Lab overview & demonstration guide

Independent research · bounded demonstrations

The lab explores how communities and businesses can turn ideas into inspectable workflows: keep the evidence, make decision authority explicit, and carry the resulting context into the next handoff. This page is a short map of the demonstrations. Each link says what it shows and what it does not establish.

Three roles — Who does what

These are architectural roles, not connected services. The separate Engine reference source includes policy, review, scoped authority, receipt and verification code; this showcase does not call those services. Its R1 synthetic integration remains proposed: as documented on October 16, 2026, owners are unassigned, ten gates are open and 36 integration tests are not run.

TAE / DEFINE

Gives a request a clear shape and states the rule and the human decision boundary that apply to it.

Hivewire / GROUND

Keeps evidence, corrections and source relationships attached to the work so a reviewer can see where information came from.

Proof Layer / PROVE

Produces a record another participant can inspect, and states narrowly what that record does and does not show.

Six responsibilities, kept separate

1. DEFINE — Shape the request.
2. GROUND — Attach the evidence.
3. GOVERN — Apply an explicit rule.
4. DECIDE — Leave the decision to an accountable person.
5. PROVE — Make the record inspectable.
6. RECONCILE — Keep the state honest across handoffs.

A proposed pattern for dividing responsibility, not an industry standard, certification or integrated deployment. The adapter prepares requests and carries results; TAE/Guardian owns the policy verdict. A human approval, a separate execution grant and a verification result do not substitute for one another.

Choose your question — Open the relevant demonstration

Hivewire reviewer walkthrough

Where did the information come from?

Role / context: GROUND · a seeded recording with indexed reviewer notes; corrections keep their source locators.

Boundary: Recording only. Accepting evidence does not approve the claim; the claim stays Held. Separate from the vendor-payment fixture.

Governance adapter

Who decides what happens next?

Role / context: GOVERN · a local vendor-payment fixture compares $8,500 with a $5,000 threshold and requires human review.

Boundary: Local routing illustration, not a connected adapter. No live policy authority, payment or human decision.

Proof Pilot walkthrough

How does a person resume and review the work?

Role / context: Bounded evidence handoff and guided review, on a separate site.

Boundary: A separate synthetic-claim prototype with its own runtime. Recorded or simulated elements are not human decisions or production execution.

Gate verification

What can another participant check?

Role / context: PROVE · three local checks: identity agreement, threshold recomputation and evidence-pointer resolution.

Boundary: Illustrative browser-side checking of an unsigned gate record. No cryptographic attestation or transaction proof.

Proof Pilot offline inspector

What can another participant check?

Role / context: A separate export-inspection surface described as checking against a pinned authority snapshot.

Boundary: Not the showcase gate checker. Historical integrity is not current permission, source truth or human approval.

Workflow coordination

How could this support a community network?

Role / context: RECONCILE · an illustrative pending gate and the next-stage responsibility.

Boundary: Proposed coordination only. Preserve input records and link later results separately; receiving a packet is not substantive acceptance or execution permission.

Go deeper — Walkthroughs, concepts and design decks

Six-stage guided run

Role / context: The whole vendor-payment fixture, stage by stage.

Boundary: No shared case identity or runtime handoff with the Hivewire recording.

Architecture overview

Role / context: How the roles and the responsibility pattern fit together.

Boundary: Proposed architecture, not a deployed system.

Distributed mesh concept

Role / context: A proposed distributed-node application for supply chains, logistics and commerce.

Boundary: Proposed concept. No live mesh, network identity or transactions.

Logistics/commerce walkthrough library

Role / context: Source-backed food-distribution and changing-conditions simulations, plus governance scenarios.

Boundary: Synthetic scenarios and simulated events. No real deliveries or approvals.

Optional Proof Pilot Showcase (food)

Role / context: An optional in-site community-food demonstration of staged handoffs and record checks.

Boundary: Not the same case or runtime as the external Proof Pilot synthetic-claim prototype.

Technical architecture deck

REFERENCE SYSTEM DESIGN

Boundary: Proposed design, not executable evidence or production readiness.

Copilot experience deck

PROPOSED INTERACTION CONCEPT

Boundary: An interaction concept, not a connected assistant or delegated decision authority.

Suggested paths

Suggested paths are editorial recommendations, not claims validated by the demonstrations.

Civic partners and legislative staff

1. Executive brief
2. Governance adapter
3. Workflow coordination

Business owners

1. Proof Pilot walkthrough
2. Hivewire reviewer walkthrough
3. Proposed packet service (below)

Technical and funding reviewers

1. Guided run
2. Gate verification
3. Technical architecture deck

Proposed next steps — not established offerings

1 · Demonstrate the mechanic

Use Proof Pilot and the bounded showcase exercises to explain evidence, review, authority and handoffs. Record comprehension gaps, friction and unresolved dependencies before choosing a field pilot.

2 · Apply the lab method

Develop one scoped Miami civic pilot alongside an idea-to-prototype-packet service for business owners. Candidate projects include community meal distribution, maintenance handoffs and small-business intake coordination. A packet would hold the problem, participants, workflow, evidence and assumptions, demonstration, decision boundaries, implementation steps and measures of success.

Both stages are proposed. The Miami pilot and the packet service are not established offerings or commitments, and no affiliation, funding or endorsement is implied.

Bring one recurring coordination problem, its current handoff, an accountable owner and an observable success measure. A proposed first engagement would aim to produce a scoped packet for review, so an accountable person can decide whether a field pilot is justified.

Keep the limits attached

The demonstrations show bounded examples of evidence handling, routing and inspection. The synthetic vendor-payment fixture, the Hivewire claim recording, the separate Proof Pilot synthetic-claim runtime and the source-backed food simulations are distinct cases. None establishes production integration, an integrated mesh, trusted identity, underlying source truth, real deliveries, real-world approvals, payment authority or measured community impact.

Share this guide

The shared link opens this page only. It does not carry scenario state, selections or progress from any demonstration.

https://trust-artifact-architecture-showcase-a-anglade999labs.org/executive-one-pager

Demonstration links open online destinations; this file does not run demonstrations or carry their state.