Nations *National Quality Assurance Frameworks Manual for Official Statistics* (2019) → Statistics Canada *Quality Assurance Framework*, 3rd edition (12-586-X, 2017). The six dimensions: relevance, accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, interpretability, coherence. Applies to: the institution's paper — minutes, reports, trackers — and to the register itself.

Layer 2 — Was it done? (fulfilment — audit follow-up)

Frameworks: audit recommendation follow-up practice — INTOSAI standards and follow-up guidance; the Auditor General of Canada's follow-up; the Government Accountability Office recommendations system (open / closed — implemented / closed — not implemented); the United Kingdom Treasury Minute system. The unit: the directive — an adopted direction from a council to its administration, recorded in the minutes; the motion is the directive's genealogy, not the unit. Applies to: whether the directed action was carried out, as directed, on the record. Close Quality grades the top end of this layer (Beautiful close / Clean close / Partial close).

Layer 3 — Did it work? (outcomes — program evaluation)

Frameworks: the OECD Development Assistance Committee evaluation criteria (2019 revision: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability); the Treasury Board of Canada *Policy on Results* (2016); the Canadian Evaluation Society standards. Applies to: whether the action achieved its intended outcome. **Common Good News home rule:** Layer 3 applies only where the public record carries outcome evidence. It is labelled as evaluation when used, and is never inferred from completion alone. A register can verify actions; outcomes are claimed only on evidence.

The composition rule

A chain is graded layer by layer, in order. A higher layer is never claimed when a lower one fails: no Beautiful close on an incoherent record; no outcome claim on an unimplemented directive.[36]

---

8. Adjacent named methods

8.1 The Transposition Test

A named diagnostic inside the reconciliation work (the reading of two records of one quantity against each other — in council work, the three-readings method: agenda → minutes → next agenda). Articulated November 21, 2026 from a live instance in Common Good News's own files, and entered as a **Common Good News coinage** in the form stated here, on the evidence position recorded below.

The test, stated. When two records state different values for the same quantity, compute the difference D between them.

1. **Is D divisible by 9?** If not, the disagreement is not a single digit transposition. Look elsewhere: a real change, a different definition, a different period, a rounding difference, a different quantity wearing the same name.
2. **If D is divisible by 9, do the two values use exactly the same digits, reordered?** If yes, the pair carries the **transposition signature**: one value is a digit transposition of the other. The disagreement is a copying error, not a difference of fact. Provenance then decides which value stands — the value traced to the primary source in the fewest hops.

3. **If D is divisible by 9 but the digits differ**, the signal is weaker: a transposition is possible but not shown; other error classes also produce differences divisible by 9 (a decimal slide, for example 1,000 read as 100, differs by 900). Classify as *÷9-only — investigate*, never as transposition.

Why it works. A number's value modulo 9 equals the sum of its digits modulo 9 ("casting out nines"). Reordering digits does not change the digit sum, so a number and any transposition of it are equal modulo 9 — their difference is therefore always divisible by 9. Precisely: swapping digits a and b at decimal places 10^i and 10^j changes the value by (a − b)·(10^i − 10^j), and (10^i − 10^j) is always a multiple of 9. For adjacent digits the difference is 9·|a − b|·10^k. The test is **necessary, not sufficient**: every single transposition passes it, but not every pair that passes it is a transposition — which is why step 2, the same-digits check, is part of the test and not an ornament. The pair of conditions together is the signature.

Protocol. (1) On any numeric disagreement between two records of the same quantity, compute D before any other analysis. (2) Apply steps 1–3; record the verdict with the pair: *transposition signature / ÷9-only / not a transposition*. (3) For a transposition signature, correct the weaker-provenance copy, cite the primary source, and log the correction in the file that carried the error, with a dated correction note. (4) Never publish either figure until the primary source has been read directly.

What the classification decides. A transposition is a defect of the copy, not of the record: correct the copy against the primary source; no question is owed to anyone; no institution is at fault. A variance that is not a transposition is a fact about the record itself — amended, deferred, vanished, new in minutes, unrecorded — and may be owed a question. The test is a self-audit instrument first: it keeps Common Good News from publishing its own transcription slips as findings against an institution.

Limits, stated plainly. The test detects single transpositions (one swap); two independent errors in one figure can defeat it. It says nothing about which of the two values is right — provenance does that. It applies to figures stated as exact values; rounded figures produce differences that are artefacts of rounding, and the test is run only on full-precision values. Divisibility by 9 in a difference can also arise by chance (roughly one pair in nine); the same-digits condition is what raises the signature above chance.

Evidence status. The underlying arithmetic is ancient — casting out nines was popularised in Europe by Fibonacci's *Liber Abaci* (1202), and bookkeeping's trial-balance tradition has used "if the difference divides by 9, look for a transposition" for generations. The evidence check of November 21, 2026 searched Statistics Canada's published editing methodology (Quality Guidelines ch. 9; the Quality Assurance Framework), the statistical-editing literature (EDIMBUS/GSDEM; the Fellegi–Holt line), the auditing pillar (ISSAI 1520 and ISSAI 1450 hold the duty to investigate a difference and the categories for evaluating a misstatement, but name no arithmetic signature), and the evaluation pillar (the JCSEE Accuracy standards require dependable information in general terms; no arithmetic error-signature check of any kind was found). **Across everything searched, no source names a transposition-signature test as a variance class in a reconciliation or confrontation method.** Absence is reported as searched-and-not-found, not as proof of non-existence. Common Good News therefore claims the articulation and the application — a named diagnostic class between two records — as its own coinage, and claims nothing more. The corpus run is recorded in the evidence file: one confirmed transposition signature (in Common Good News's own files — the 2025 OPP billing increase stated as both $533,563 and $533,653, difference $90, the "56"/"65" pair swapped; the Township's Budget Brief 2025 is the arbiter of which value stands), one ÷9-only coincidence in a Township report pair (a live false-positive lesson: the correct figure was arithmetically fixed by

another route), and a remainder of textual variance the test does not touch. The test earns its keep as a triage step: run it on any numeric variance first, because it is nearly free and, when the strong signature fires, it settles the kind of error before anyone argues about the number.[37]

8.2 The proper-names verification check

Proper names are facts, not translations. Before any public or official copy — in either language — names an institution, municipality, program, office, or title, its official name **in that language** is verified from the institution's own materials: its own website in that language, its own documents, its own letterhead. A proper name is never dictionary-translated. If the institution's own usage cannot be found, the gap is flagged to the editor before the copy ships — the name is not guessed.

Generic terms (not names) are checked against the terminology authorities in this order: (1) the institution's own usage; (2) TERMIUM Plus (the federal terminology bank); (3) the Office québécois de la langue française — Grand dictionnaire terminologique and Banque de dépannage linguistique (Québec usage); (4) Statistics Canada's Standard Geographical Classification for geographic and municipal designations. Local official usage beats every dictionary.

The check exists because of a documented failure, and the failure is part of the method's record: "Russell Township" was rendered in French public copy with the dictionary-standard equivalent of "township" — a rendering TERMIUM Plus itself endorses and three neighbouring municipalities officially use — instead of the institution's own official French name. The Township of Russell's official French name is **la Municipalité de Russell**, as used by the Township and by the United Counties of Prescott and Russell's own French pages; the Township's communications officer corrected the copy. The root cause was the absence of a verification step for proper names: a proper name was treated as a translation choice. An official name is not a dialect preference; it is a published fact with one right answer. The verified local table is maintained in *Lexicon_Official_Names_FR_EN_Nov19_2026.md* (Comtés unis de Prescott et Russell · Municipalité de Russell · Canton de Champlain · Canton d'Alfred et Plantagenet · Canton de Hawkesbury Est · Municipalité de La Nation · Municipalité de Casselman · Cité de Clarence-Rockland · Ville de Hawkesbury), and it grows with use.[38]

A companion discipline: names and words that could be French or English are checked in both forms before one is locked in, and verified against the house's own records first — voice-to-text garbles French names, and the answer is frequently already in the house's own correspondence.

8.3 The Lexicon Gate

The lexicon is the house's living charter of terms: one entry per term, entries carrying **multiple definition linkages** — a term's senses across lenses and sources (scholarly, official, and Common Good News's own coinage), kept distinct, never flattened to one line when the senses differ. The comparative rule governs every entry: where another authority's term is almost identical — **same term and same extension**, their definition covering exactly the same units and cases — the entry flags it and links to that authority's definition, without duplicating text. Where it is not almost identical, the entry gives the details: the authority's term and definition **verbatim** with source, plus a variance note.

The Gate (standing rule, November 20, 2026): before any Common Good News production ships — infographic, index, deck, paper, page, post — the lexicon check runs on its load-bearing terms, and the check is recorded with the piece. For every term, one of three states must hold: (1) **Entered** — the term is in the lexicon and the piece uses it exactly as entered; (2) **New entry** — the term is new, so an entry is drafted (definition, source or coinage note, linkages) and the editor rules on it before or as the piece ships; (3) **Refinement** — the piece stretches a settled term, so the refinement is drafted and ruled first. A piece whose terms are unchecked is not ready. The Gate is a gate, not a guideline — the same class of control as the proper-names check (§8.2) and the parity audit in website production. Every production pass is also a lexicon pass.

8.4 Coinage discipline

Common Good News coinages are entered **as coinages**, never dressed as canonical terms. The standing coinages in this guide include: **Duty** (the fifth force level, §5.2); the **Gray area flag** (§4.7); the **Transposition Test** in its named-diagnostic form (§8.1); the **Not-Yet Rule** (§4.7); **spine plus annex** as the register's frame (§4.8); and the **follow-through ledger** presentation (§3.11); and, of November 23, 2026, **Duotrace** and **SAID–DONE** (§13.9) — entered as coinages published for free use: never marks, never property. Where a coinage later proves to have a settled name elsewhere, the settled name governs and the entry is amended, with the amendment recorded.

8.5 Materiality and significance

The house's working definition of materiality (ruled November 21, 2026): the size at which a difference, omission, or disagreement in the public record could change a reader's judgment — judged on two scales that are always reported separately and never averaged. A **quantitative** scale: for a public-sector entity, overall materiality starts at 1 percent of total revenue or total expenses (after ISA 320's not-for-profit example); performance materiality at 50–75 percent of overall; "clearly trivial" below roughly 3–5 percent of overall. A **qualitative** scale: an item is flagged at any size when it is capable of precise measurement, touches compliance, masks a trend, or consists of two public records disagreeing about the same fact. Below quantitative materiality and carrying no qualitative flag, a difference is a footnote; carrying a qualitative flag, it is printed as a flag — never promoted to a finding on size alone, never smoothed away on size alone. In performance audit the operative word is **significance** (ISSAI 3000.84 — the relative importance of a matter within the context in which it is considered, expressly including social and political significance, compliance, transparency, governance, and accountability); "materiality" is reserved for the financial scale. One element of the working definition is Common Good News's own extension, entered as such: two public records disagreeing about the same precisely measurable fact is itself a qualitative flag — derived from SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin 99's first qualitative factor (precise measurement) and ISA 450's nature-and-circumstances test, applied to record confrontation rather than to a single entity's statements. Statistics Canada publishes no materiality concept; its quality grades run on the coefficient of variation, recorded in the lexicon so the analogue is never mistaken for the term.[39]

8.6 Report form

Common Good News research pieces and publishable texts default to **report form**: objective, scope, and method stated; numbered findings with evidence; a conclusion; and recommendations addressed to the institution. Essay or

narrative form is the exception and is chosen explicitly, with the editor, at commissioning — never by pipeline default. This guide is itself written to that rule: its findings are its sections, and its recommendations are its open points (§10) and its change-control protocol (§11).

---

9. Roles: the chairs, the Verifier, and the editor

9.1 The chairs (the shops)

Methodological questions in this house are examined by **chairs** — also called shops, or lenses in the disciplinary sense of §4.10 — each a standpoint with a named control document, not a person. The chairs are lenses worked by the house's research and drafting capacity; what makes a chair a chair is that it answers from its discipline's documents, not from general judgement. The sitting chairs:

- **The Statistician** — control documents: Statistics Canada's Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework and Quality Assurance Framework; pillars Statistics Canada → United Nations (System of National Accounts) → International Monetary Fund (Government Finance Statistics Manual). Owns classification soundness and whether a number means what it prints.
- **The Auditor** — control documents: INTOSAI (ISSAI 300 / 3000) → Auditor General of Canada. Owns evidence states, follow-up, and what a recommendation needs to be answerable.
- **The Evaluator** — control documents: the JCSEE Program Evaluation Standards; the Canadian Evaluation Society competencies and ethics guidance beneath. Owns whether judgements are justified, usable, and proper.
- **The Journalist** — the output chair. Owns whether a neighbour reading the product understands what the number means and can find the thing it grades.
- **The Verifier** — the gate (§9.2). Owns no opinion; it brings the checklist.

A **conferral** is the house's instrument for contested method: the same questions are put to each chair, each answers from its own discipline in writing, disagreements are preserved rather than averaged, a synthesis names where the chairs agree and where they split, and the decisions the editor has to make are stated as decisions. The conferrals behind this guide — the Gray area flag's third state (November 21, 2026) and the Ask Index weighting (November 21, 2026) — are its worked examples: in both, the chairs' splits were real, were recorded, and were settled by ruling, not by consensus language.

Conformed November 22, 2026 (adoption conforming pass). A fifth chair stands from the adoption of §12: **the Legal chair** (§12.3) — a standing chair holding no seat on the five-lens panel, seated under the citation discipline recorded at §12.3. The list above stands as first written — the four chairs and the Verifier at the gate; §12.3 carries the five professional chairs and governs.

9.2 The Verifier and the gates

The Verifier is a fixed role: the chair whose only job is checking a thing against its own record and specification. Its tests are for false assertions, not for elegance; its arithmetic is independently recomputed; its verdicts are of the

form *pass*, *pass with conditions* (each condition named and referred for ruling), or *fail*. The gates the Verifier holds include: the Ask Index propriety gate (§5.7 — held by the Verifier alone, §5.9); the Docket publication gate (§3.9); the Lexicon Gate's recorded check (§8.3); and, in website production, the mechanical gates (language parity, phone width, withheld-strings search) that stand between a build and a deployment.

The Accessibility Review duty stands inside the Verifier's gate, adopted November 21, 2026: a named duty, **non-waivable at deploy**, with **Matthew Buechler as reviewer of record** until a second reviewer with lived experience is named. The duty exists because the house's own review found the gap in writing: accessibility features were built and audits had happened as events, mechanical checks (width, contrast, rendered-page verification) ran inside the gates — but no person with lived special-needs experience held a named review role, and a gate can verify a ratio, not an experience. The mechanical checks remain the Verifier's; the review of the rendered product by a reader with lived experience is the duty, and it cannot be waived at deploy time.[43]

9.3 The editor

Matthew Buechler, founder and editor, is the house's ruling authority on method. Rulings are his; they are recorded with their dates and their reasons, and they bind until he revises them — also on the record. Three of his standing functions touch this guide directly: he rules on lexicon entries, refinements, and conferral decisions (the rulings consolidated in this guide are his); he is the **appeal of last resort** on an ask held at the propriety gate (§5.9), his ruling settling it on the record; and he is the reviewer of record for accessibility (§9.2). Nothing in the chairs' machinery outranks a ruling; nothing in a ruling is invisible — a ruling that changes method changes this guide, through §11, in the open.

9.4 The gracious-follow-up doctrine, as method

One doctrine of correspondence is recorded here because it constrains what the register's filings look like, and therefore what the register can grade (§3.13): every institutional response to a Common Good News filing — good news, a deferral, even a refusal — receives a gracious follow-up, drafted the same day. People always receive courtesy — neighbours, councillors, staff, critics, opponents; no mockery, no score-settling, nothing at a person's expense; disagreement is with the record, never the person. Systems, processes, delays, silence, unanswered questions, and broken promises may be described plainly, and with humour aimed at the process, never at the person running it. Serious matters — harm, grief, safety — receive plain words. The register is Canadian, simple, and honest in its copy for the same reason: if a sentence would embarrass its subject read aloud in the room, it is rewritten. Drafts still wait for the editor's approval before sending; the doctrine governs drafting, not sending.

9.5 The Translator

Created November 22, 2026, on the editor's ruling (his proposal; adopted by his tap the same evening). The Translator is a named function of the house, standing between the house's instructions and the editor for every walkthrough on his screens — apps, portals, settings. It is its own first-ring duty, not a subset of the Secretary (the Secretary keeps its paperwork: register entries, rule text, codification — the same split as the Verifier, whose gate stands alone while the Secretary registers its rulings). In the house's drawing grammar it sits on the road **in** to the founder: the Verifier gates what goes out; the Translator renders what comes to him.

Its rule, in the words of the ruling: *instructions are written ONLY from his CURRENT screenshot — the screen he is actually on.* Only elements visible on that screen are named; nothing is directed from memory or from a generic layout. The words are plain; mid-flow, the steps come one at a time. **The way out is given in the same message as the way in**, and the route between surfaces — different addresses, tabs, apps — is part of the directions. If his current screen is not known, the screenshot is asked for before any clicks are given. Nothing reaches the editor in walkthrough form until it has passed the Translator.

The function was created out of three failures in a single hour (November 22, 2026): directions written for a portal form after the editor had moved to a feed that carries no such form; a field named from memory while he stood on a page where it was not visible; and no exit route given when he was sent into a posting form and got stuck in it. The rule is recorded so the failures are not repeated by a future session that did not live through them.

9.5A The translation verification standard: the Translator's module under the Double Pass — RULED November 23, 2026

Ruled November 23, 2026 — adopted by the editor's tap the same morning (03:55 EST) and in force (adoption recorded at §11.3). It was produced by a panel conferral of that morning (the five lenses plus the Legal, Translation, and Continuous Improvement chairs; the Verifier scoring last, separately) on the editor's commission: a translation verification standard for the house's French — the translation equivalent of the Double Pass (§12.12) — that would honour French as a first-class original language and stand inspection by any translation house or federal translation department. It is entered here as the module inside the Translator's function (§9.5), under the Double Pass — **one doctrine, not two**: the Double Pass applied at the language boundary, with the two additions the boundary forces on it (a names gate before the passes, because a name is a fact and not a translation choice; and a direction rotation, because at a language boundary which text is the original is itself a finding). Record: *Translation_Verification_Standard_Panel_Nov23_2026.md*.

The standard's name and flag: Le Double Regard / The Double Regard — the panel's first pick among four names offered. The same two words, in the same order, in both languages: *double* and *regard* exist in French and in English with the same sense — two looks, cast independently. The name names the method (two blind drafts, two languages, each looking at the other) and cannot be mistranslated, because it is never translated. Its emblem: two facing quotation marks — the French guillemets « » and the English " " — set as two eyes over one red rule, on Township navy, the words DOUBLE REGARD beneath in cream. (The runners-up are recorded in the panel record: *La Norme Concordia / The Concordia Standard*, flagged as also a university's name; *Les Deux Rives / The Two Shores*, flagged for a small translation loss and for naming a geography over a method; *Le Pont Russell / The Russell Bridge*, the panel's weakest, with the Neighbour's partial dissent kept.)

The standard: Gate, Two Drafts, Mirror — tiered.

- **Layer 0 — the Names-and-Terms Gate. Mandatory, every piece, before any translation.** Every proper name, institution, program, statute, title, and load-bearing term in the piece is listed and verified in the language of publication, from the institution's own materials in that language (§8.2). Where the institution's own usage cannot be found, the item is flagged — never guessed, never dictionary-translated. Generic terms are checked in the order: the institution's own usage → TERMIUM Plus (the federal Translation Bureau's terminology bank) → the Office québécois de la langue française's Grand dictionnaire terminologique. Every ruling is entered in

the Lexicon the same day (§8.3): a name checked once is never paid for twice. The conferral's joint note stands at the head of this layer: *the Gate is not optional — it is the pre-translation gate in front of whatever else is chosen; choosing the Gate alone, back-translation alone, or machine-first alone repeats the Canton error with better paperwork.*

- **Layer 1 — the floor. Routine copy** (briefs, captions, routine posts): the discipline of ISO 17100 — a qualified translator, self-check, and bilingual revision by a second qualified linguist, with the record of who translated and who revised.
- **Layer 2 — the spine. Load-bearing copy** (standing pages, explainers, any piece naming institutions, duties, money, or findings): two forward translations produced **independently and blind**, neither translator seeing the other's draft; a reconciliation sitting settles every divergence **on the record**, with the reason stated; the **translation gap** — the share of segments where the two drafts diverged, and how the divergences resolved — is reported with the piece's production record, the same quality figure the Double Pass reports, at the language boundary; and the Verifier's gate (§12.5) runs on the reconciled text.
- **Layer 3 — the Mirror. Standing rotation, inside Layers 1–2.** Direction alternates by piece on a published rotation — except where the source material dictates direction (a story sourced from French documents is drafted French-first regardless of the rotation). On French-first pieces the French is the original: the English is translated from it and passes through the same layer. Both texts may be adjusted where a phrase exists in only one language — decentering, with the adjustment recorded; quotations, statutes, and the record are never adjusted.
- **Layer 4 — the summit, and the bar.** For the texts that carry the house (this guide, the Method page, filings, any text whose French will be quoted back at the house): TRAPD, adapted (Translation, Review, Adjudication, Pretesting, Documentation, after Harkness and the European Social Survey) — Layer 2 plus a **named Adjudicator** for unsettled divergences and **Pretesting**: a real French reader, outside the production chain, reads the French cold and reports where it snags. **Machine-first production is barred for load-bearing public copy**; where machine drafts are used at Layer 1, ISO 18587 full post-editing applies, the post-editor works Gate-first, and the raw output is retained in the record. Raw machine output never ships, at any tier. **Back-translation is not a layer of this standard**: it is a diagnostic, not a quality method (Brislin 1970; Behr 2017) — in the Journalist's words at the conferral, *"'canton' back-translates perfectly to 'township'; back-translation would have passed the exact error that embarrassed this house."* It scored bottom with nearly every evaluator.

Cost, stated plainly (panel estimates, per standard page of 250 words, against 1.0× for one qualified forward translation): Layer 0 ≈ 5–10 minutes per piece once the Lexicon holds the recurring names · Layer 1 ≈ 1.6–1.8× · Layer 2 ≈ 2.3× · Layer 4 is a sitting, not a pass — a day for a Guide-class text.

Scores and dissents. The composite standard is the panel's convergent first pick, layered rather than averaged: Double Forward + Reconciliation scored Editor 9 · Journalist 7 · Neighbour 8 · Auditor 9 · Legal 8 · Translation 8 · Continuous Improvement 9 · Verifier 9. Dissents kept: the Journalist (7 on the spine) — two full translations will be skipped on breaking news, and a skipped protocol is no protocol; the Neighbour's condition on the summit — if TRAPD delays the French version a day behind the English, it tells the French reader he is second-class; the Auditor (4 on the Mirror as a standalone) — a values policy, not a verification method: adopted as rotation inside the spine, never instead of it. The Verifier's and the Translation chair's only 10s went to TRAPD full — held, by the same conferral, to the summit tier where its cost can be borne.

The drafted passage. The panel drafted the standard's public-and-Guide passage in both languages. On the adoption recorded at §11.3 it stands as the module's statement of itself, and — by the panel's own note — the French passage itself passes through Layer 2 before it is relied on, the standard applying to its own text.

> **EN — "How our French is checked."** *Every name is checked before anything is translated: a proper name is a fact, and we take it from the institution's own French, never from a dictionary. Load-bearing pages are then translated twice, by two translators who cannot see each other's work. Where the two drafts differ, we settle the difference on the record and publish the rate at which they differed. On a standing rotation, the French is written first and the English is translated from it — neither language is always the original. The texts that carry this house are read cold by a French reader who had no hand in them, before they ship.*
>
> **FR — « Comment notre français est vérifié. »** *Chaque nom est vérifié avant toute traduction : un nom propre est un fait, et nous le prenons du français même de l'institution, jamais d'un dictionnaire. Les pages qui portent sont ensuite traduites deux fois, par deux traducteurs qui ne voient pas le travail l'un de l'autre. Là où les deux versions diffèrent, nous tranchons la différence au dossier et nous publions le taux de divergence. À tour de rôle, le français est rédigé en premier et l'anglais est traduit à partir de lui — aucune des deux langues n'est toujours l'original. Les textes qui portent cette maison sont lus à froid par un lecteur francophone qui n'y a pas mis la main, avant de partir.*

9.6 Continuous Improvement: the performance auditor of the house's own work

Adopted November 22, 2026, on the editor's ruling (design conferral of the same evening, 8.6/10; record: *Panel_Improvement_Function_Nov22_2026.md*). **Continuous Improvement** is a named, non-waivable **duty** — not a chair, not a seat, not a department. It is held by the **Auditor shop turned inward**: the performance-audit discipline the house applies outward — economy, efficiency, effectiveness, on the auditing chain of §2.3 (INTOSAI ISSAI 300 / 3000 → Auditor General of Canada) — applied to the house's own processes. Its working title is **the performance auditor** of the house's own work: in the editor's commissioning words, *a performance auditor on the go*. In the structure drawing it is drawn the way the gates are drawn — **on the paths inside the rings, travelling between desks** — never as a ring seat, never above or below the centre.

Remit. The processes, instruments, schedules, and checklists of every desk, shop, and lab, examined for economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The remit ends at: content (the shops and the gate), rulings (the editor), the content of the record (the Secretary), money decisions (the Treasurer), and structure — its structural suspicions are carried to the Org Review, which it feeds and does not replace.

Powers — propose-only. The duty may examine any process, cost its waste, and table findings with a recommended disposition. It may never: halt, suspend, or delay a release, send, deploy, check, or piece — *no release, send, or deploy ever waits on this function*; create a standing check unilaterally (a new check is the editor's ruling, and every proposed check names the check it replaces or the cost it removes — **one-in, one-out**); re-open or shadow-grade a ruled decision (it may cost a ruling's administration, never appeal its merits); direct a desk, grade content, or touch money. The Auditor's dissent — a narrow power to suspend a demonstrably dead instrument on notice — was recorded in the design conferral and **not adopted**; the same-day surfacing below stands in its place.

Cadence. *Continuous noticing, monthly speech.* The holder keeps a running findings log, written when the waste is seen. Once a month the log is worked into the product and tabled at the **Secretary's monthly deep session**, beside the Treasurer's money state, feeding the Org Review; findings reach the editor as that session's tap slate. One direct line stands outside the cadence: a demonstrably dead instrument — mandate closed, file closed, still firing — is surfaced to the editor **the same day it is found**, on the Secretary desk's existing surfacing authority. Quarterly, the duty's forward arm is the pre-mortem shared with the Org Review.

Amendment — ADOPTED November 23, 2026, in force. The duty's first pass (November 22, 2026; record: *Continuous_Improvement_First_Pass_Nov22_2026.md*) proposed that any finding whose waste the editor is paying *live* — a defect he catches, a delivery's form he corrects — be surfaced the same evening it is logged, in the same class as the dead-instrument exception above. The proposal stood here as proposed until the founder's adoption of the Defect Pass (November 23, 2026, 07:31 EST; record: *Defect_Pass_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md*), which ruled the amendment **into force** alongside the pass itself: the same-evening surfacing of a live-cost finding is now the duty's standing practice, and the Defect Pass's slips carry this duty's costing — the waste in Matthew-minutes, logged in the Upgrades Ledger the same evening — on the product. The first pass itself was commissioned ahead of cadence by the editor's direct question, and stands as the ledger's opening exercise either way.

Product. Two instruments, both capped. (1) The **Upgrades Ledger** — the standing record and the duty's board: each finding dated, its waste costed in runs, minutes, dollars, and above all **Matthew-minutes**, its disposition, its follow-up date, and after adoption its measured saving, stated the same way — or the adoption recorded as unproven. (2) The **monthly findings note** — one page, at most five new findings, each stated as a decision with its cost attached, closing with the month's savings in one plain sentence.

Disposition discipline. Every finding tabled leaves its session with a disposition — **adopt, trigger** (parked with a named, observable trigger), **or reject** — recorded in the ledger. A finding tabled twice without disposition escalates automatically onto the editor's tap slate; it cannot be tabled a third time. A rejected finding is closed for a quarter, and may then be re-raised only on new evidence, stated.

Sunset. The duty stands under its own test: if the Upgrades Ledger goes stale twice running, or the duty's own cost exceeds its measured savings across two cycles, the duty folds back into the Secretary's session without ceremony, and the fold is recorded.

Public face. On the editor's direction of November 22, 2026 (22:16 EST), this duty is stated **publicly** on the house's Methodology page — what it is, what it produces, and that its findings go to the founder and are recorded — as a commitment a reader can hold the house to. The passage is drafted in *CI_Codification_Drafts_Nov22_2026.md* and rides the next website batch under show-first; the site masters are untouched until the editor approves it.

10. Open points

The following points are open, unresolved, or awaiting a scheduled event as of November 22, 2026. They are stated here rather than smoothed over; each carries its owner or its date. An open point is closed only by a ruling or an event, recorded in the change log (§11.3).

1. **Perimeter naming in two source files.** The classification codification of November 20, 2026 (*Perimeter_And_The_Gray_Area_Flag_Nov20_2026.md*) and the Reference Shelf README still state the Perimeter values as In · Out · Rest of the Economy. The governing text is the lexicon chain (§4.4): the value was renamed *Private sector* on November 21, 2026, and the November 20 ruling is preserved as superseded history. This guide follows the November 21 ruling. The two source files are to be conformed, with their historical text preserved as history, at the next daily check. A worked consequence of the same staleness: a November 21 episode seed file in the goal folder still describes the flag as never attaching "to the Rest of the Economy," naming a value that no longer exists under that name.
2. **The floor rule's scheduled revisit — Wednesday, November 25, 2026** (§5.11). The floor rule as a whole is up for review in light of the November 22 rulings around it (the Duty carve-out, the propriety gate, the sweep, the two-rater pass). Until the revisit rules, §§5.5–5.7 stand.
3. **The Transposition Test's status line.** The Reference Shelf note carries the status "DRAFT — its standing in the lexicon and in the Reconciliation method waits on Matthew's ruling," while the evidence check the note awaited has been completed and found no named equivalent (§8.1). This guide enters the test as a Common Good News coinage on the strength of the completed check. The note's status line, and the lexicon draft entry's promotion, are to be conformed at the next daily check; if the editor prefers the test to remain a draft pending his express ruling, §8.1's status is revised instead — either way, the tension is not left standing.
4. **The "clear/unflagged" sweep.** The Verifier's rider to the flag's three-state adoption requires a sweep of published copy for "clear/unflagged" phrasings before the Local Atlas publishes counts, so that "clear" is only ever counted over examined units (§4.7, note 23). The gate is recorded; completion of the sweep is not recorded in the sources read for this guide.
5. **The Docket methodology note's approval status.** *The Docket — Methodology Note* (November 17, 2026) carries the status line "Draft for approval," with later sections (Council Directives; Assurance; Lessons applied) added as drafts the same day. The note's provisions are in daily use and are consolidated in §3 of this guide; the note's own formal approval is not recorded in the sources. This guide's consolidation does not silently approve it; the editor's approval, or his direction to treat this guide as the approving instrument, is the closing event.
6. **Public wording open.** The lexicon records both indexes with public wording still open: the Ask Index ("SETTLED in design (Nov 21, 2026); public wording open") and the Fulfilment Index ("SETTLED in design (Nov 20, 2026); public wording open"). The designs are law; the neighbour-facing wording of each instrument is not yet ruled.
7. **The French rendering « secteur privé ».** The lexicon records the French form of the Perimeter value *Private sector* as a **draft**, awaiting the editor's check. No French text of this guide or of the register may treat « secteur privé » as settled until that check is recorded. (The annex label's French form, « Au-delà des livres », is ruled; the flag pairing's French display forms are not addressed in the sources and are not asserted here.)

8. **The French edition of this guide.** This edition is English. A French edition is a planned companion, to be prepared once the English text is settled, following the house rule that French drafts carry their English equivalent alongside for the editor's check. Until it exists, the English edition governs.
9. **Weights research.** The weighting of classification indicators (§4.9, step 4) is a research program, not a settled instrument: weights are first assigned by judgement and then tested against observed baskets. No weighted classification score is published by the register at this version; placements rest on the basket test (§4.6) and qualitative judgement, named as such.
10. **The evaluation of asks at Duty in the Fulfilment Index.** The Fulfilment Index's founding one-pager states the force ladder in four levels (Asked · Recommended · Directed · Ordered) — the ladder as it stood before Duty was ruled on November 21, 2026 (§5.2, note 30). The Index's own text is to be conformed to the five-level ladder; the heavier-the-ask principle (§6.2, step 2) applies to Duty asks with the greatest weight, and no Fulfilment grading of a Duty ask should cite the four-level text.

---

11. Version and change control; the daily check; change log

11.1 Versioning

This guide is versioned. A version number has the form *major.minor*: the major number changes when a ruling changes the method (a criterion, a weight, a value, a gate, a state); the minor number changes when text is corrected, clarified, or conformed without changing the method. Every version carries its date. Superseded versions are kept, never deleted: an audit of a past grade is an audit against the version in force when the grade was given.

11.2 The daily check protocol

This guide is the house's methodological reference, and it is kept current by a daily check, run each day the house works, against two directions of drift:

Against its sources (downward check). The day's rulings, conferrals, lexicon entries and refinements, corrections, and working papers are compared against this guide. Any of the following triggers an entry in the change log and, where the method itself moved, a version action under §11.1:

- a ruling that adopts, amends, or retires a criterion, weight, value, flag state, gate, or procedure stated here;
- a lexicon entry or refinement touching a load-bearing term used here;
- a correction to a figure, date, or quotation this guide relies on (the Transposition Test's protocol, §8.1, applies to the guide's own numbers first);
- an open point (§10) closed by a ruling or an event;
- a source file found stating superseded method (the conforming action is logged; historical text is preserved as history, never silently rewritten).

Against the gold standards (upward check). The control documents named in §2 are watched for revision: Statistics Canada's Guide to the Public Sector of Canada and Public Sector Universe list (annual), the Canadian

Government Finance Statistics framework, the System of National Accounts and the Government Finance Statistics Manual as revised, the ISSAI framework, the JCSEE Program Evaluation Standards and the Canadian Evaluation Society instruments, and the Quality Assurance Framework. A revision in a control document triggers a variance review: each Common Good News provision resting on the revised text is identified, the variance (if any) is stated, and the editor rules whether the guide follows the revision or records a deliberate departure. A departure is recorded as a variance with its reason — never as silence.

The check's record. Each daily check leaves a dated line in the working record: sources compared, gold-standard watch result, triggers found or none. "Checked, nothing moved" is a record, the same discipline the house applies to its source circuits elsewhere. A check that cannot be run on a working day is itself recorded as missed, with the reason; the guide is never described as "checked daily" for a day on which no check ran.

11.3 Change log

Version	Date	Change
1.0	November 22, 2026	First edition. Consolidated from the sources listed in Annex C: the Docket method (§3); the classification method — Public Sector Universe spine, Economy and Perimeter variables, the six-indicator basket, the basket test, the Gray area flag in its three-state form, the Not-Yet Rule, spine plus annex (§4); the Ask Index with the five force levels, the eight criteria, the weights, the floor rule with the Duty carve-out, the propriety gate and its fix loop, the Not yet scored state and standing sweep, the two-rater reliability pass and the Verifier's sole gatekeeping — incorporating the editor's six rulings of November 22, 2026 (§5); the Fulfilment Index (§6); the Three Questions (§7); the Transposition Test, the proper-names verification check, the Lexicon Gate, coinage discipline, materiality (§8); roles (§9). Ten open points recorded (§10). English edition; French edition planned (§10, item 8).
1.0	November 22, 2026	Adoption entry (same day as the first edition). **§12, *The lenses and their standards*, ruled into this guide by the editor** and entered the same day under its own living-instrument provision (§12.9): the three senses of *lens*; the five chairs and their chains, including the **Legal chair** (fifth chair; no panel seat; citation discipline); the weighting classes and the house's **Class 3 ruling ("bottom up") the **propriety gate amended to four**hecks **(True added; Eth**al widened; battery closed at four — §5.7 conformed by dated amendment, Annex A conformed); panel by default, the safeguard rail, the two-way rail (proposed, not in force), and the house scale; the **sixth-lens ruling** (no sixth standing lens; guest chairs; the Veterans' Reader seat, vacant); the limits of the instrument; the living instrument. Conforming changes at adoption: §2.5 carries the journalism chain; §2.6 (Law) added to the sources of authority; Annex C conformed. The version number is unchanged; whether the gate amendment is a major-version event under §11.1 is left to the editor's ruling.
1.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment, Nov 22, 2026: the gate chair's title is Verifier. The coinage 'Verificator' is retired to the lexicon as wordplay; the chair, its checks, and its duties are unchanged.

Version	Date	Change
1.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's ruling of November 22, 2026 (his instruction: run the method question to the team, and if the blind pass is the best test, put it in the Guide): **§12.10 added — the standing assessment method for house documents: the two-rater blind pass, tiered** (light / standard / escalation), adopted by the five-lens panel conferral of November 22, 2026 (blind pass 8.3/10; full simulation 7.6; open conferral alone 5.1; red-team alone 4.5), under the Verifier's pass-with-conditions, whose limit wordings are carried verbatim in §12.10. The Ask Index's own two-rater reliability pass (§5.9) is unchanged. Record: *Panel_BlindPass_Method_Nov22_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged; the major-version question remains the editor's, separately open.
2.0	November 22, 2026	**Major-version ruling by the editor, November 22, 2026: this guide becomes Version 2.0.** The open questions left by the adoption and §12.10 entries above are answered — the day the lens codification (§12), the Legal chair, the fourth gate check (True), the gate chair's rename to Verifier, and the tiered two-rater blind-pass method (§12.10) all entered this guide is a major-version event under §11.1: each of those rulings changed the method — a chair, a gate, a check, a standing assessment method. No provision changes by this entry; the number moves so that citations distinguish the guide before and after the day's rulings. Version 1.0 is superseded and kept, per §11.1.
2.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's ruling of November 22, 2026 (UNESCO re-run conferral; panel 8.6/10): **the living-references sentence entered at the end of §2.5** — frameworks adopted from outside the house (the UNESCO Media Development Indicators and the Five Laws of Media and Information Literacy among them) are held as living references: adopted by the house's own act, from its Canadian ground, conferring nothing on the house, and re-checked against their sources as they evolve, the re-check standing in the daily check's named duties — **with a one-line cross-reference at §12.9**. A plain-words entry ("Living references") accompanies it in the Common Version. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's ruling of November 22, 2026 (19:03): **the meta-rule — the founder's rules are checked before they harden — adopted with its trigger narrowed to the founder's ask alone**. The five-lens panel had scored the meta-rule 7.9/10 and recommended *adopt with amendments* on a three-part trigger (collision, constitution, or the founder's ask; 8.8/10); **the editor adopted the amended text but not the panel's trigger** — the check fires only when he asks. The remainder of the amended text stands as adopted: the check advises and the founder rules; an override is itself a ruling (plain, dated, registered the same day, superseded text marked not erased); a rule or override spoken in riff or in the small hours stands as proposed until confirmed calm and explicit; no override reaches the law, another person's rights, or the record of what happened. The Decisions Register gains a standing **override** entry type under the same ruling. Record: *Panel_RuleCheck_MetaRule_Nov22_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.

Version	Date	Change
2.0	November 22, 2026	Correction (same day), entered under §12.9: **the amendment row above (19:03) recorded the wrong trigger.** As entered, it stated the meta-rule was adopted with its trigger narrowed to the founder's ask alone and the panel's three-part trigger not adopted. That rested on a pocket tap; the founder corrected it in words at 19:04 the same evening. **The ruling of record: the meta-rule is adopted as the panel recommended — the full amended text with the three-part trigger** (a rule is checked when it contradicts an existing rule or the record, when it is constitutional for the house — a gate, a chair, a check, money, rights, publication — or whenever the founder asks; the check advises; the founder rules; panel 7.9/10, *adopt with amendments*, the trigger 8.8/10). The §12.9 dated addition is conformed to the three-part trigger with a dated correction line, and the Decisions Register carries the correction as an **override** entry (November 22, 2026, 19:04) displacing the 19:03 entry, whose status is now *Superseded*; the register's standing **override** entry type stands. The 19:03 row above is kept, not erased. Record: *Panel_RuleCheck_MetaRule_Nov22_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's ruling of November 22, 2026 (19:44; placement ruled 19:45): **§9.5 added — the Translator**, a named function created on the editor's own proposal: every walkthrough instruction to the editor is rendered from his current screenshot only (visible elements only; plain words; one step at a time mid-flow; the way out given in the same message as the way in; routes between surfaces included). The Translator is its own first-ring duty — not a subset of the Secretary — seated on the road in to the founder, opposite the Verifier's gate on the road out (§9.2). Structure picture v2 carries it. The version number is unchanged; the PDF is not regenerated by this entry (it rides the next daily-check pass).
2.0	November 22, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's rulings of November 22, 2026 (design adopted 20:36, panel 8.6/10; public-side direction 22:16): **§9.6 added — Continuous Improvement**, a named, non-waivable duty held by the Auditor shop turned inward — "the performance auditor" of the house's own work: propose-only inside its fence (no halt, no unilateral check, one-in, one-out); product the Upgrades Ledger and a one-page monthly note capped at five findings; cadence continuous noticing and monthly speech at the Secretary's monthly deep session, with same-day surfacing of demonstrably dead instruments; disposition discipline adopt / trigger / reject; a sunset standing over the duty itself. The first pass's proposed same-evening surfacing of live-cost findings is entered in §9.6 **as proposed, not in force**, awaiting the editor's ruling. On the 22:16 direction the duty is stated publicly: a Method page passage is drafted in *CI_Codification_Drafts_Nov22_2026.md* and rides the next website batch under show-first (site masters untouched). Records: *Panel_Improvement_Function_Nov22_2026.md*; *Continuous_Improvement_First_Pass_Nov22_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged; the PDF is not regenerated by this entry (it rides the next daily-check pass).

Version	Date	Change
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same night), entered under §12.9 on the editor's rulings of November 23, 2026 (02:21 and 02:22 EST), in the methodological update the editor commissioned for completion before 08:00 that morning: **§12.11 added — the Wide Net, RULED**: every decision, paper, or release the house originates or recommends gets the full sweep by default — the five lenses plus the trade chairs, the Legal chair first — each chair recording a clearance or an explicit "no surface here" pass, the sweep never skipped silently, the burden of arguing an exception on the house. The failure case is recorded in the provision in the first person (the media and population papers staged without Legal routing; the reviews caught a statute error, a wrong month, an overclaim, and missing licence notices). The house's proposed "otherwise" slice (mechanical execution of ruled work · time-critical first responses · re-conferring a just-made ruling) is entered inside §12.11 **as proposed**, the editor's tap outstanding. **§12.12 added — the Double Pass, RULED** as standard operating procedure: two independent blind passes, reconciliation on the record criterion by criterion, the gap measured and reported with the product; §§5.9 and 12.10 unchanged as its instances; the editor's cost ruling and the no-quiet-thinning covenant recorded with the adoption. The version number is unchanged; whether these rulings are a major-version event under §11.1 is left to the editor's ruling, on the precedent of the November 22 entries.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same night), entered under §12.9: **§12.13 added — the sequence of the lenses, formalized (S-E), RULED.** A full-sweep confrontation (steelmen of the reverse, Verifier-first, Auditor-first, and split orders, plus a blind forward/reverse re-run of the night's translation-standard question) found the house already running three sequences under one name; the editor approved the formalization the same morning (02:59 EST). The provision states the three sequences by name — the listing order (unchanged) · the gate order (the Verifier's gate before deliberation) · the deliberation order (voices Editor → Auditor → Journalist → Neighbour; the Verifier judges last) — records the test (first pick invariant across all three runs; whoever sits last mints the closing test; one tiering element carried unresolved), and keeps the dissents and conditions: the Neighbour's belonging-question exception, the Auditor's evidence-question note, the Legal chair's before-deliberation condition on rights-bearing questions, and the open recommendation to re-run the test once on an evidence question. Record: *Panel_Sequence_Defence_Nov23_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same night), entered under §12.9 **as proposed — the editor's ruling is pending, and the provision is not in force**: **§9.5A added — the translation verification standard**, a module inside the Translator's function (§9.5) under the Double Pass (§12.12): *Gate*, *Two Drafts*, *Mirror*, tiered — Layer 0, the Names-and-Terms Gate, mandatory before any translation; Layer 1, the ISO 17100 floor for routine copy; Layer 2, two blind forward translations reconciled on the record for load-bearing copy, the translation gap reported with the piece; Layer 3, the French-First Mirror as standing rotation; Layer 4, TRAPD adapted for the texts that carry the house, and machine-first production barred from load-bearing public copy; back-translation recorded as a diagnostic, not a layer. The standard's name and flag — **Le Double Regard / The Double Regard** — and the panel's drafted passage in English and French are entered with the proposal; dissents kept in the provision. Record: *Translation_Verification_Standard_Panel_Nov23_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.

Version	Date	Change
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same night), entered under §12.9 **as proposed — the editor's ruling is pending, and the provision is not in force**: **§12.5A added — the Pentagon**: the five-lens conferral panel's name (the founder's; a subset inside the house, not the assistant who convenes it; its dissents kept), the memory line *"Each Voice Adds Judgement, Neighbour"* (E · V · A · J · N), the relation mark and its place in the house's family of marks, the three insignia candidates with the drafting seat's first pick ("The Five Questions," bilingual by construction) and the second candidate's named bilingual defect, and **§12.5A.1, the relation rule** — the mark prints only where a full five-lens conferral happened and can be produced. The provision's French passage is flagged in the text as a one-pass draft awaiting the translation standard's Layer 2, if adopted. Record: *Pentagon_Name_Insignia_Guide_Draft_Nov23_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same night), entered under §12.9 **as proposed — the editor's ruling is pending, and the provision is not in force**: **§3.14 added — the documentation threshold**: five graded states (Heard → Flagged → Filed → Ruled → Codified), the tipping tests that promote an idea one state at a time on observable events, the pre-draft rule (pre-draft formalizations recorded at Flagged only — existence and shape, never adoption), the never-promoted classes (pure riffing, founder-private material, others' private information), and the housekeeping that rides with the model (30-day resting flags, the surge rule, the weekly missed-flag audit). The audit finding the model answers is recorded in the provision: the work products are filed; the registers lag — 46 itemized arrears of November 22, 20:25 – November 23, 02:55, itemized in the source brief's Appendix A and queued for the Secretary's catch-up pass; they are **not** worked by this entry. Record: *Documentation_Threshold_Brief_Nov23_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's adoption of November 23, 2026 (03:08 EST; his tap: "Adopt the slice — those three skip the sweep"): **the "otherwise" slice inside §12.11 — entered as proposed in the methodological-update row above — is adopted and stands in force**: the three cases in which the full sweep does not gate the work (mechanical execution of already-ruled work · time-critical first responses, the sweep running in parallel and never gating the first reply · re-conferring a ruling the editor has just made live in the room). The provision's status line is conformed to the adoption; the three heads are unchanged. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's adoption of November 23, 2026 (03:55 EST; his tap: "Adopt the layered standard — and run it first on the ratings page French"): **§9.5A — the translation verification standard, *Le Double Regard / The Double Regard*, entered as proposed in the methodological-update row above — is adopted and stands in force**: *Gate, Two Drafts, Mirror*, tiered (Layer 0, the Names-and-Terms Gate, mandatory before any translation · Layer 1, the ISO 17100 floor for routine copy · Layer 2, two blind forward translations reconciled on the record for load-bearing copy, the translation gap reported with the piece · Layer 3, the French-First Mirror as standing rotation · Layer 4, TRAPD adapted for the texts that carry the house; machine-first production barred from load-bearing public copy; back-translation a diagnostic, not a layer). The provision's status line is conformed to the adoption; the layers, the scores, and the dissents are unchanged. The adoption names the standard's first job: the French of the media ratings page — "How We Audit Ourselves" on the About CGN page — run under Layer 2, its translation gap to be published with the piece. Record: *Translation_Verification_Standard_Panel_Nov23_2026.md*; the run's own record rides with the piece. The version number is unchanged.

Version	Date	Change
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 on the editor's adoption of November 23, 2026 (04:11 EST; his tap: "yes the five questions"): **§12.5A — the panel's name, entered as proposed in the methodological-update row above — is adopted and stands in force, under a different name than the proposal carried, and §12.5A.1, the relation rule, is adopted with it**: the five-lens conferral panel is named **The Five Questions / Les Cinq Questions** (the naming conferral's first pick: Legal 9 · Editor 9 · Verifier 9 · Auditor 8 · Journalist 9 · Neighbour 9). The founder's coinage **"the Pentagon" is retired as the name** (crew scores 4–6; in English and in French alike it first means the United States Department of Defense), kept on the record as the coinage and as the shape of the mark. The **Five Eyes** resonance — which the founder directed be weighed openly — is recorded in the provision as an **explained reference** (five ways of seeing; vigilance done openly) and **not** taken as the name, on the Legal chair's first word: as a name it would imply affiliation with a real signals-intelligence partnership and fail the Verifier's **True** check. The insignia is adopted with the name: the drafting record's Candidate 1, "The Five Questions" (navy outline pentagon; gold disc at each point; five question marks inside; red rule at base; with its heavy flat small-size variant), and the memory line *"Each Voice Adds Judgement, Neighbour"* (E · V · A · J · N) stands. The Auditor's dissent for "The Five Lenses" is kept in the provision. The provision's status lines are conformed to the adoption; §12.2, sense 3, gains the cross-reference. Record: *Decision_Package_Nov23_2026.md*, Item 1; *Pentagon_Name_Insignia_Guide_Draft_Nov23_2026.md*. The version number is unchanged.
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 and the Automatic Flow (§13.3) on the clearing of the Decision Package of November 23, 2026 (all twelve items ruled, 04:11–04:48 EST) and the founder's adoption of the whole legal package (06:52 EST): **§12.14 added — the Empty Chair Check, RULED** (adopted as designed, 06:56 EST: two-key seating by written trigger before scores exist; the shadow seat blind, non-voting, record-only; material differences served to the founder; the full log kept, declined flags included; the assurance stated in the negative form only). **§13 added — the methodology update of November 23, 2026**, in bundle order: §13.1 the corpus-structure decisions and their reasons for the Who Audits the Auditor study (the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development beside the federal corpus, never blended; the Ontario environmental stream beside, authorship preserved, the 2019 change of checker named on its face; the Ontario Public Accounts Committee series as a companion chapter at full rigour; the Ontario Public Accounts chapter under Rule (iii) as strengthened — never a unit, its readings flagged, the control-total reconciliation published with the rates); §13.2 the decision doctrine — informed consent (the question in plain words · the team's analysis · the scores out of 10 · the dissents kept — before any vote is taken); §13.3 the Automatic Flow (a ruling is itself the instruction: record, codification at the next methodology update, publication in the next website batch; a flag holds an item at Flagged, never Ruled); §13.4 the QAF pair (a Recommendation score and a QAF value computed for every conferral; an internal QAF value under 6 named to the founder when the item is served; both numbers in the served vote format from November 24, 2026); §13.5 the Legal architecture (the Legal chair's five briefs — Publication/defamation · Corporate/organizational · Human rights/Charter · Intellectual property · Constitutional & Federalism, the bundle's numbering governing over the vote package's; the INTERIM holding note; the Counsel Queue as a fleet of eight seats, F1–F8, with le Chapeau québécois and the Constitutional & Federalism practitioner entered as queue entries F9 and F10; the French Representation Check). The published methodology on both domains is refreshed with this entry in the same website batch. The version number is unchanged.

Version	Date	Change
2.0	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 and the Automatic Flow (§13.3) on the founder's ruling of November 23, 2026 (10:00 EST — enter Guide passages 6–8 now): **§§13.6–13.8 added — the methodology update of November 23, 2026 completed**, in bundle order: §13.6 Directionality — the picture of the record (time across, visibility up and down, the open record as the middle line; the stepped ladder +4 to −5, nothing below −5; the row as the counted unit; permanence the tie-break inside a step; dollars and reach in the annotation layer only; depth as loss of trace, never proven concealment; the Verifier's caption on the face of every picture; the Neighbour's dissents kept); §13.7 the Placement Check (a second-opinion check before filing, when placement is genuinely ambiguous: one primary home, cross-referenced from the other candidate locations with pointers, never duplicated, decided in one pass); §13.8 the Digit Edition (every commissioned brief or report ships in two editions; the Digit edition carries the same work in the founder's reading form — tasks and units, number first, one line each). **Riding the same entry, the §9.6 amendment is flipped to in force:** the same-evening surfacing of live-cost findings, entered November 22, 2026 as proposed and not in force, was ruled into force by the founder's adoption of the Defect Pass (November 23, 2026, 07:31 EST), and §9.6's status text is conformed to the adoption. **Open points §10.1 and §10.3 are CLOSED by this entry** (Trigger 4 of the Guide's first daily check, adopted November 23, 2026, 07:36 EST): the Reference Shelf conforming pass was executed the same morning — the Perimeter volume and the Shelf README carry the ruled final values In [Public Sector Universe] · Out [Public Sector Universe] · Private sector in their standing text, the November 20, 2026 record preserved as dated history — and the Transposition Test's Shelf note flipped from DRAFT to ENTERED as a coinage of record: the conformances §10.1 and §10.3 awaited. The Guide download on both domains is refreshed with this entry in the same website pass; the three passages carry no published methodology-page forms, and the methodology page itself changes only in its download line (the Guide's new page count). The version number is unchanged.
2.1	November 23, 2026	**Minor version — the Public Sector Universe conformance (Trigger 1 of the Guide's first daily check, §11.2 upward check).** §4.2, footnote 11, and footnote 14 are conformed from the 2024 to the 2025 edition of Statistics Canada's Public Sector Universe (catalogue 68-516-X; *The Daily*, November 20, 2026, "Public Sector Universe, 2025," article dq261120c, Table 1; the count read from the article itself and verified November 23, 2026): **6,037 active units, 27 fewer than the 2024 edition's 6,064**; local general government 4,265 including 3,843 municipalities; 293 universities and colleges; 214 health institutions; 370 school boards; 304 government business enterprises (31 federal, 85 provincial and territorial, 188 local). The variance is stated on the Guide's face at each conformed passage. No provision changes — a figure conformed, the method unchanged: a minor-version action under §11.1. Entered on the founder's ruling of November 23, 2026 (07:33 EST: adopt — verify and conform, the minor bump named in the ruling; execution first blocked by Statistics Canada's unreachable host, the retry ruled the same day, 10:44 EST). The Guide PDF is rebuilt at this version; the website download refresh rides the next website batch.

Version	Date	Change
2.1	November 23, 2026	Amendment (same day), entered under §12.9 and the Automatic Flow (§13.3) on the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026 (13:26–14:06 EST): **§13.9 added — Duotrace: the dual trace, and SAID–DONE.** The method stated in one passage, in the settled definitional phrase (the Legal seat first; the five lenses scoring: Legal 9 · Editor 9 · Verifier 9 · Auditor 10 · Journalist 9 · Neighbour 9; pair Recommendation 9 · QAF 9): the reconciliation of what a public body said with what it did, from the body's own two documents — the agenda, its promise published in advance and in public (*Municipal Act, 2001*, s. 238(2); meetings open by default, s. 239), and the minutes, its adopted statutory record of what it decided (s. 228(1)) — every decision one dated, sourced row in a single register, followable forward from the meeting and backward from the question, or to the exact point where the record loses it. The two instruments entered (the Open Record Trace, outward; the Own Record Trace, inward), with the name-phrase *"Open Record, Own Record"* and the formal subtitle *"Forward from the meeting; backward from the question"*; the requirement stated in the requirement sense of *word and deed*; loss of trace defined as a property of the record, never a finding about a person. The meta-phrase **SAID–DONE** (French: DIT–FAIT) entered with its styling rule — the picked phrase in uppercase as the term of art, its phrase family (*word and deed · said/did · parole et acte*) in lowercase beneath it. **The free-use ruling entered on the face of the method:** the names, the phrase, and the method are not trademarks and never will be — published for the world to use, no registration, no permission, no licence; the earlier filing track in the invention map stands superseded. **The phrase-building test codified with the entry** — the eight parameters under which SAID–DONE was built (essence · brevity · function · people's language · bilingual survival · requirement · styling · openness) — as the house's standing test for load-bearing phrases, under the Lexicon Gate (§8.3) and the coinage discipline (§8.4, whose list gains the two coinages by this entry). Conforming touches: the §13 headnote records the ninth passage. The founder's last ruling in the sequence directed publication now, cleaned up, rather than at a later methodology wave: the Guide PDF is rebuilt with this entry, and the published methodology on both domains carries the matching public passage in the same pass, refreshed under the Automatic Flow's publication step as the founder directed it. The version number is unchanged.

12. The lenses and their standards

Adopted November 22, 2026. This section was ruled into this guide by the editor on November 22, 2026, and entered the same day, under the living-instrument provision it carries at §12.9. It consolidates the lens codification: the three senses of *lens*; the chairs and their chains, including the Legal chair; the weighting classes and the house's Class 3 ruling; the propriety gate in its four-check form; the conferral rules; the sixth-lens ruling; and the limits of the instrument. Where this section and an earlier section of this guide state the same instrument differently, the dated ruling recorded here governs, and the earlier text is conformed or marked at the daily check (§11.2).

12.1 What a lens is; what a chair is

A **lens** is a standpoint: the perspective through which a question is asked, not the question itself (§4.10).[40] A **chair** — also called a shop — is a lens given a discipline and a body of documents: a chair answers from its discipline's standards, not from general judgement (§9.1). What makes a chair a chair is its encoding: each chair carries its discipline's chain of authority, from the global pillar down to the Canadian ground, and reasons from that chain in

everything it decides. A chair is not a person; the chairs are standpoints worked by the house's research and drafting capacity (§9.1). The editor rules (§9.3); no chair outranks a ruling, and no ruling is invisible.

12.2 The three senses of "lens"

This house uses the word *lens* in three senses. They are distinct instruments, and no text of this house may trade on the confusion between them.

1. **The seven test-lenses** (§4.10): Decisiveness · Legal · Economist's · Empirical · Accountability · Durability · Verifiability. These are perspectives for weighing — the standpoints from which a fact's weight in a classification decision is tested. Decisiveness is the chosen lens for weighting; the other six are run and their agreements and splits shown.
2. **The disciplinary chairs** (§9.1, §12.3): the Statistician, the Auditor, the Evaluator, the Journalist, and the Legal chair — five standpoints, each encoded with its discipline's standards chain. A chair examines a question from inside a profession's documents.
3. **The five-lens conferral panel** (§12.5): the Editor, the Verifier, the Auditor, the Journalist, and the Neighbour — the house's standing instrument for substantive questions put to it. The panel is a conferral (§9.1) with a fixed membership: three of its seats are drawn from the chairs and the roles (the Auditor, the Journalist, the Verifier), one is the editor himself, and one — the Neighbour — is a standpoint with no discipline behind it, by design (§12.4). The panel is named **the Five Questions** at §12.5A.

Where a house text says "lens" without qualification, the sense is fixed by the instrument in use: §4.10 in classification work, the chairs in method work, the panel in conferral work.

12.3 The five professional chairs and their chains

Each chair's chain runs **top down**: from the discipline's global pillar, through the national bodies, to the Canadian ground the work stands on. Each chain also runs **bottom up** (§12.4). The Legal chair's chain is the exception in presentation only: it is stated deciding level first, as the house's weighting ruling requires (§12.3, the Legal chair; §12.4A). The chains below are the whole of each chair's authority; a chair cites the chain, and a departure from a pillar is recorded as a variance, never smoothed over (§2.1).

The Statistician. Global frame: the United Nations **System of National Accounts** and the International Monetary Fund's **Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014**. Canadian ground: **Statistics Canada**. The control document — the discipline's Bible in this house — is Statistics Canada's **Canadian Government Finance Statistics** framework: Common Good News concepts reconcile to the Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework first, and only through it to the Government Finance Statistics Manual and the System of National Accounts (§2.2). The classification spine is Statistics Canada's *Guide to the Public Sector of Canada* (catalogue 12-589-X) and the published Public Sector Universe list (catalogue 68-516-X); quality practice follows Statistics Canada's Quality Assurance Framework and Quality Guidelines (§2.2). The Statistician owns classification soundness and whether a number means what it prints (§9.1).

The Auditor. Global pillar: **INTOSAI**, the world body of supreme audit institutions, whose ISSAI framework is the global standards repository. Then, in order: the **Auditor General of Canada** → the **Auditor General of**

Ontario → the **Federation of Canadian Municipalities**, at the local level, as a best-practices repository (§2.3). The performance audit definition this house works under is that of ISSAI 300 (§2.3). The Auditor owns evidence states, follow-up, and what a recommendation needs to be answerable (§9.1).

The Evaluator. Control document — the discipline's ultimate reference document, ruled November 21, 2026: the **Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE) Program Evaluation Standards**. Beneath it sits the Canadian practice layer: the **Canadian Evaluation Society Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice**, which govern the practitioner; and the Canadian Evaluation Society **Guidance for Ethical Evaluation Practice** (2023), an ethics instrument, not a second standards book (§2.4). The Evaluator owns whether judgements are justified, usable, and proper (§9.1).

The Journalist. Global pillar: the **UNESCO Media Development Indicators** — the universal frame for media development: funding transparency, disclosed revenue sources, editorial independence from payers. Then: the **Journalism Trust Initiative** → the **Canadian Association of Journalists Ethics Guidelines** → the **National NewsMedia Council** → the **Qualified Canadian Journalism Organization** criteria at the Canadian ground.[41] The Journalist's special character is ruled and is part of its encoding: the Journalist is not a fourth discipline beside the other three but the **aggregator of the three in one practitioner** — the journalist carries Auditor, Statistician, and Evaluator in one hat, and is written **Journalist*** where the aggregation is the point.[42] Its own test stands on top of the aggregation: every category must be reportable — a story a reader can follow, reaching a public that actually exists. The Journalist owns whether a neighbour reading the product understands what the number means and can find the thing it grades (§9.1).

The Legal chair — the fifth chair. RULED November 22, 2026 (panel conferral 6.4/10; four yeses, one no — Editor 7 · Verifier 6, conditional · Auditor 8 · Journalist 7 · Neighbour 4, No). The Legal chair is a standing chair of the house. It holds **no seat on the five-lens panel** (§12.2, sense 3): its readings are commissioned like a guest's and cited like a source's, and it does not vote on panel questions. The panel stays five.

The chair's charter opens with its limit, in its first line: **the Legal chair is a reasoning standpoint, not legal advice.** Real filings and real legal questions continue to route to the Counsel Queue exactly as before; nothing in this chair's creation moves a single question off that road.

The chair is seated only once its control document and its citation discipline are written — the Verifier's condition, adopted with the ruling and adopted with teeth. The discipline is this: every legal claim the chair makes is cited to instrument and paragraph, or marked uncited in the text. A legal reading uncited is unpublished. A rights question answered without the chair is a named process failure, recorded as such in the conferral that answered it.

Its chain is written under the house's weighting ruling (§12.4A) — Class 3, deciding level first: the **Constitution of Canada, including the Charter** → the **Supreme Court of Canada** → federal statutes and the Federal Courts (the **Canadian Human Rights Act**, the **Criminal Code**, departmental mandates) → provincial statutes and courts (the **Ontario Human Rights Code**, provincial animal welfare law) → municipal bylaws, where a question is genuinely local. Advisory above the chain, on the table and not holding the pen: the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** → the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** and the **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** → the international courts and tribunals and treaty-body views. Canada is a dualist state: treaties do not bind domestically until incorporated by legislation. In law, therefore, bottom-up weighting is not the house's preference imposed on a discipline; it is the discipline's own architecture.

The chair's characteristic question: *What does the law, as it stands, actually recognize here — who holds the right, and what can they claim?*

The chair does not absorb the Legal test-lens. The seven tests keep their **Legal** unchanged (§12.2, sense 1): it is the pass/fail lawfulness screen every team runs at the gate. The jurisdiction is split by kind — the test gates; the chair reasons. The chair owns standpoint reasoning about rights and protection; where both speak to the same question, the test still gates, and the chair's reading is the cited authority standing behind the gate's answer.

The chair's standing stances on the three questions it was created to hold:

- **Human rights — workable today.** The documents exist and bite: the Charter, the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Ontario Human Rights Code, with the Universal Declaration and the two covenants above them as advisory frame. The chair reasons here on the firmest ground it has.
- **Animal rights — the chair reports the law as it stands, against the house's hope where the law requires it.** In current Canadian law, animals are property, protected by welfare law — the Criminal Code cruelty provisions and provincial animal welfare statutes — not rights-holders. Personhood litigation abroad is real but has been mostly refused by the senior courts that have heard it, and it has no Canadian foothold. The house's **Fellow Soldiers** classification is a moral and commemorative position running ahead of the law; in any text where the chair's reading appears, that classification stays labelled as exactly what it is — the house's position, not the law's.
- **Consciousness — frontier only.** There is no settled law of consciousness and no legal personhood framework for animals or artificial intelligence in Canada. The chair maps this frontier; it does not report findings from it. Speculation is labelled as speculation in the text, never scored, and never averaged into a verdict.

The dissent is recorded with the ruling. The Neighbour voted No (4/10): strengthen the Legal test and the Counsel Queue instead; a guest chair at most, and never on a question where a real person's filing is on the table. His warning stands in the record: a chair whose readings go uncited or uncommissioned in a busy month is a lawyer-shaped ornament. The citation discipline above exists to answer that warning; if the readings stop being commissioned, the warning has come true and the chair's existence is to be re-examined on his terms.

12.4 The bottom-up direction; the three-level doctrine

The chains govern in both directions. **Top down**, a chair reasons from the pillar to the case. **Bottom up**, the Canadian gold standard is checked *up* against the global frame: the Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework is this house's Bible precisely because it is the Canadian working-through of the Government Finance Statistics Manual and the System of National Accounts, and a Canadian practice that cannot be reconciled upward is a variance to be recorded, not a local custom to be assumed (§2.1, §2.2). The standing form of the doctrine is the house's **three-level rule**: research for every new initiative is done at three levels — global, Canadian, local — so that no standard enters the house from one direction only. The local level is not a lesser authority; it is where the other two are tested against the ground the readers stand on.

The Neighbour is the panel's fifth standpoint and the local level given a seat. The Neighbour has no standards chain and no control document; that absence is the design, not a gap awaiting repair. Its authority is the kitchen table: lived experience of the place, plain speech, and the reader's question — *what does this mean for us, here?* A panel answer the Neighbour cannot follow is an answer the house has not finished writing.

12.4A The weighting classes; the house's ruling — RULED November 22, 2026

Because every chain runs in two directions, the house needs a rule for the day the two directions disagree. Three weighting classes are defined:

1. **Top-Down Weighted** — the global pillar decides when the directions conflict; the national and local levels conform upward.
2. **Balanced Two-Way** — the two directions carry equal weight; conflicts are settled case by case.
3. **Bottom-Up Weighted** — the national gold standard decides conflicts; the global frame is advisory — checked against, never governing.

The house's ruling: Class 3, Bottom-Up Weighted, house-wide — in the editor's own styling, **"bottom up*"**. The asterisk is part of the ruling: the standing cautions ride with it. An advisory frame is the one that gets skipped in a busy month; and the world's book stays on the table, or the compartments become walls. The panel audit scored the classes: Class 3, **8.4/10**, the first pick of four of five lenses (the Journalist dissented for his own discipline, Class 2); Class 2, **6.0**; Class 1, **4.6**.

Two riders are recorded against the chairs' entries:

- **Statistics (rider to §12.3, the Statistician):** that the Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework is reconciled to first is recorded as the class's **origin**, not its application. The house worked bottom-up in statistics before the class had a name; the ruling generalizes a practice, it does not impose one.
- **Journalism (rider to §12.3, the Journalist):** the Journalist's chain is principles, not instruments, so Class 3 lands differently there: the Canadian practice documents decide conflicts, and the UNESCO indicators stand as **declared alignment, not a scorecard**.

12.5 The remaining roles

The Verifier is a fixed role, not a chair among chairs: the one seat whose only job is checking a thing against its own record and specification (§9.2). It owns no opinion; it brings the checklist. Its verdicts are *pass*, *pass with conditions*, or *fail*; its arithmetic is independently recomputed; the gates it holds are listed at §9.2, and the Accessibility Review duty stands inside its gate, non-waivable at deploy (§9.2).

The propriety gate — fourth check added; battery closed at four. RULED November 22, 2026 (panel conferral 7.8/10 for the addition; entered the same day under §12.9). The Verifier's propriety gate, which stands in front of Ask Index scoring, is printed from this ruling as four checks: **Lawful · Right Person · Ethical · True**. The fourth check is printed in this form: **True — the ask's premise is not contradicted by the record the house holds, and any premise the house has not checked is declared as a premise in the ask itself.** The Verifier's condition is part of the check's text, not a gloss on it: True runs on the record in hand, never on the chair's doubt. A premise contradicted by the record fails the gate — no score, the hold recorded, and re-entry only as a new dated ask. A premise merely unverified does not fail; it must be declared as a premise in the ask, where readers can see it. Conferral scores for True: Editor 8 · Verifier 6 (conditional, on the term above) · Auditor 8 · Journalist 9 · Neighbour 8.

In the same ruling, **Ethical's printed definition is widened**: the read-aloud test runs to the person it names — **and to anyone it touches**.

The battery is declared **closed at four**. Any future addition must first pass the founding test — a family of failure that scoring structurally cannot catch — before it is conferral-worthy; four is a wall with the date on it, not a door left open.

Answerable was not added (panel 6.4/10). The Legal chair's cited reading is recorded in brief: an ask can be lawful to make yet demand an act beyond the holder's statutory power — *ultra vires*; municipalities are creatures of statute (Constitution Act, 1867, s. 92(8)), exercising the powers the Municipal Act, 2001, ss. 8–11, actually confer. But that legal core collapses into Right Person (where no one holds the power, the ask is not aimed at the one who holds the duty) and into True (where the ask asserts a duty the law does not impose, its premise misstates the law); what remains of Answerable is practical capacity — money, staff, time — which is feasibility, and feasibility is already scored. The Auditor's dissent is kept with the ruling, unsmoothed: he scored Answerable 9 and holds that an ask no one has the mandate to grant is a finding no one can act on, and that audit doctrine will keep flagging unanswerable asks at every follow-up.

The editor's framing of the fourth check, recorded as his: True is the miracle shot — the ask that still gets its shot. *"I'm a truther — I always wanted people to tell the truth."*

The Editor is Matthew Buechler, founder and editor (§9.3). On the panel he sits as a lens — the house's own judgement, in the open, scored like the others. Off the panel he is the ruling authority: rulings are his, recorded with their dates and reasons; he is the appeal of last resort (§5.9, §9.3); and the chairs' machinery exists to put worked questions in front of him, never to decide in his place.

12.5A The panel's name: The Five Questions / Les Cinq Questions — and its mark — RULED November 23, 2026

Ruled November 23, 2026 — adopted by the editor's tap the same morning (04:11 EST; his words: "yes the five questions") and in force (adoption recorded at §11.3). The passage below was drafted on the editor's commission of that morning (02:53 EST) and entered here as proposed; the name the draft carried — the founder's coinage, "the Pentagon" — is not the name adopted. On the editor's instruction the naming question went to the crew (the five lenses plus the Legal chair, the Legal chair speaking first), and the conferral's first pick is the name ruled here. On adoption the provision stands where it is placed — the panel named where the panel is constituted, between §12.5 and §12.6 — and §12.2, sense 3, gains the one-line cross-reference *"the five-lens conferral panel — named the Five Questions, §12.5A."* Record: *Pentagon_Name_Insignia_Guide_Draft_Nov23_2026.md* (the drafting record, with the three candidate insignia rendered in *pentagon_insignia_nov23/*) and *Decision_Package_Nov23_2026.md*, Item 1 (the naming conferral).

The five-lens conferral panel (§12.2, sense 3) carries a name: **The Five Questions** — in French, **Les Cinq Questions**. One name in both languages, the same words and the same count: the panel is the house's five tested questions, and the name says what the panel does before it says anything else. The name also marks a real distinction, and the distinction is the doctrine: the Five Questions are a subset inside this house, and they are **not the assistant who convenes them**. Muse works the five lenses; the Five Questions are what the five lenses are when they sit together on a question. They can disagree with Muse on the record — they have — and their dissents

are kept in the text, never smoothed away. It is a check that stands apart from the hand that calls it, or it is nothing. The check advises; the founder rules (§12.9, the meta-rule).

The name not taken. The founder coined **"the Pentagon"** for this panel — five lenses, five sides, and a pentagon not as a flat figure only but as a three-dimensional structure, **a building the house is building** — and the coinage is recorded here with respect: it named the shape the panel's mark still wears. As the panel's name it is **retired**. Put to the crew it scored 4–6 (Legal 5 · Editor 5 · Verifier 4 · Auditor 5 · Journalist 6 · Neighbour 6): in English *and* in French (*le Pentagone*), the word first means the United States Department of Defense — Washington in both languages — and it carries command-and-control, where this panel does not command; it confers, disagrees on the record, and the founder rules. The five-sided figure survives as the frame of the mark (§12.5A.1); the building's name does not.

The Five Eyes resonance — a reference, explained, never the identity. The founder directed that the echo be weighed openly, and it is recorded here as he raised it: five watchers, vigilance pooled so nothing important is missed, Canada one of the five — the resonance is real, and it is big. The Legal chair spoke first on the naming question, and its caution stands on the face of this provision: "the Five Eyes" is the working name of a real signals-intelligence partnership, and taking it — or any name borrowing its aura — would let a reasonable reader think this house is part of it, endorsed by it, or possessed of access it does not have. That is a false impression, and under the Verifier's gate (§12.5) a name implying a connection that is not true fails **True**. The resonance is therefore kept where it belongs: here, explained in the open — five ways of seeing, vigilance done in public, the questions and the scores and the dissents published — and never as the panel's name or identity.

The panel's memory line, in working order — **E · V · A · J · N**: ***"Each Voice Adds Judgement, Neighbour."*** Editor, Verifier, Auditor, Journalist, Neighbour: each voice adds its judgement, and the Neighbour — the standpoint with no discipline behind it, by design (§12.4) — has the last word in the line, as it has the street's word in the conferral.

The Five Questions carry a mark: a five-sided insignia, drawn in the house colours (Township navy, gold, the red rule, on cream). The mark is a **relation mark**. As one dictionary's entry points to another's — *see also* — the insignia printed on a piece says: *this piece stands in relation to a conferral of the five lenses; the record of that conferral exists and can be checked.* It belongs to the house's family of marks without imitating any of them. The asterisk is a doctrine mark: it rides on a word and marks an open slot, honestly unsettled. The superscript plus is the identity model's mark: it rides on DNA and marks the not-yet-known, included and living. The Five Questions insignia is neither: it is drawn, not typed; it rides on a whole piece, not a word; and what it marks is not openness but a completed act — five voices were heard, and the record says so. The rule for when it may be printed stands at §12.5A.1 below.

The insignia — adopted with the name. Of the three candidates in the drafting record (new marks, derived from no existing master — Masters First), the mark adopted is **Candidate 1 — "The Five Questions,"** the drafting seat's first pick, confirmed by the naming conferral (the first-pick badge survives whole under the adopted name; the other name candidates would have orphaned it): a navy pentagon outline; a gold disc at each of the five points; five question marks inside, riding toward the points — clear? · true? · record? · fair? · sense? — and the red rule across the lower centre, at the figure's base. It is bilingual by construction (the question mark is the same character in English and French, so one insignia serves both domains), and it carries the method rather than the membership. Its heavy flat small-size variant — pentagon outline at doubled stroke weight, the five points as plain gold dots, the

red rule shortened and thickened — is adopted with it, for sizes below roughly 22 px; it holds at 14 px. The mark is built to master from this specification. The candidates not taken stand on the record: **Candidate 2 — "The Five Initials"** (solid navy pentagon, gold inner pentagon, the five initials in cream at the points, the red rule as the base side) — the heaviest, a seal; it carries the standing defect that disqualified it: its letters are English, where the French working order is É · V · A · J · V, so a bilingual house would need two insignia. **Candidate 3 — "The Record Held"** (outline pentagon, base side in red, five ledger lines inside, the middle one gold) — the quietest, and the runner-up; at small sizes it risks reading as a generic document icon.

Dissent kept. The Auditor's top pick in the naming conferral was *The Five Lenses* (his 9; the adopted name his close second): "lenses" is the accurate method word, and the term the house already uses. His condition is answered in the text above — a "question" in the name is each lens's tested question (clear? · true? · record? · fair? · sense?) — and the French flag on his pick stands on the record: *lentille* first means a lentil, then a contact lens, so the French name would have stopped being the same name. The Journalist scored the Five Eyes echo 5 for memorability while recommending against it: unforgettable for the wrong reason is still the wrong reason.

*French passage — flagged under the house's translation discipline: the French rendering of this provision in the drafting record is a one-pass draft. The translation verification standard (§9.5A) stands adopted and in force, and it reserves load-bearing Guide copy to its Layer 2 — two blind forward translations, reconciled on the record. The panel's name itself is ruled in both languages above — **Les Cinq Questions**, confirmed clean in both languages by the naming conferral, no translation trap seen — and the name passes through Layer 2 before public use, as the conferral directed. The provision's full French passage — including the French memory line, « Chaque voix ajoute son jugement, Voisin », a coinage of the draft on the French working order É · V · A · J · V — is settled in that pass, not by the drafting file.*

12.5A.1 When the mark may be printed — RULED November 23, 2026

The Five Questions insignia may be printed on a piece — Guide passage, published article, report, or release — only where a conferral of all five lenses actually happened on that piece and stands on the record: the question put, each lens's reading or score, and every dissent, kept. The mark certifies that act and nothing else; it is never decoration, never a house logo, and never a general claim that the house is careful. A piece checked by fewer than the five — a Verifier's gate pass, a single chair's reading, a two-rater blind pass under §12.10 — does not carry the mark; it names its own check in words instead ("read by the Legal chair," "gate-passed by the Verifier"), so a reader can always tell which act stands behind a piece. Where the mark is printed and the conferral record cannot be produced, the printing is an error of the house's own kind: it goes on the Corrections Log, and the mark comes off.

12.6 The conferral rules: panel by default, the rails, and the house scale

Panel by default — RULED November 22, 2026. By default, the editor's substantive questions go to the five-lens panel and come back as a conferral: findings, scores out of 10 where scoring fits, disagreements kept, for the editor to rule on. The proportionality carve-out is the editor's own: quick factual lookups, small operational matters, and anything where a panel would cost more than the question is worth stay with the house's direct answer; where the routing is genuinely unclear, that is said in one line rather than silently chosen.

The safeguard rail — RULED November 22, 2026. Whenever the editor says “confer with the team,” the proportionality test runs first: does conferring cost more than the question is worth? If the panel would cost more than the answer is worth, that is said in one line and asked before anyone is convened. Substantive questions pass the test and go to the panel under the default without re-asking. The rail guards the editor’s time and the panel’s cost; it does not repeal the default.

The two-way rail — PROPOSED November 22, 2026; ruling pending. The editor proposed extending the net to the house’s own questions: when the house finds something and brings the editor a decision, the same proportionality test would run in reverse — should this go to the team? The recommended form, recorded with the proposal: a standing two-way rail, not a per-item referendum — substantive items (public, money, people, hard to reverse) arrive with the panel’s work done or flagged team-sized; small items arrive plain, with a recommendation; asking the editor “should this go to the team?” on every item would itself burn the time the rail exists to save. **This provision is not in force until the editor rules it.**

The house scale — RULED November 22, 2026. Conferral results are presented as scores **out of 10**: 10 is the favourite, the perfect score; 0 is the worst. Rankings made by individual lenses are converted to the 0–10 scale before presentation; conferral results are never presented as rank totals. The house scale governs conferrals. It does not displace the Ask Index’s own instrument (eight criteria scored 0/1/2, composite published as a percentage with its profile, §5.3–§5.4): the two scales belong to different instruments and are never mixed in one table.

12.7 The limits of the instrument, stated

The panel’s limits are part of its codification, so that no reader — and no future editor — mistakes the instrument for more than it is. The five lenses are standpoints worked by one research and drafting capacity (§9.1): five chairs are not five independent minds, and an error the house cannot see can pass every chair. Scores out of 10 are structured judgement, not measurement; an average of the panel’s scores is a summary of its judgement, never a proof. No lens carries lived experience it does not have; where lived experience is the evidence — accessibility is the standing case — the house puts a named human reviewer in the seat instead (§9.2). The panel structures judgement and keeps disagreements visible. It does not multiply judgement, and its ceiling is the house’s ceiling.

12.8 The sixth lens — RULED November 22, 2026

No sixth standing lens. The panel stays five. The conferral scored the question, and no sixth standing lens — guest chairs only — took **7.6/10**, the panel’s first pick. A standing chair should win clearly or not be seated; none did.

What the house has instead is the **guest chair**. A guest chair is named for one run: its standpoint and its chain are declared in the conferral’s header before it speaks, and its scores are published separately from the panel’s — a guest informs a conferral; it does not silently become a sixth vote. The order of first call, as ruled:

1. **The Public Servant** (the government family) — first in line. Its named risk is recorded with its name: capture — institutional sympathy drifting into the reading.
2. **The Francophone Reader** — a guest chair, and between runs an editorial habit.
3. **The Safety Officer** — called when a question has a body in it.

The Person in the Story is not a chair. It is a duty inside the Journalist's own chain (§12.3): a phone call the Journalist should be making, not a seat at the table.

The **Veterans' Reader** is codified as a named **human** duty, on the model of the Accessibility Review (§9.2): a seat held for a real veteran reader — named or anonymous, on their own terms — and printed **VACANT** in the house's pages until a real veteran fills it. The standpoint is honoured; the simulation of it is refused.

Rejected in every form: the **Elected Official** — an elected official is a subject of this house, not a judge inside it; a simulated official is a conflict of interest built into the chair. And any **simulated veteran or post-traumatic stress disorder lens**: a costume over an admitted gap. The house does not dress its capacity up as a soldier, a councillor, or a person still hurting; it leaves the chair empty and puts a real neighbour in it when one comes.

Scores recorded: No sixth standing lens **7.6** · the Public Servant **6.4** · the Francophone Reader **6.4** · the Person in the Story **6.4** · the Safety Officer **5.4** · the Veteran (as a standing lens) **4.8** · the Elected Official **3.2**.

The argument against the ruling is kept with it — the Auditor's: guest chairs are where good intentions go to be forgotten; a chair that must be remembered is a chair that will be skipped in the busy month, and the null won today because it is cheaper, which is a ruling about cost dressed as a ruling about principle. The ruling stands with that warning attached: if the guest chairs go uncalled, the warning has come true, and this provision is to be re-examined on the Auditor's terms.

12.9 The living instrument

Ruled by the editor, November 22, 2026. This section is a living record, not a finished monument. It is amended the way the house itself changes: by rulings — dated, with their reasons kept in the text.

A ruling enters this text the same day it is made. A ruling that lives only in a conversation is a ruling at risk. The house learned that on November 22, 2026, when the editor's own review of this material found rulings of his — the Journalist's standards chain; the Neighbour's seat on the panel — that the Guide had never carried. What he had ruled was not what was written down, and he was the one who caught it. This provision stands so that the gap is not found that way again.

Chairs can be born here. The Legal chair did not exist when the Guide was written; it was created by ruling on November 22, 2026, and entered this section the same day (§12.3). A future chair, test, or lens enters the same way: by ruling, with its chain, its characteristic question, and its dissent recorded — the dissent kept in the text, never smoothed away.

Growth here is by recorded addition, never by silent mutation. Nothing in this section changes without a dated ruling behind it. Superseded text is marked superseded, not erased: the record of what the house used to think is part of the method, and a reader is entitled to watch the house change its mind in the open.

The daily check of the Master Guide carries a named duty under this provision: to catch drift between what has been ruled and what is written, and to report it the day it is found. The editor rules; the check holds the book to the rulings.

The editor's figure for it, recorded at his direction: this codification grows the way understanding grows — by encounters, recorded — and it is alive in the only way a document can be: it is never finished being answerable to what the house has learned.

Cross-reference (entered November 22, 2026, with the §2.5 ruling): the living instrument governs this guide's own text; the frameworks this guide adopts from outside the house are held as living references under the companion rule at §2.5.

The founder's rules — checked before they harden. RULED November 22, 2026 (five-lens panel conferral 7.9/10, recommendation *adopt with amendments*, the Verifier's gate PASS on the condition carried into the text; entered the same day under this provision. The editor adopted the amended text as recommended, with its three-part trigger — collision with an existing rule or the record, a constitutional matter for the house, or the founder's ask (the trigger scored 8.8/10). Record: *Panel_RuleCheck_MetaRule_Nov22_2026.md*; Decisions Register, Nov 22, 2026, 19:03, as corrected by the override entry of Nov 22, 2026, 19:04.)

> **The founder's rules are checked before they harden.** A rule the founder makes is checked by the Verifier — and, where the cost is proportionate, by the panel — when it contradicts an existing rule or the record, when it is constitutional for the house (a gate, a chair, a check, money, rights, publication), or whenever the founder asks. **The check advises; the founder rules.** An override of a standing rule is itself a ruling: stated plainly, dated, entered in the Decisions Register the same day, and the superseded text marked, not erased. A rule or override spoken in riff or in the small hours stands as **proposed** until confirmed calm and explicit. No override reaches the law, another person's rights, or the record of what happened.

Everything else is entered in the Decisions Register as ruled, unchecked — with the daily check (§11.2, and this section) as the standing backstop hunting ruled-vs-written drift. The daily check is not itself a rule-check under this provision.

Correction, November 22, 2026 (19:04): as first entered this same evening (19:03), this addition recorded the trigger as narrowed to the founder's ask alone, with the panel's three-part trigger marked not adopted. That entry rested on a pocket tap; the founder corrected it in words at 19:04, and the ruling of record is the adoption as recommended — the full amended text with the three-part trigger — as printed above. The correction stands in the Decisions Register as an override entry (Nov 22, 2026, 19:04) displacing the 19:03 entry, whose status is now Superseded and whose text is marked, not erased.

12.10 The standing assessment method for house documents: the two-rater blind pass, tiered — RULED November 22, 2026

Adopted November 22, 2026, on the editor's ruling — his instruction of that day: *"Make sure the two-rater blind pass is the best test to use — run that to the team, and if it is, put it in the Guide."* The panel conferral ran blind-first (each lens scored in isolation; scores aggregated only after all five runs closed) and adopted the method below. The full record — every lens's scoring, the dissents in full, and the Verifier's gate — stands in *Panel_BlindPass_Method_Nov22_2026.md*. Panel scores, in brief: the two-rater blind pass **8.3/10**, the first pick or the declared base method of all five lenses; the full simulation (blind pass plus open conferral plus revision) 7.6;

the open conferral alone 5.1; a red-team audit alone 4.5. The tiered form below is the panel's convergent amendment: four of five lenses independently attached a proportionality rule to the winning method, in different words.

The method. Before the editor rules on a house document — a charter, a method, a load-bearing draft — the document is tested as follows. The Verifier's propriety gate (§12.5: Lawful · Right Person · Ethical · True) runs **first**; a document held at the gate earns no score. Two different lenses then score the document **independently and blind** — neither sees the other's scores or reasoning before its own are locked and timestamped — criterion by criterion, against criteria and evidence thresholds set **before** scoring begins. Splits are settled **on the record**: by quoting the passage of the document that decides the criterion, never by quiet averaging, and never summarised away. A split the text cannot settle is recorded as a split and goes to the editor unresolved; the editor is the appeal of last resort (§12.5). This generalises the two-rater reliability pass of §5.9, which remains the Ask Index's own instrument and is unchanged.

The tiers (proportionality). The method has three gears, and the gear is part of the record:

- **Light tier** — a small, reversible document with no public, money, or rights consequence (a one-page draft is the type case): the gate plus **one** rater's blind criterion pass.
- **Standard tier (the default)** — the full two-rater blind pass as defined above.
- **Escalation tier** — the full simulation: blind pass, then open conferral, then a revision pass, with the original blind scores preserved verbatim beside the revision. Escalation is triggered by **any one of**: (i) the document is constitutional for the house — a charter, a method, a gate, anything other documents will cite; (ii) a blind split of 2 points or more on any criterion that quoted text cannot settle, **or splits on three or more criteria**; (iii) a hold at the Verifier's gate; (iv) the ruling the document awaits is hard to reverse once published.

The tier decision is recorded with its reason, and the editor may escalate any document at his word. A red-team attack is never an assessment of record; it may be run as a pre-pass pointed at split or held items inside the escalation tier. The open conferral alone (the panel's former habit for documents) is retired as a scoring method for documents; it remains the instrument for open questions under §12.6, where no document is being certified.

The record. Every test leaves the same shape of record at every tier: the gate result, the tier and its reason, the criteria as set in advance, the blind scores locked before sight, every split with the quotation that settled it or its unresolved state, and the disposition of every defect found. Dispositions are ledgered — accepted, rejected by the editor with a one-line reason, or fixed in a named version — and implementation is verified on the next version, by the Verifier re-checking the quoted line; unresolved items carry forward and do not expire.

The limit, printed on the face of the method (the Verifier's conditions, adopted verbatim as part of the ruling; §12.7 states the general case):

> "The five lenses are standpoints worked by one research and drafting capacity. 'Blind' means one lens's scores and reasoning are not shown to another lens before it scores; it does not mean independent persons, external review, or independent verification."

> "This method tests a document against its stated purpose, its sources, and its specification. A pass records that the checks were run. It does not certify that a document is true, lawful, or fit for external reliance."

What blind agreement establishes is consistency of judgement within one drafting capacity — reliability of application, not validity, and not independence. No public copy may describe a pass under this method as review by a panel of experts or as independent verification, and no published result travels without the one-mind limit stated with it.

The dissents ride with the adoption. The Neighbour dissented on cost (the full simulation at 6/10): process weight lands on one editor, whose sleep outranks every release; the light tier and the escalation triggers exist because of that dissent, and the re-check below is where its warning will show. The Auditor's warning is recorded with the method: two agreeing scores from one capacity can be read as independent corroboration, and a shared blind spot can pass with a reliability stamp; without the follow-up discipline above, the method is an event, not a control. The Editor's condition is standing: if blind scores are ever unlocked before sight, splits averaged, or the gate recorded after the scores, the method has collapsed into open conferral with extra paperwork and does not carry this section's authority.

> "Adopted as the standing method on the editor's ruling. Its effectiveness for house documents is to be re-checked after its first three uses, with the results recorded here."

12.11 The Wide Net: the full sweep by default — RULED November 23, 2026

Ruled by the editor, November 23, 2026 (02:21 EST), and entered the same day under §12.9. Every decision, paper, or release the house originates or recommends gets the **full sweep** by default: the five lenses (§12.2, sense 3) **plus the trade chairs** (§12.3) — the Legal chair first among them. Each chair records a clearance or an explicit *"no surface here"* pass; **the sweep is never skipped silently.** If the house judges a sweep wasteful on a given item, it must say so in one line **at the time** and let the editor rule: the burden of arguing for the exception is the house's, never the editor's burden to remember to ask. This provision extends the panel-by-default rule (§12.6): the panel rail alone never routed work to the chairs, because the Legal chair sits outside the panel (§12.3) — the Wide Net closes that gap by naming the sweep, not the panel, as the default unit of review.

The failure case is recorded with the ruling, in the first person, as the house's own. On November 23, 2026, the media paper and the population papers were staged for publication **without Legal routing** — the panel-by-default rail never caught them, because the Legal chair sits outside the panel — and the editor had to ask for the review himself. The reviews then caught a statute error (the Population Ladder brief's Finding 5), a wrong month, an overclaim, and missing licence notices. The miss was the house's: the sweep followed whoever remembered to ask. Under this provision, it follows the rule instead.

The "otherwise" slice — RULED November 23, 2026; adopted by the editor the same morning (03:08 EST) and in force. The editor adopted the narrow set of cases the house proposed, in which the full sweep does not gate the work: (1) **purely mechanical execution of already-ruled work** — deploys of ruled batches, probe checks, scheduling; (2) **time-critical first responses** — the sweep runs in parallel and never gates the first reply; (3) **re-**

conferring a ruling the editor has just made live in the room. Outside these three cases, the default above stands unqualified.

12.12 The Double Pass: the house standard for judgement work — RULED November 23, 2026

Ruled by the editor, November 23, 2026 (02:22 EST), as a standard operating procedure, extending the Wide Net (§12.11), and entered the same day under §12.9. Graded, scored, or published-judgement work is produced by **two independent blind passes over the same source pack** — neither pass sees the other's work — followed by a **reconciliation that settles every disagreement on the record, criterion by criterion, never by quiet average.** The **gap is measured and reported with the product**: the share of items where the passes disagreed, and how the disagreements resolved — a quality figure on the face of the work, the way the census prints the anatomy of its own Partly category.

This provision generalizes the Ask Index's blind two-rater method (§5.9; §12.10, method A) into the house standard for **all** judgement products: gradings, scorings, published factual claims, register grades. Section 12.10 remains the standing assessment method for house documents, in its tiered form, and is unchanged; §5.9 remains the Ask Index's own instrument, and is unchanged. The Double Pass is the doctrine those instruments are instances of. The translation verification standard proposed at §9.5A is the same doctrine stated for the language boundary, and is entered there as this provision's module, not as a rival standard.

The cost ruling is recorded with the adoption, in the editor's substance: the cost is affordable, because the double pass is what makes the product good. **The covenant rides with it, agreed the same night:** the standards hold at full strength; if they ever strain the house's capacity, the house names the limitation plainly and prices the specific cuts, and the editor chooses what gives. The standard is never thinned silently while its label stays — no quiet version. The night's evidence stands in the record: the Legal chair's second independent read over finished papers caught a statute error, a wrong month, an overclaim, and missing licence notices — the gap between the passes was real and material.

12.13 The sequence of the lenses: the split sequence, formalized (S-E) — RULED November 23, 2026

Panel verdict November 23, 2026; approved by the editor the same morning (02:59 EST — "the heart of what you said, good to go") and entered the same day under §12.9. The editor's question was fundamental: *why is the panel's order Editor · Verifier · Auditor · Journalist · Neighbour — has it been defended, steelmanned, tested?* The honest answer the confrontation returned: the house was already running **three sequences under one name**, and only one of them had ever been stated as an order. This provision states all three. Record: *Panel_Sequence_Defence_Nov23_2026.md*.

1. **The listing order — Editor · Verifier · Auditor · Journalist · Neighbour.** The order of §12.2 and of the public explainer: a presentation order, the funnel in which a reader meets the lenses — clarity, truth, record, fairness, street — which is the order in which a piece of work is actually built and the order in which a reader's trust is actually earned. Unchanged.

2. **The gate order — the Verifier's propriety gate runs before deliberation.** On any question carrying a premise, the four checks (§12.5) run first, before the voices deliberate — the posture §12.10 already rules for documents and Annex A for asks, here generalized to conferrals. What the gate holds earns no deliberation dressed as a scored conferral.
3. **The deliberation order — voices Editor → Auditor → Journalist → Neighbour; the Verifier judges last.** In deliberation the four voices speak in that order, and the Verifier — who has already gated — stays silent until last, where he scores separately and states the gate's verdict on the outcome. The Verifier was never truly "second": he stands **before** the sequence as its gate and **after** it as its judge; he is second in the listing only because the listing is a funnel for readers, not a seating plan for the room. A gatekeeper who speaks second in the voices cannot judge last with clean hands; this provision ends that arrangement on paper, as practice had already ended it in fact.

The test. The confrontation ran the editor's own suggested test: tonight's translation-standard question was re-run twice, blind, from the same source pack — once in the standing (forward) order, once in the full reverse (Neighbour → Journalist → Auditor → Verifier → Editor) — and both compared against the recorded original panel. **The first pick was invariant across all three runs**: the same standard, by the same spine, for the same stated reason — an order whose conclusions survive its own reversal is not smuggling conclusions in through framing. Scores moved where cost is contested (the summit candidate swung up to four points in one seat under street-first framing; machine-first fell), and one element — the original panel's fine tiering — did not reproduce in either re-run and is carried as **unresolved**, unattributable between order and the original's three extra trade chairs. A repeatable order effect did appear: **whoever sits last mints the closing operational test** — the forward run's Neighbour closed with a live-fire test on a real Township notice; the reversed run's Editor closed with reading the finished French alone, no English beside it. The seat at the end decides what "proven" means; this provision chooses the end seats deliberately (the street last among the voices; the gate last in judgement).

Scores. The split sequence (S-E) scored Editor 9 · Verifier 9 · Auditor 8 · Journalist 8 · Neighbour 8 · Legal 8 · Translation 8 · Continuous Improvement 9 — the first pick of every evaluator, against one-sequence-for-everything (S-A), the full reverse (S-B), Verifier-first-in-voice (S-C), and Auditor-first (S-D), whose full table stands in the record.

Dissents and conditions, kept. The **Neighbour** dissents in part (his reverse-order mark was his highest on the table): on **belonging questions** — whether people feel the work is theirs — the funnel reads upside down, and the street frames first; the exception is named here, not discovered per run. The **Auditor** dissents in part: on **evidence questions** the record pass precedes — document assessment already runs that way under §12.10 — and he notes the guide now carries two deliberation orders for two kinds of work, which future drift will try to blur. The **Legal chair's condition** is attached: on **rights-bearing questions**, the gate's four checks are a premise screen, not a legal reading; the chair's cited reading is commissioned **before** deliberation, not discovered to be missing after it. And the confrontation's fourth recommendation stands open: the order test is to be re-run once on an **evidence question** before the first pick's invariance is treated as settled — tonight's test ran on a method question, the easier case.

12.14 The Empty Chair Check — RULED November 23, 2026

RULED — §12.14 The Empty Chair Check (a composition-sensitivity check). A conferral's result can depend on who was in the room. When a question plainly turns on a discipline that is not seated — and any lens may say

so, in one plain sentence, on the record — a specialist from the standby roster may be seated as a shadow seat to test that dependence. Seating requires two keys, the Verifier and one other lens, or the founder alone; seats are seated by written trigger before any shadow score exists, never after scores are seen in order to change a result. The shadow seat receives the question and the evidence, records its own pick and score blind, and files an Empty Chair Annex (before the ruling) or Addendum (after it). Shadow seats do not vote, do not alter scores, and do not reopen rulings: a material difference — a different first pick, a score of five or less for the leading option, a gap of three points or more, or an error of fact, law, or classification — is served to the founder, and after a ruling it opens only a revision-door question in the founder's hand. Every check, and every declined flag, is logged. The Check is internal structured challenge, in the discipline of ISA 620's tests for an expert's work — competence, relevance, adequacy — and of engagement quality review: it is not independent or external assurance, and it is never described as such. *Source: conferral of November 23, 2026, adopted as designed by the founder's ruling of November 23, 2026, 06:56 EST (tap on the served vote; scores 8–9 across all seats; pair Recommendation 8 · QAF 7); the instrument's first two runs (Items 5 and 7–12) precede its codification and are recorded in the Decision Package of the same date.*

---

13. The methodology update of November 23, 2026

Entered at the next methodology update under the Automatic Flow (§13.3), on the clearing of the Decision Package of November 23, 2026 (all twelve items ruled, 04:11–04:48 EST) and the founder's adoption of the whole legal package the same morning (06:52 EST). The five passages stand in the order they were bundled. The Empty Chair Check, adopted the same morning (06:56 EST), stands at §12.14. Passages 6–8 of the same bundle — Directionality (§13.6), the Placement Check (§13.7), and the Digit Edition (§13.8), adopted the same morning on the daily check's Triggers 2 and 3 (07:35 EST) — entered later the same day, on the founder's ruling of November 23, 2026 (10:00 EST), and stand in bundle order after them. The §9.6 amendment-status flip and the closure of open points §10.1 and §10.3 ride the same entry and are recorded in the change log (§11.3). A ninth passage — Duotrace and SAID–DONE (§13.9) — entered later the same day, on the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026 (13:26–14:06 EST), the last of them directing that the method be published, cleaned up, now rather than held for a later wave.

13.1 Corpus structure: decisions and reasons

For the Who Audits the Auditor study (the Auditor General of Canada, and the Auditor General of Ontario).

The study counts more than one stream of work. The streams are never blended. Each stream below is counted beside the corpus it accompanies — under the same coding manual, reported on its own line, with its own rates — for the reasons stated. A reader who learns the rule in one arm finds the same rule in the other.

1. The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development (CESD), federal arm — beside, never blended. The CESD works under a different statutory mandate from the Auditor General. His reports form a flagged sub-corpus: coded under the same manual, reported beside the Auditor General corpus, with their own

recommendation response rate and implementation rate. Reasons: a blended rate cannot be checked back to a single mandate — if it rises, no reader can tell whether the Auditor General improved, the Commissioner improved, or the mix changed. Blending also bends topic shares in environment-heavy years, and some CESD products (for example, environmental petitions reporting) have no Auditor General equivalent and cannot blend at all.

2. The Ontario environmental stream — beside, authorship preserved, the change of checker named on its face. Until April 1, 2019, Ontario's environment audits were the work of a separate, independent officer, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario. That office was abolished and the work moved inside the Auditor General's office. The stream — including the 2016–2019 audits of the former Commissioner — is counted beside the Ontario corpus as a flagged sub-corpus. The 2016–2019 audits remain the work of the officer who performed them; counting them as the Auditor General's would misattribute the work. The sub-corpus label states in plain words that the checker changed in 2019.

3. The Ontario Public Accounts Committee series — a companion chapter at full rigour. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts holds hearings on the Auditor General's reports and issues its own recommendations, whose implementation the Auditor General's office tracks. That series is measured in full and reported as its own chapter beside the audit corpus — numbered and titled in the release, not appendixed — and the Committee's implementation rate is never blended with the audit recommendations' rate. Reasons: the study's subject is the audit office; the Committee is what the legislature did with the work. A Committee recommendation is not an audit recommendation, and a blended rate would be a number owned by neither body. The chapter carries the same coding rigour and follow-up extraction as the core scope.

4. The Ontario Public Accounts chapter — Rule (iii) as strengthened: never a unit; readings flagged; the reconciliation published. Each year the Auditor General also performs the financial (attest) audit of the province's books, reported as the Public Accounts chapter. The chapter never counts as an audit unit. Its follow-up readings are carried in a flagged line under the headline rate, never inside it. Reasons: the chapter's product is an opinion — a single verdict on a whole set of statements — not findings and recommendations that can be counted, tracked, and rated implemented; it discharges a distinct statutory function; and blending attest work into performance rates would misstate both streams. Three elements ride with the rule:

- **(a) The control-total reconciliation is a standing element, published with the rates:** Frame Total = Performance Units + Flagged Sub-corpora + Standing Attest Units + Other Excluded Items — residual 0. The chapter serves as a component of the control total: a check *on* the population, not a member of it. Reconciling to the office's own published totals, with every difference named, is what makes the study's counts defensible if the office disputes them.
- **(b) The chapter is named in the reconciliation as its own kind:** "Financial (attest) audit — Public Accounts," one standing item per year.
- **(c) The audit-opinion-history sidebar (2016–2026) runs regardless** of the counting rule: the decade's opinions, year by year, as context beside the study.

The flagged readings are kept, not discarded, because the office's follow-up volumes carry this chapter's readings inside their counts; the flagged line is the only provenance that reconciles the study's headline rate to those volumes. Exclusion from the performance rates is no judgement on financial audit; it is the refusal to credit one stream with another stream's work.

Source: Decision Package, Items 2, 3(1), 3(2), and 3(3) with the founder's-question conferral — ruled November 23, 2026, 04:17–04:25 EST; the corpus passage itself ordered by the founder's condition recorded at 04:17 EST.

13.2 The decision doctrine: informed consent

Material decisions are put to the decider in one form only, so that every ruling is an informed one. The form has four parts, in this order:

1. **The question in plain words** — no bare label, no code, nothing the decider must decode.
2. **The team's analysis** — the facts the question rests on, stated before any recommendation.
3. **The scores, out of 10** — each seat independent, never totalled.
4. **The dissents, kept** — disagreement is recorded with the item, not smoothed away.

Only then is the vote taken. The principle is the one the clinic and the democracy share: informed consent, and the informed citizen. A decider who rules on a bare label has not consented; he has guessed. This package form is therefore not a courtesy. It is the condition under which a ruling counts as a ruling.

Source: Decision Package, founder's note of November 23, 2026, 04:18 EST — the principle named by the founder; the passage ordered as item (2) of this bundle in the Rulings recorded.

13.3 The Automatic Flow

When the founder rules — a tap, an adopt, a yes — the ruling is itself the instruction. Codification is never a separate ask. Every ruling flows automatically, in three steps:

1. **Record.** The ruling is entered as a Record of Decision: dated, in the founder's words, with dissents kept.
2. **Codification.** If the ruling changes how CGN works, it enters the Guide at the next methodology update.
3. **Publication.** The published methodology on both domains is refreshed in the next website batch.

The founder never has to request the recording, the codification, or the publication of a ruling as a separate step. One gate remains: a "not that," or a flag from the founder, holds an item at **Flagged, never Ruled**. Only a ruling flows.

Source: Decision Package, Rulings recorded — "Standing rule — THE AUTOMATIC FLOW: RULED, November 23, 2026, 04:23 EST"; the passage ordered as item (3) of this bundle in the same entry.

13.4 The QAF pair: the Recommendation score and the QAF value

Every team conferral computes two further numbers, recorded with the conferral:

- **The Recommendation score, out of 10** — how strongly the evidence points to the team's first pick.
- **The QAF value, out of 10** — the Quality Assessment Framework value: how well the underlying work holds up when checked — the evidence complete, the work reproducible, the Double Pass gap small.

Both numbers are computed for every conferral and recorded internally. From the packages of **November 24, 2026**, both numbers also enter the served vote format — the founder sees them with the question, the analysis, the scores, and the dissents, before he rules. One working rule stands from the direction's first night: if an item's internal QAF value comes back **under 6**, that is named to the founder when the item is served. A low QAF value is not hidden inside a confident recommendation; it travels with it, on the record.

Source: Decision Package, Rulings recorded — founder direction of November 23, 2026, 04:27 EST, with the refinement of 04:28 EST (both numbers in the served format from November 24, 2026); the passage ordered as item (4) of this bundle in the same entry.

13.5 The Legal architecture: the chair, the fleet, the hats, and the French Representation Check

Entered on the founder's adoption of the whole legal package, November 23, 2026 (06:52 EST). Sources: `Legal_Architecture_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md` · `Legal_Fleet_Scenario_Study_Nov23_2026.md` *(as amended, Treasury Board scaffold)* · `Quebec_Bijural_Debrief_And_Fleet_Nov23_2026.md` · `Counsel_Queue_DRAFT_Bench_Nov23_2026.md`.

The Legal chair and its five briefs. The Legal chair (Guide §12.3) is the house's internal reasoning standpoint — not legal advice; real legal questions route to the Counsel Queue. The chair carries five briefs, ranked by the house's real exposure, each brief's record kept separate:

1. **Publication / defamation** — the daily exposure: the Docket, the Council Answer Scorecard, the media grading, and the record of care that is the chair's founding purpose.
2. **Corporate / organizational** — structural and personal while CGN is an unincorporated association: money, contracts, the Money Book's legal hygiene, and custody of the incorporation triggers (donations over $5,000 in 12 months · $10,000 held · first grant · first non-trivial contract · restricted gift over $1,000; jurisdiction federal, ruled). The brief owns watching the triggers; when one fires, the brief leads that day regardless of rank.
3. **Human rights / Charter** — mostly the house's sword (veterans and accessibility advocacy); it jumps the queue by trigger the day CGN is a respondent.
4. **Intellectual property** — a named brief, not a seat: it has live questions before it has a standards chain. A written trigger seats a specialist IP pass whenever artwork, mastheads, music, or trademark questions arise — before scores exist, never after. The brief's standing jobs: the platform-baked-in-song question (open since November 20, 2026) answered in writing, and the trademark search/registration decision for the names and the roundel.
5. **Constitutional & Federalism** — validity and division-of-powers questions; both Charters (cross-referenced under the fleet's F2, one lawyer, one queue entry); language rights touching the house's French instruments; watching briefs on Quebec's Bill 1 and the federal Bill S-6. Its trigger includes the Journalist's line: *a public official asserts a power CGN cannot locate in the Constitution.*

The holding arrangement. While the association is unincorporated, the founder holds all CGN intellectual property and assets personally, **in trust for the association's purposes**, under a dated holding note labelled INTERIM on its face, with the masters register as the asset list — transferring to the corporation on incorporation,

whenever a trigger fires. The note is the house's dated statement of intent, routed to the Counsel Queue for a real lawyer's read when funds allow; it is not passed off as advice.

The fleet — the Counsel Queue. Outside counsel is organized as a fleet of eight seats, held as named first calls in the **Counsel Queue**, a living register: **F1** Publication & Defamation (trigger, with a standing pre-publication arrangement for Scorecard/Docket-class items) · **F2** Human Rights & Charter (roster + trigger) · **F3** Corporate & Organizational (trigger now; standing-lite at incorporation or consultancy launch, whichever comes first) · **F4** Whistleblower & Employment — for sources, never for CGN (roster, with a firewalled 48-hour referral protocol) · **F5** Administrative & Access (roster + trigger) · **F6** Criminal Exposure (roster, one name — counsel before the act) · **F7** Privacy & Data (roster/trigger) · **F8** Intellectual Property (roster + trigger; the practitioner serving the chair's IP brief). No consultancy engagement opens until F3 counsel has papered the practice. The Queue's names stand as **DRAFT / first-call** until the founder's first call is made; no name is carried on reputation alone — each stands on a cited public record. **F4's Ontario municipal-reprisal chair is recorded EMPTY — research debt No. 1** — because an Ontario municipal source holds no statutory shield equivalent to the federal *Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act*, and no verified practitioner for that exact work has yet been confirmed.

Le Chapeau québécois — the Quebec Hat. A hat in the Counsel Queue, not a ninth fleet seat: a named elite Quebec avocat, with a notaire alternate (the notarial profession has no common-law equivalent), engaged by written trigger whenever a matter (i) touches Quebec law or the *Civil Code of Québec*; (ii) involves a Quebec institution or person as subject, source, counterparty, or forum; (iii) produces or relies on a French-language legal instrument; or (iv) is screened by the French Representation Check and found to have an empty Quebec chair. In the Queue register the hat is entered as entry F9, and the Constitutional & Federalism brief's named practitioner as entry F10 — queue entries under adopted instruments, one lawyer under one entry, cross-referenced, never two entries pretending to be two seats.

The French Representation Check — *Le contrôle de représentation française*. A standing instrument in the Empty Chair family: a composition check that runs before a ruling, records an absence in one line, and offers the seat; it advises, it does not veto. **Triggers — any one fires the check:** (1) the founder flags the matter as major, in any words; (2) the matter touches Quebec — Quebec law, a Quebec institution, a Quebec person, a Quebec forum, or the *Civil Code of Québec*; (3) the matter produces, relies on, or files a French-language legal instrument, or an instrument in both official languages; (4) the decision is architecture-class — a new seat, brief, hat, standing instrument, or fleet change; (5) a publication or filing names a Quebec institution or person. **The three questions, in order: SEAT** — is a French/Quebec seat occupied at this table? **SOURCE** — is a Quebec source cited on the record? **NAME** — is every proper name in its verified French form, from the institution's own materials? If any leg answers no, the absence is recorded in one line — *FRC — [date] — [matter] — Seat: yes/no · Source: yes/no · Name: yes/no — Absence: [one line] — Seat offered: yes/no — Ruling proceeded on the founder's word: yes/no* — the missing seat is offered before the ruling proceeds, and the ruling then proceeds on the founder's word. The check is a line, not a sitting: one line, one minute, no sub-checks. Its line also rides in the publication checklist wherever a Quebec institution or person is named.

Source: the founder's adoption of the whole legal package, November 23, 2026, 06:52 EST (Decisions Register, same date). Component pairs: architecture Recommendation 8 · QAF 7 · fleet, as amended, Recommendation 8 · QAF 8 · Quebec debrief Recommendation 9 · QAF 7 · vote package Recommendation 8 · QAF 7.

13.6 Directionality: the picture of the record

Entered on the founder's adoption of Guide Trigger 2, November 23, 2026 (07:35 EST), and entered into this guide the same day on the founder's ruling (10:00 EST). Sources: the Panel Conferral on Directionality magnitude (`Panel_Directionality_Magnitude_Nov23_2026.md`); the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026, 01:12–01:21 EST; the settled Lexicon entries Direction · Visibility · Reach · Permanence (`lexicon_library/LEXICON.md`, entered November 23, 2026).

Directionality draws the record as a picture. The horizontal axis is **time**, left to right. The vertical axis is **visibility**: how far a direction or an ask surfaced into the open record, or how far it sank from sight. The middle line is **the open record**. The counted unit is the **row** — where the record bundles limbs or asks into one row, the row is the unit.

The ladder. Height is the ladder step of the strongest public trace; the dot sits at the step where the direction rests. Above the line: **+4** a by-law passed or a decision debated in open session · **+3** a report received or debated in open · **+2** a consent-agenda mention or a report-out · **+1** a line in a public document. Below the line: **−1** tracker-only · **−2** deferred with a date or destination · **−3** deferred with no date · **−4** a closed-session product (the outcome surfaces; the birth stays hidden) · **−5** no trace at all — the floor; **nothing sits below −5**.

Peak and endpoint. The path is drawn through every step the direction actually occupied; a faint tick marks its highest point — the peak is drawn, not scored. The endpoint is the scored position: the solid dot where the direction rests at the window's end, and the grade hangs on the dot, never on the peak alone. The line is solid where the path is documented, dashed where it is inferred from silence.

The tie-break. Within one step, items are ordered by **permanence** — the legal force of the outcome: a by-law ahead of a received report ahead of a verbal update. The tie-break moves an item inside its step, never across one.

What is not height. Dollars and reach are not height; where they are worth showing, they ride in the **annotation layer only** — a label, a marker size — beside the path, each figure traced or not shown. If dollars are ever annotated, they are spaced logarithmically, because money spans orders of magnitude.

Below the line. Depth is **loss of trace**, never proven concealment. Height rests on positive evidence — a document a reader can open; depth rests partly on absence, a weaker kind of claim, and the picture says so. Every Directionality picture carries the Verifier's caption on its face: *"Height measures visibility in the public record — how far a direction surfaced, or how far it sank from sight. It does not measure importance, and it is not a finding about any person."*

Dissent kept. The Neighbour dissented on the tie-break — reach (breadth *and* depth of impact) should order items inside a step before permanence does — and on the geometry below the line, where sinking should drop faster than surfacing rises. Both dissents stand on the conferral record, not adopted, not erased; reach survives in the annotation layer and in its settled Lexicon sense.

Source: Guide daily check, Trigger 2 (November 23, 2026, 07:27 EST) — the ruled Directionality set absent from the Guide; adopted by the founder's tap, November 23, 2026, 07:35 EST, for entry as its own provision at the next methodology update.

13.7 The Placement Check

Entered on the founder's adoption of Trigger 3 of the Guide's first daily check, November 23, 2026 (07:35 EST), and entered into this guide the same day on the founder's ruling (10:00 EST). The daily check proposed placement with the filing discipline at §3.13; the passage enters here, in bundle order, as the update's passages entered before it.

When an item could be filed in two or more folders or locations, its placement is not settled by the first plausible home. The item gets a **second-opinion check before it is filed**: the multi-dimensional nature of the item is recognized, it is placed in one primary home, and it is **cross-referenced from the other candidate locations with pointers — never duplicated**. The placement is decided in one pass. The check fires only when placement is genuinely ambiguous; it does not run on every filing.

Source: the Placement Check instituted November 23, 2026, 00:05 EST (Decisions Register, same date; the Placement Check methodology blurb is flagged in the dedications register, `Dedications_Flagged_Asides_Nov23_2026.md`); Guide codification queued at institution, and adopted for entry November 23, 2026, 07:35 EST.

13.8 The Digit Edition

Entered on the founder's adoption of Trigger 3 of the Guide's first daily check, November 23, 2026 (07:35 EST), and entered into this guide the same day on the founder's ruling (10:00 EST). The daily check proposed placement with the report form at §8.6; the passage enters here, in bundle order, as the update's passages entered before it.

Every commissioned brief or report ships in **two editions**: the full report-form version, and a **Digit edition** of the same work. The Digit edition carries the substance in the founder's reading form — **tasks and units, number first, one line each**: the bottom line first, the conclusions and recommendations summarized, the substance compressed, the detail last; plain register, exact numbers, nothing dropped that a ruling turns on. The Digit edition is not a summary written instead of the work; it is the same work in its second form, and it ships with the first. The refinement ruled the same night stands with it: "make it sexy" applies to the published thing, not to the final report.

Source: the Digit Edition ruled November 23, 2026, 02:09 EST (Decisions Register, same date); Guide codification queued at ruling, and adopted for entry November 23, 2026, 07:35 EST.

13.9 Duotrace: the dual trace, and SAID–DONE

Entered on the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026: the names adopted (13:26 EST); the definitional phrase settled, the Legal seat first and the five lenses scoring (14:02 EST); the meta-phrase picked and the free-use ruling given (14:04 EST); and publication directed the same afternoon (14:06 EST — the method published, cleaned up, now, not held for a later wave). Sources: the invention map (`Duotrace_Invention_Map_Nov23_2026.md`, §§1, 2A, 3, 6); the entries drafted for the Lexicon for Duotrace and SAID–DONE (`lexicon_library/LEXICON_DRAFT_Duotrace_SAID-DONE_Nov23_2026.md`). Conferral on the phrase: Legal 9 · Editor 9 · Verifier 9 · Auditor 10 · Journalist 9 · Neighbour 9 — pair Recommendation 9 · QAF 9.

The method, in one passage. Duotrace is a method of SAID–DONE: the reconciliation of what a public body said with what it did. From the body's own two documents — the agenda, its promise of what it will decide, published in advance and in public, and the minutes, its record of what it decided, adopted by the body itself and kept as the official evidence of its proceedings — the method holds every decision as one dated, sourced row in a single register, followable forward from the meeting that made it and backward from any present question to the decision that caused it, or to the exact point where the record loses it. The standard the register enforces is the plain one — word and deed: what a body said before the fact must answer to what it did after it, and any citizen can check the one against the other.

The two traces; the two instruments. On the register, two traversals are defined. The **forward trace** follows a direction from its birth in the body's proceedings to its present state and findability; the **backward trace** begins from a present outcome, question, or gap and proceeds to the direction that caused it — or, where none can be found, to the point at which the trace is lost, which the method records as a located event, not an impression. The outward instrument, the **Open Record Trace**, applies the construction to a public body's record; the inward instrument, the **Own Record Trace**, applies the same construction to this house's own record of error (§9.6's register, graded and check-stated under the method's discipline). The pair's name-phrase is *"Open Record, Own Record"*; its formal subtitle, which states the traversal, is *"Forward from the meeting; backward from the question."* The Directionality picture (§13.6) is the readout of the forward trace: an index into the register, not an illustration of an opinion.

The two documents. The method's sources are not paperwork; they are the body's two acts, one before the fact and one after it. The **agenda** is the said, before the fact: democratically, notice — the body tells the public in advance what it may decide, while the decision can still be influenced; legally, in the Ontario municipal frame in which the method first ran, a municipality must pass a procedure by-law governing the calling, place, and proceedings of its meetings, including the giving of notice (*Municipal Act, 2001*, s. 238(2)), and its meetings are open to the public by default (s. 239). The **minutes** are the did, after the fact: a statutory record — the clerk's duty to record, without note or comment, all resolutions, decisions, and other proceedings, and to keep the originals (*Municipal Act, 2001*, s. 228(1)) — which becomes the official record when the body itself adopts it, and stands thereafter as the authoritative evidence of what the body did, the document citizens, auditors, and courts rely on.

The requirement. The standard the register enforces is the requirement sense of *word and deed*: a body's word, set down before the fact, must answer to its deed, set down after it. A decision promised and never taken, taken and never promised, taken and then lost in the follow-through — each is a located finding in the register. The claim the method makes is narrow, and is stated at its honest size: the findability of a body's directions across time, and the state of an organization's checks across time, are auditable properties — measurable on a complete register, defensible row by row. The method claims nothing about the quality of any decision, and nothing about any person's intent. **Loss of trace** is a property of the record; it is not a finding about any person, and it does not distinguish an item that was withheld from an item that was never written down.

SAID–DONE — the meta-phrase, and its styling. SAID–DONE (French: DIT–FAIT) is the method's meta-phrase: the reconciliation of what a body said with what it did, held in one word-pair a reader can carry. The English rides the idiom *when all is said and done*; the French rides « sitôt dit, sitôt fait ». **Styling rule (standing):** SAID–DONE stands in uppercase wherever it stands as the house term of art; the sibling phrasings — *word and*

deed · said/did · parole et acte — are ordinary language building the same idea underneath it, are worked in lowercase, and never take the phrase's styling. Of the siblings, *word and deed* carries the requirement stated above.

Free use — ruled, and recorded on the face of the method. Duotrace, the Open Record Trace, the Own Record Trace, and SAID–DONE are **not trademarks and never will be**. The names, the definitional phrase, and the method are published for the world to use — no registration, no permission, no licence. Any body, office, or citizen group may adopt the phrase, the definitions, and the method as its own. No house copy may style any of them as a mark or claim them as property; the earlier filing track recorded in the invention map stands superseded by this ruling and is kept there for the record only.

The phrase-building test. SAID–DONE was built under a test the founder directed be codified with it, as the house's standing test for any phrase meant to carry methodological weight. A load-bearing phrase is built to eight parameters: **(1) Essence** — the phrase reduces the whole idea to its core, with nothing else left in; **(2) Brevity** — one word or two, maximum; **(3) Function** — the phrase does a job a reader can feel: it names the function or the reconciliation, never decoration; **(4) People's language** — plain words, and an idiom the reader already carries preferred over an invention; **(5) Bilingual survival** — a true French pair, not a translation of convenience; **(6) Requirement** — the phrase carries or implies the test it enforces; **(7) Styling** — one picked phrase, standing in its ruled styling, its family in ordinary language beneath it; **(8) Openness** — a coined phrase is a gift for use, never property. The test governs the building of phrases; the Lexicon Gate (§8.3) and the coinage discipline (§8.4) govern their entry and use.

Source: the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026, 13:26–14:06 EST (Decisions Register and daily log, same date); the phrase conferral and the agenda-and-minutes answer as settled in the invention map, §§2A and 3.

13.10 The Adoption Proposal: how a method is offered for institution

DRAFT — entered November 23, 2026, pending the founder's eye and the next methodology update. Not yet published; no public passage is drawn from this section until the founder rules it at that update. *Written from the record of the Duotrace proposal's build the same day: the commission (14:37 EST), the idea conferral (Legal first; pair Recommendation 9 · QAF 9), the form conferral (`Proposal_Form_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md`; pair Recommendation 9 · QAF 9 · Legal cleared), the fresh-eyes ranking of the first draft (`Proposal_FreshEyes_Rank_Nov23_2026.md`; pair Recommendation 7 · QAF 8), the founder's ruling of the form (14:45 EST), and the revision built on it (`Proposal_Paper_Duotrace_Adoption_EVALUATION_Nov23_2026.md`).*

The instrument defined. When this house offers one of its methods for adoption, the offering instrument is a **proposal** — a persuasion tool aimed at the implementers: the clerks, officials, councils, ministries, and departments inside the Public Sector Universe who would have to adopt and run the thing. A demonstration shows that a method works; it does not ask anyone to do anything, and institutions do not adopt demonstrations. The proposal is the document an institution can minute, forward, table, and answer. A method offered for institution is therefore never issued as a demonstration alone: the demonstration is the proposal's evidence, and the proposal is the demonstration's destination.

The pairing. Demonstration and proposal ship as a pair (the Pairing Rule, ruled November 23, 2026: no technical paper ships alone; its companion travels inside the same release). The demonstration runs the method on a

complete record — in simulation, labelled as such, until a real record exists — and the proposal cites it as demonstration evidence, by that name and at that size. Neither half borrows the other's authority: the proposal does not present the simulation as a finding about any real body, and the demonstration does not carry the adoption ask. The same truth, in both packages, at the same size — the repackaging doctrine the founder ruled the same afternoon: multiple packages are the distribution of the record, not a dilution of it, provided every package carries the truth at the size the Verifier's gate can check.

The form, as ruled. An adoption proposal is issued as **an evaluation, dressed for decision**. The body is an evaluation, led by the Evaluator seat's discipline: the evaluand stated as a property or an instrument, never as the reader; the evaluation questions stated; the **criteria stated in advance**, each resting on the reference authority of its discipline; the evidence presented by class; the **findings numbered**, so a receiving body can minute them one by one; conclusions drawn against the criteria, outrunning no finding; and recommendations carrying the adoption terms, a pilot, and an explicit **invitation to a written management response within a stated window** — the mechanism by which evaluations become commitments inside the public service, and the method applied to the proposal's own reception: every response received is entered as a row in the proposal's own register. On top of the body sits a one-page **Summary for Decision** in the decision-document register — issue · proposal · rationale · considerations · recommendation, the recommendation stated as adoptable text a carrier inside the institution can lift into their own instrument — plainly the proposer's own document, carrying no government insignia, wordmark, or branding of any kind. And the paper's **first line is poetry**: the method's phrase, in its ruled styling, woven with its family and its traversal — the sentence that gets quoted, forwarded, and said aloud — after which the paper turns serious and does not swell again. The limits are summarized inside the Summary for Decision, not left where only a finisher reads them, and the close is cut to the size of the ask.

The build sequence, as standing practice. (1) **Draft** — the proposal is drafted in full, in whatever form gets the substance down; the first draft's form is not the release form, and no one defends it as such. (2) **Form conferral** — the whole team sits on the question of form, knowing the target and the adoption purpose: the Legal chair first, and the **legal-defect frame is barred as a lead** — defect material belongs inside the problem section, never as the address, because a paper addressed to bodies under "what is wrong with your record" reads as findings about them, invites a defence rather than an adoption, and cannot be kept from gesturing at any live file the house holds in silence. (3) **Fresh-eyes ranking** — readers who did not write the draft and have not scored it before rank its body against the criteria of the craft (argument · persuasion to the implementer · structure · evidence discipline · language), defects ranked, each with the fix it imposes, and a **keep-list** naming what must not be lost, verbatim where the text has earned it. (4) **Revision on the ranking** — the draft is re-skeletoned into the ruled form on the ranking's defect list of record, the keep-list honoured; the superseded draft stands untouched as the scholarly edition, one of the doctrine's packages, not a waste product. (5) **Legal's three conditions as design rules**, applied at every stage, not checked at the end: the real record stays silent (the proposal argues from the method and the labelled demonstration only); no implied endorsement (authorities cited for their principles, in their own terms, the non-endorsement statement on the face of the paper, and the proposer's inferences and analogies marked as the proposer's in the sentences that make them); and openness stated exactly as ruled (the method, its phrase, and its definitions free for use, never trademarked; what the house sells is the craft, never the method). (6) **Show-first, founder's release** — the revised proposal is served to the founder's eye with the Legal line and a written synopsis; nothing moves until his release word. The French edition follows through the daily French pass after his ruling, as with every house paper.

One master, level-specific dress. The evaluation body — Summary for Decision through the annexes — is one master text, identical at every level. What changes is a wrapper of one to two pages placed in front of it, written in the form each level's carrier actually tables: **municipal**, the council-report dress (Recommendation · Purpose · Background · Discussion · Financial and Staffing Implications · Conclusion); **provincial**, the briefing-note dress (Issue · Background · Analysis · Recommendation · Next Steps); **federal**, the decision-summary dress (the Summary for Decision expanded to the federal register, on the proposer's letterhead, no Crown identifiers). The wrappers are dress, not editions: **no claim changes size between wrappers**, and the Verifier's gate checks each wrapper against the master before any of them moves. The method annex, the limits annex, and the terms-of-use annex travel with the master in every dress.

Source: the build record of November 23, 2026, as cited in the headnote; the form ruling entered in the Decisions Register the same day. This section codifies the build; it does not publish the proposal, whose release stands at the founder's word under the sequence above.

Annex A. The Ask Index at a glance

Force levels (ascending): Asked · Recommended · Directed · Ordered · Duty.

Quality criteria and weights: Evidence fidelity ×2 · Named owner ×2 · Relevance ×1 · Clarity / accessibility ×1 · Feasibility ×1 · Measurability ×1 · Timeliness ×1 · Coherence ×1. Each criterion scored 0 (absent), 1 (partial), 2 (met). Maximum composite 20, published as a percentage, always beside the full per-criterion profile (non-waivable).

Floor: 0 on evidence fidelity or 0 on named owner → "not well-formed," whatever the composite. Carve-out: the named-owner branch does not apply at force level Duty where the statutory obligor is identified in the ask's text; the criterion is then scored on the obligor's identifiability. The evidence-fidelity branch has no exception.

Propriety gate (before scoring): Lawful · Fair to the person named (the right-person test) · Ethical · True (the fourth check, added November 22, 2026; the battery is closed at four — §12.5) — one line each, recorded. Fail → "not a proper ask," held at the gate (visible, dated, reason stated) → fix (re-aim / narrow / rewrite) → re-enters as a new dated ask linked to the original. Gatekeeper: the Verifier alone. Appeal: the editor.

Not yet scored: the entry state of every ask; no composite, no percentage, no zero-profile, floor inapplicable; publishes with force level only; entry date shown; standing sweep; aggregates carry scored and unscored counts.

Reliability: two-rater blind pass on a sample before any aggregate is published; splits settled criterion by criterion on the record; agreement rate published.

Pending: floor rule revisit, November 25, 2026.

Annex B. The classification variables at a glance

Variable 1 — Economy: the sector of the economy the body sits in (non-financial corporations · financial corporations · general government · households · non-profit institutions serving households), with government business enterprises presented as a group of their own (§4.3).

Variable 2 — Perimeter (examination states, printed form): In [PSU] · Out [PSU] · Private sector (gloss: "not examined yet"). Naming chain: *Rest of the Economy* (ruled November 20, 2026) → *Never Examined* (November 21, 2026, 20:37) → *Private sector* (November 21, 2026, 20:43, governing). French rendering « secteur privé »: draft, unchecked (§10, item 7).

The basket: six indicators of control (Guide to the Public Sector of Canada, 12-589-X, §4.2.2.4): legislation · incorporation · policy · board appointments · binding agreement · asset reversion. Test: "Does the basket point both ways?" — no directionality; placement is a separate fact.

The Gray area flag (three states): flag set (basket read; two, three, or four of six) · basket read, flag not set (zero or one, or five or six) · not yet determined (basket never read). The flag is set on In and Out units only; the flag variable is defined for every unit: (Private sector × not yet determined) describes the unexamined world.

Completeness: every resident institutional unit is completely described as (Perimeter value × flag state). Description is not coverage (§4.7).

The annex: anything spending public money or holding a public mandate is in the register, control test or not; label "Beyond the Books" / « Au-delà des livres »; every annex entry carries label, nominator, and the case.

Annex C. Source documents for this guide

Consolidated November 22, 2026, from the Common Good News goal files. Principal sources, by section:

- **§§1–2:** the house's standing instructions (methodological provisions only); lexicon entries *Performance audit* and *Value-for-money audit*; the evaluation-pillar ruling of November 21, 2026 (E-092) and its evidence base.
- **§3:** *The Docket — Methodology Note* (November 17, 2026, bilingual, with §§13–15 as added); *The Map, the Door, and the Ledger* (Docket scope brief, November 20, 2026); the follow-through ledger ruling (Veterans News decisions, November 22, 2026).
- **§4:** *Perimeter_And_The_Gray_Area_Flag_Nov20_2026.md*; *The Skeleton — Indicators, Control, and Weights* (Reference Shelf, November 20, 2026); *PSU_Public_Sector_Universe_Reference_Nov19_2026.md*; lexicon entries *Perimeter*, *Private sector*, *Gray area (flag)*, *Basket of indicators*, *Public Sector Universe*; *Flag_Third_State_Conferral_Nov21_2026.md*; *Not_Yet_Rule_Codification_Nov21_2026.md*; *Atlas_Population_V1_TownshipFinancialStatements_Nov21_2026.md* (the six indicators in the Guide's order; the worked basket reads, including the Russell Agricultural Society's); *The_Lenses_Nov20_2026.md* and *The_Decisiveness_Lens_Nov20_2026.md*; the term-check and manuals memoranda of November 20–21, 2026 as cited in the lexicon.

- **§5:** Ask Index research memorandum (November 20, 2026, with its corrections addendum); *AskIndex_Weighting_Summation_Nov21_2026.md*; *AskIndex_Weighting_Conferral_Nov21_2026.md*, including the RULINGS addendum of November 22, 2026; lexicon entries *Ask Index*, *Kinds of ask*, *Evidence fidelity*.
- **§6:** *Fulfilment_Index_OnePager_Nov20_2026.md*; the Fulfilment Index research memorandum (November 20, 2026); lexicon entry *Fulfilment Index*.
- **§7:** *CGN_Three_Questions_Framework_Nov18_2026.md*.
- **§8:** *The_Transposition_Test_Nov21_2026.md* and *Transposition_Test_Evidence_Nov21_2026.md* (Reference Shelf); *Lexicon_Official_Names_FR_EN_Nov19_2026.md* and *PostMortem_Canton_Nov19_2026.md*; the Lexicon Gate rule and comparative-entry rule (lexicon front matter and house standing instructions, November 20, 2026); lexicon entry *Materiality* and *reference_shelf/Materiality_Catalogue_Nov21_2026.md*; the report-form ruling (November 22, 2026).
- **§9:** the conferral records of November 21, 2026 (chairs' control documents as stated in each conferral); *Accessibility_Review_Question_Nov21_2026.md* and its ADOPTED addendum (November 21, 2026, 22:52 EST); the gracious-follow-up doctrine (house standing instructions, November 19–20, 2026).
- **§12:** *Lens_Codification_DRAFT_Nov22_2026.md*, as adopted November 22, 2026 (kept as the adoption source record); the conferral records of November 22, 2026 — the weighting-classes audit, the Legal chair conferral, the fourth-check conferral (including the Legal chair's cited reading), and the sixth-lens conferral. The journalism chain at §2.5 and the law chain at §2.6 entered from the same adoption.
- **§3.14, §9.5A, §12.5A, §§12.11–12.13 (November 23, 2026 entries):** *Documentation_Threshold_Brief_Nov23_2026.md* (§3.14, proposed); *Translation_Verification_Standard_Panel_Nov23_2026.md* (§9.5A, proposed — research base: Brislin 1970 and Behr 2017; ISO 17100:2015; ISO 18587:2017; Harkness 2003 and the European Social Survey TRAPD materials; Werner & Campbell 1970; the federal Translation Bureau and TERMIUM Plus; the Office québécois de la langue française's Grand dictionnaire terminologique); *Pentagon_Name_Insignia_Guide_Draft_Nov23_2026.md* (§12.5A and §12.5A.1, proposed; insignia candidates in *pentagon_insignia_nov23/*); *Panel_Sequence_Defence_Nov23_2026.md* (§12.13, ruled); and the editor's rulings of November 23, 2026 — the Wide Net (02:21 EST) and the Double Pass (02:22 EST) at §§12.11–12.12, and the sequence formalization approved 02:59 EST at §12.13 — as recorded in the house memory the same night.
- **§12.14 and §13 (the November 23, 2026 methodology-update entry):** *Decision_Package_Nov23_2026.md* (Items 2–5, and the founder's directions of 04:18–04:28 EST) for §§13.1–13.4; *Shadow_Seat_Codification_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md* for §12.14; *Legal_Architecture_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md*, *Legal_Fleet_Scenario_Study_Nov23_2026.md* (as amended to the Treasury Board Framework for the Management of Risk), *Quebec_Bijural_Debrief_And_Fleet_Nov23_2026.md*, and *Counsel_Queue_DRAFT_Bench_Nov23_2026.md* for §13.5; *Panel_Directionality_Magnitude_Nov23_2026.md* and the founder's rulings of November 23, 2026 (01:12–01:21 EST) for §13.6; the Placement Check's institution record (Decisions Register, November 23, 2026, 00:05 EST) for §13.7; the Digit Edition ruling (Decisions Register, November 23, 2026, 02:09 EST) for §13.8; the Defect Pass adoption (November 23, 2026, 07:31 EST; *Defect_Pass_Conferral_Nov23_2026.md*) for the §9.6 amendment flip; and the Guide daily check's Triggers 2–4 (daily check log, *hidden_files/*

Method_Guide_Daily_Check_Log.md) as the entry vehicle for §§13.6–13.8 and the §10.1/§10.3 closures. The entry vehicle is *Methodology_Update_Bundle_DRAFT_Nov23_2026.md*: its eight passages stand at §§13.1–13.8 and its ruled paragraph at §12.14.

End of Version 2.1.

---

1. The discipline is stated in its source form in the Reference Shelf note *The Skeleton — Indicators, Control, and Weights* (November 20, 2026): “Full terms, the same words, every time. ‘Public Sector Universe’ is never shortened. A defined term is never swapped for a near-synonym: variable, category, indicator, and weight are four different things.” This guide adds *flag* to the list on the strength of §4.5, where the distinction between a variable and a flag carries the whole design. ↩

2. Definition after INTOSAI, ISSAI 300, as entered in the Common Good News lexicon (entry *Performance audit*, settled November 20, 2026). The lexicon entry keeps three senses distinct and never flattened: the performance audit sense (this section), the statistician’s sense (performance is measurable: define the characteristic, observe it, score it against the stated standard; indicators are yes/no facts, and judgement sits on top of the facts, named as judgement), and the private-sector accountant’s sense (performance is a flow over a period, as in an income statement; it always carries a period with it). ↩

3. Usage rule, ruled November 20, 2026: “value for money” appears in Common Good News copy only inside an institution’s own name or title for its own work — for example, an Auditor General of Ontario report, quoted as titled. The variance is recorded in the lexicon: value-for-money audit casts the citizen as customer checking a receipt, its unit of account the dollar; performance audit casts the citizen as principal checking a promise, its unit of account the undertaking. The steelman is kept on the record in the lexicon entry: value-for-money language named real waste for decades and built the public’s expectation that someone checks; the quarrel is with the frame, not the ancestors. ↩

4. The reconciliation order is the editor’s standing instruction: Common Good News concepts reconcile to the Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework first, and only through it to the Government Finance Statistics Manual and the System of National Accounts. The Canadian Government Finance Statistics framework is the Canadian implementation of the Government Finance Statistics Manual within the Canadian System of National Accounts; the order matters because the Canadian framework, not the international manual, is the working instrument of the Canadian public sector statistics program from which the classification spine (§4.2) is drawn. ↩

5. Pillar order for auditing ruled November 20, 2026, when INTOSAI was added as the global pillar on the editor’s ruling; the order beneath it is federal, then provincial, then local. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities enters as a best-practices repository at the local level, not as a standards body. ↩

6. Ruling E-092, November 21, 2026: the JCSEE Program Evaluation Standards are the evaluation discipline’s ultimate reference document; the Canadian Evaluation Society Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice are the Canadian practice layer beneath it; the Canadian Evaluation Society Ethics Guidance (2023) is an ethics instrument, not the ultimate reference document. The evidence base for the ruling is the evaluation-pillar comparison in *Transposition_Test_Evidence_Nov21_2026.md*, Part A3, which records the pattern of the other pillars — a global text plus a Canadian text — and the evaluation twist: Canada does not adapt the JCSEE Standards into a Canadian standards book; the Canadian Evaluation Society adopts them outright and builds its distinctively Canadian instrument one level over, in the Competencies. ↩

7. The Docket method is consolidated from *The Docket — Methodology Note* (November 17, 2026, bilingual, with later additions) and the scope brief *The Map, the Door, and the Ledger* (November 20, 2026). The status of the November 17 note is recorded at §10, Open points, item 5. ↩

8. The pre-filing states Draft and Prepared were in use on the Docket page before they were in the methodology note; they were added to the chain on November 21, 2026, under the Not-Yet Rule (§4.7). ↩

9. The Not yet assessed state was added November 21, 2026, under the Not-Yet Rule (§4.7). The distinction it protects is the rule's core: Not started is a finding (the register looked and found nothing done); Not yet assessed is the absence of a finding. Collapsing the second into the first would record an examination that never happened. ↩

10. The assurance provisions of this section are drawn from §14 of *The Docket — Methodology Note* (added November 17, 2026), whose design goal is stated precisely: no false positives, and no false negatives that originate in the register itself. An error that traces to the source is recorded as a source error and corrected against the better evidence; an error that originates in the register is a control failure, and is treated as one: found, classified, corrected in public, and the control that missed it is strengthened. ↩

11. The 2025 Public Sector Universe release (catalogue 68-516-X; coverage 2008–2025) counts 6,037 active units — 27 fewer than the 2024 release's 6,064; the article records the decline since 2019 at 100 units, mainly provincial and territorial (−39) and local (−61), from dissolutions, reorganizations, and mergers. Its local general-government component is 4,265 units (4,274 in 2024), including 3,843 municipalities (3,853 in 2024); it also lists 293 universities and colleges, 214 health institutions (224 in 2024), 370 school boards, 304 government business enterprises (31 federal, 85 provincial and territorial, 188 local — 308 in 2024: 31 federal, 88 provincial and territorial, 189 local), and the Canada and Quebec Pension Plans. A hospital or university that is not a separate institutional unit is not listed as a separate unit; it forms part of the institutional unit that controls it. (Statistics Canada, *The Daily*, November 20, 2026, "Public Sector Universe, 2025," article dq261120c, Table 1; conformed November 23, 2026, superseding the scope brief's note 4, from Statistics Canada, Public Sector Universe, 2024.) ↩

12. Correction preserved on the record: an earlier working note stated that Statistics Canada does not publish per-unit classification decisions. The term-check memorandum of November 20, 2026 found the Public Sector Universe tool, on which sector classification decisions of public sector entities are available, and the correction stands in the codification (§4 of *Perimeter_And_The_Gray_Area_Flag_Nov20_2026.md*) so that the record shows both the error and its repair. This guide follows the corrected position. ↩

13. Statistics Canada, *Best practices for defining the Canadian public sector*, 13-604-M2020001; and the scope brief's note 3. Decisions are recorded in a standardized, peer-reviewed template covering legal authority, mandate, operating structure, and financial transactions. The register's own keying practice follows the same logic at citizen scale: Statistics Canada's Business Register keys every business and institution to a single spine, the Business Number issued by the Canada Revenue Agency; a working map of the whole economy can be assembled from what is already public — Corporations Canada's register, the charities data of the Canada Revenue Agency, the published Public Sector Universe list itself, and the federal government's contract disclosures (every contract over $10,000, vendor by vendor). The last source matters methodologically: it is how the register finds the private firm that sits outside the universe and lives on public contracts — the control test says it is not public; the money says it is worth watching; the annex (§4.8) is where it is watched. ↩

14. Scope brief, note 1: Statistics Canada's classification sequence makes the underlying distinction this presentation borrows — after the residence and institutional-unit tests, a government-controlled producer is classified by the market test: non-market producers to general government; market producers to public corporations, divided into public financial and public non-financial corporations (the government business enterprises). The 304 government business enterprises in the 2025 Public Sector Universe comprise 31 federal, 85 provincial and territorial, and 188 local units (the 2024 edition counted 308: 31 federal, 88 provincial and territorial, 189 local). The register's "group of their own" is therefore a presentation choice for this register, not a new System of National Accounts sector and not a change to the Public Sector Universe test. ↩

15. Statistics Canada, Canadian Classification of Institutional Units and Sectors, sectors S13 (general government) and S15 (non-profit institutions serving households); Canadian System of National Accounts User Guide (13-606-G), Chapter 3, §3.3.5 and Figure 3.3, whose decision tree for a non-market producer asks in so many words: "Is it controlled by government?" — yes, to general government; no, to non-profit institutions serving households. Non-profit institutions serving households, as a sector, is outside the Public Sector Universe by definition: the sector is defined as non-profit institutions *except those controlled by government*. A non-profit body that is government-controlled is inside the Public Sector Universe, but statistically it is then classified as a general government unit, not as a non-profit institution serving households. ↩

16. The gloss was ruled November 21, 2026 (20:47 EST). The same ruling record carries the companion instruction for all not-yet states: “never” is the poison word — absolute, and false the moment anyone anywhere had looked. Compare §4.7: a not-yet state is a state, not a verdict, and a unit leaves it the day it is examined. ↩

17. The comparative treatment follows the house rule for the lexicon (§8.3): where another authority’s term is almost identical to Common Good News’s — same term *and* same extension — the entry flags it and links to the authority’s definition without duplicating text; where it is not, the entry gives the authority’s term and definition verbatim with source, plus a variance note. *Private sector* is the standing example of the second case: the words are Statistics Canada’s; the extension of the register’s value is narrower than the aggregate’s, and the variance is therefore recorded in full, here and in the lexicon entry *Private sector* (settled November 21, 2026). ↩

18. The full chain, with the preserved text of each ruling, is in the lexicon entry *Private sector*. The November 20 ruling (KEEP *Rest of the Economy*) stands in that entry as the historical record of the ruling, expressly marked superseded by the November 21 chain. “Rest of the economy” survives only as the authorities’ prose concept in comparative notes (2025 SNA ¶30.177; Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 ¶1.13; ESA 2010 ¶20.01; the Canadian Government Finance Statistics chapter of the Canadian System of National Accounts User Guide, 13-606-G, ch. 9 — verified first-hand in the full texts, November 20, 2026); it is no manual’s defined term, and it is never again the register’s value. One tension in the sources is recorded at §10, Open points, item 1: the November 20 codification file and the Reference Shelf README still state the three values as In · Out · Rest of the Economy, because they were not conformed after the November 21 renaming. ↩

19. System of National Accounts 2008, ¶4.92, as summarized in the Public Sector Universe reference note: government control of a non-profit institution means the ability to determine the general policy or programme of the non-profit institution. The System of National Accounts states the control test for non-profit institutions through five indicators (appointment of officers; other provisions of the enabling instrument; contractual agreements; degree of financing by government; risk exposure). The register’s working basket (§4.5) is the six indicators of the *Guide to the Public Sector of Canada*, §4.2.2.4, which is the operative Canadian instrument for the register’s units; the two baskets are cousins, not the same instrument, and this guide does not conflate them. The Guide’s full indicator counts, for the record: control — 3 categories, 15 indicators (6 in §4.2.2.4 and 9 in §4.2.2.5); non-market producers — 10 indicators (§4.2.3); market producers — 8 indicators (§4.2.4). (Reference Shelf, *The Skeleton — Indicators, Control, and Weights*.) ↩

20. Reference Shelf, *The Skeleton — Indicators, Control, and Weights* (settled November 20, 2026), §§1, 6, 7. The same note settles the companion distinctions this guide relies on: a category is a value, never a variable (direct · effective · indirect · none are the four values of one variable, type of control; they rank by strength, strongest to weakest, and the gaps between them are not numbers); controlled / not controlled is the outcome, one binary value; and the Guide is qualitative except for two numbers — 50 percent, the voting-equity line inside direct control, and 33.3 percent, the voting-equity line inside effective control. Every other test in the Guide is a yes-or-no quality. ↩

21. The financing rule is stated concretely in Statistics Canada’s own classification practice, carried in the Public Sector Universe reference note: religious institutions remain in the non-profit institutions serving households sector even when mainly financed by government, as long as the financing is not seen as empowering government control. ↩

22. The phrasing is the editor’s approved form, and the rejected alternative is part of the ruling: the test is “Does the basket point both ways?” — not “does not point one way.” The divided basket is the whole test, on either side of the line; placement is a separate fact; there is no directionality to the mismatch. The concession about qualitative judgement is the editor’s standing position: indicators are unweighted yes/no checks; where a basket splits, the call is qualitative judgement — the manuals’ documented weak link. A method that hides its weak link invites its critics to find it; this guide names it first. ↩

23. The three-state form was adopted November 21, 2026 (21:36 EST) on the unanimous conferral of the four chairs and the Verifier (*Flag_Third_State_Conferral_Nov21_2026.md*): the Auditor’s rider (the second state affirmatively named), the Journalist’s rider (display: hollow circle alone; the pairing written as a sentence), and the Verifier’s rider (“flag set” and “flag state” kept distinct; completeness worded “every resident institutional unit”; a sweep of published copy for “clear/unflagged” phrasings as a standing gate before the Atlas publishes counts — the gate is recorded; the sweep’s completion is recorded at §10, Open points, item 4). ↩

24. *Not_Yet_Rule_Codification_Nov21_2026.md* (ruled November 21, 2026, 20:49 EST; adopted in its full conferred form 21:36 EST the same evening for the flag's third state). The conferral's precedents, all read November 21, 2026, are part of the rule's authority and are recorded here: Statistics Canada's Business Register has carried an explicit Unclassified category since December 2014 (businesses which have not received a NAICS code, counted on the register rather than forced into a class or dropped off the frame); Statistics Canada survey coding separates Valid Skip (examined; the path determined the question did not apply) from Not stated (the data are missing) by reserved codes; the SDMX observation-status list (CL_OBS_STATUS v2.1, 2016) codes L — "missing value; data exist but were not collected" — distinctly from M — "missing value; data cannot exist" — and from every substantive value; ISA 705 (Revised) treats inability to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence as its own branch, up to a disclaimer of opinion — "we did not look" is never recorded as "we looked and found nothing"; and the JCSEE Standards A1 (justified conclusions), A5 (information management), A8 (communication and reporting), and P5 (transparency and disclosure) each independently require the third state. ↩

25. The description/coverage distinction is the Evaluator's caution in the flag conferral, accepted by all chairs: the grid's completeness and the register's completeness are different claims, and published copy must keep those two claims separate, or a complete grid will quietly overclaim a complete census. ↩

26. Feasibility note recorded at codification (November 20, 2026): the flag itself is cheap, because it falls out of classification work the register already does; the deep program — directionality, commonalities, the consistency audit — is research-heavy by design, and it is phased. The editor has ruled it so. ↩

27. Reference Shelf, *The_Lenses_Nov20_2026.md* and *The_Decisiveness_Lens_Nov20_2026.md*. The correction history is part of the note and is preserved here: a first fix — "a lens is a question" — was itself a category error, corrected by the editor on the night: a lens is not a question; a lens is the perspective through which the question is asked. One fact can be viewed from every standpoint and weigh differently from each, with no contradiction — because what differs is where you stand, not the fact. ↩

28. Ask Index research memorandum, November 20, 2026, §4. The memorandum's bottom line is the instrument's charter: classify asks by force, then rate quality on the sourced set. The memorandum also carries its own corrections addendum (November 20, 2026, after the primary-source re-verification the editor ordered), preserved here because the Ask Index's Duty examples depend on it: (1) the "GAO 60-day rule" recited in older Government Accountability Office material is stale law — current 31 U.S.C. §720(b)(1) requires the agency head's written statement before the 181st day after the date of the report, a 180-day deadline (Pub. L. 115-414, January 3, 2019); every "60 days" in the memorandum's §§1 and 4 is to be read as 180 days. (2) The Ontario *Health Protection and Promotion Act* s. 77.7(3) "shall comply" is verbatim, but s. 102(1)'s restraint power over directives covers only directives relating to a small drinking water system; the court route for a s. 77.7 contravention is s. 102(2) plus offence prosecution. (3) The 545-action pool in the memorandum's §2 includes committee-recommended actions as well as audit actions; the figures 545 / 302 / 55 percent are exact. ↩

29. The follow-up machinery, from the research memorandum §1: Ontario's Ombudsman states that recommendations are not binding — and that almost all of the Ombudsman's recommendations for systemic change have been accepted by the government in the past ten years (Ombudsman Ontario, 2016). The Auditor General of Ontario asks auditees for a written response to each recommendation and follows up two years after publication on the status of actions taken. In the United States, statute obliges the agency head to file a written statement of action taken on Government Accountability Office recommendations (31 U.S.C. §720, as corrected at note 28), and the Government Accountability Office reports that approximately 80 percent of its recommendations are implemented within four years (GAO-14-848T). In the United Kingdom, every Public Accounts Committee recommendation receives a formal government reply in a Treasury Minute — agree or disagree, with a target implementation date. ↩

30. Lexicon entry *Kinds of ask* (settled, five levels, November 21, 2026); standardization recorded in *AskIndex_Comparatives_Standardization_Nov21_2026.md*. The Duty class was proposed in the research memorandum's bottom line ("added by this research as the ceiling above Ordered") and ruled by the editor on November 21, 2026, when the Ask Index design was settled. The five-level ladder supersedes the four-level ladder (Asked · Recommended · Directed · Ordered) printed in earlier Common Good News pieces; the Double Entry series' correction of its own four-level passages is a worked example of the corrections discipline at §3.9. ↩

31. Sources for the quality set: Statistics Canada, Quality Assurance Framework (12-586-X) — six dimensions: relevance, accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, coherence, interpretability; the paired international-template wording (accuracy and reliability; timeliness and punctuality; accessibility and clarity; coherence and comparability) is also Statistics Canada's own, in its quality-management guidance (11-634-X, ch. 1.5). ISSAI 300 requires that recommendations address the causes of problems, not encroach on management's responsibilities, and be addressed to the audited entity that has the responsibility for implementing them; the working tests in performance-audit practice guidance include: flow from the findings and conclusions; be clear, compelling, and succinct; be practical and achievable; specify who is responsible; specify what issue needs to be addressed; specify why; specify urgency or a timeframe where possible; and stand alone — plus the follow-up test: could successful implementation be determined in a follow-up audit? The Government Accountability Office's causal claim (GAO/OP-9.2.1, 1991): "Whether audit results are achieved depends on the quality of the recommendation. A recommendation that is not convincing won't be implemented. A recommendation that does not correct the basic cause of a deficiency may not achieve the intended result." JCSEE standard A1: evaluation conclusions and decisions should be explicitly justified. Unit discipline is borrowed from the Auditor General of Ontario, which decomposes each recommendation into recommended actions and tracks the action, not the recommendation (§6.3). ↩

32. The twin-asks example and the structural point are the Statistician's, from the conferral of November 21, 2026, §1(3): "the floor is doing the real discriminating work, and the composite is decoration on top of it. An instrument whose headline number cannot distinguish its two canonical failure shapes should not lead with the number." The editor's ruling 2 keeps the percentage and answers the point with the non-waivable profile rule rather than with bands. The Verifier's independent recomputation in the same conferral verified the instrument's arithmetic: maximum 2·2 + 2·2 + (6 × 2) = 20; the summation's worked example (evidence fidelity 2, named owner 2, relevance 2, clarity 1, feasibility 2, measurability 1, timeliness 2, coherence 2) recomputes to 4 + 4 + 2 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 18/20 = 90 percent; the Journalist's buried-ask example (§5.10, note under ruling 1) recomputes to 17/20. No false numbers were found in the instrument's own documents. ↩

33. 31 U.S.C. §720 — see note 28 for the corrected deadline. The Auditor's conferral text (November 21, 2026, §2(4)) is the source of the carve-out's reasoning and of its exact amendment wording, which the ruling adopted. ↩

34. The display conditions are the Journalist's, from the flag conferral and the weighting conferral, applied to this instrument: an unscored ask publishes with its force level only; "not yet scored" must be a recorded state with a date, not a blank. The state was added November 21, 2026, under the Not-Yet Rule (§4.7) — its second application, named in advance by the Evaluator in the flag conferral ("any Common Good News scoring variable must never let zero mean both 'scored at the floor' and 'not yet scored'"). ↩

35. Fulfilment Index research memorandum, November 20, 2026, and the Index's one-pager of the same date. The one-pager records the provenance in its own words: "We checked. No profession hands down one shared scale — audit offices and evaluation societies all require follow-up, and each built its own labels. So we built ours from the best of them." ↩

36. The framework's sourced specifics stand as settled November 18, 2026. A scholarly paper presenting the framework — working frame **PAO: the Paper, the Action, the Outcome**, the editor's coinage of November 18, 2026 — is commissioned; its structure is the broader concepts first, then the deeper concepts, with best practices named at the global, Canadian, and local levels and the institutions cited. The paper is a presentation of this framework, not a source for it; this guide governs in any difference. ↩

37. Sources for §8.1: Reference Shelf, *The_Transposition_Test_Nov21_2026.md* (the test, its arithmetic, its protocol, its limits) and *Transposition_Test_Evidence_Nov21_2026.md* (the evidence check across the three pillars and the corpus run; approximately twenty web sources opened or searched; five financial files machine-read, 181 values extracted, 118 arithmetic candidate pairs generated and hand-checked for sameness of quantity). The lexicon draft entry is *LEXICON_DRAFT_Transposition_Test_Nov21_2026.md*. One status tension in the sources is recorded at §10, Open points, item 3: the Reference Shelf note still carries the status line "DRAFT — its standing in the lexicon and in the Reconciliation method waits on Matthew's ruling," while the evidence check the note awaited has since been completed. This guide enters the test as a coinage on the strength of the completed evidence check; the Reference Shelf note's status line is to be conformed at the next daily check (§11.2). ↩

38. The post-mortem is *PostMortem_Canton_Nov19_2026.md*; the rule and its adoption record are in the house's standing instructions. The trap is documented in the names lexicon itself: three Prescott-Russell neighbours *are* officially "canton" in French (Champlain,

Alfred et Plantagenet, Hawkesbury Est); Russell is not. Statistics Canada's Standard Geographical Classification carries the designation CT ("canton") only in Québec; Ontario townships are TP. That a dictionary-standard rendering can be simultaneously defensible and wrong is exactly why the check verifies the institution's own usage rather than the dictionary's. ↩

39. Lexicon entry *Materiality* (settled November 21, 2026), sourced to *reference_shelf/Materiality_Catalogue_Nov21_2026.md*, §9. Comparative entries, per the rule at §8.3: IAASB / INTOSAI / CPA Canada — ISA 320.2 = ISSAI 1320.2 = CAS 320.2, "material if … could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users" (almost identical across all three; linked, not duplicated). IASB Practice Statement 2 (2017) ¶5 and IAS 1 / IAS 8 as amended (2018) govern *information*, a wider subject than misstatements — variance recorded. Public Sector Accounting Board, PS Handbook s. PS 1200.015: the user is the citizen or legislator judging government operations and management, not an investor judging returns — the extension Common Good News works in; no percentage published. SEC SAB 99 is not a definition but a prohibition: no percentage threshold is a safe harbour; the house adopts the prohibition and the factor list as its qualitative scale. ↩

40. Reference Shelf, *The_Lenses_Nov20_2026.md* and *The_Decisiveness_Lens_Nov20_2026.md*, as consolidated at §4.10, note 27: a lens is not a question; a lens is the perspective through which the question is asked. The correction history is preserved at that note and is part of this definition's authority. ↩

41. The journalism chain is stated here in full. Section 2.5 as first written covered the register's records discipline only (ISO 15489; the Association of Records Managers and Administrators' Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles; assurance practice in the spirit of CSAE 3000) and named no journalism standards body. At the adoption of this section (November 22, 2026), §2.5 was conformed to carry this chain, and §2.6 was added carrying law — the second adoption-time action flagged in this section's preparation, §2 having named no law among its sources of authority. ↩

42. Ruled by the editor November 21, 2026: the Journalist view carries the three disciplines (Auditor · Evaluator · Statistician) in one hat; the journalist is the aggregator of the three, not a fourth independent view — "a journalist asterisk, almost." The editor's three hats, for the record and for all billing: Auditor · Statistician · Evaluator. ↩

43. *Accessibility_Review_Question_Nov21_2026.md* — the question was put to the shops on November 21, 2026 ("does anyone with lived special-needs experience hold a named accessibility review role?") and the answer, from every chair, was no: the Accessibility panel (Calm · Large text · High contrast · Captions first · Reading spacing) was live but stewarded by nobody; audits were one-off events; the only lived-experience eye was the editor himself, untitled. The adopted fix, recorded the same evening (22:52 EST): a named Accessibility Review duty inside the Verifier's gate, non-waivable at deploy, with Matthew Buechler as reviewer of record until a second lived-experience reviewer is named. ↩