

LAKANA: A Doctrine-Constrained, Deterministic Architecture for Sovereign Cyber-Physical Safety Systems

MarTaize KarTreal Fails
LAKANA Systems
Norman, Oklahoma, USA
contact@lakanasystems.com

March 2026
Preprint

Abstract

We present LAKANA, a layered cyber-physical architecture governed by an explicit constitutional doctrine that enforces deterministic, physics-first, fail-closed, and local-first constraints across all subsystem interactions. The architecture originates from two founding insights: first, that safety-critical admissibility must be a deterministic binary predicate bounded by physical constraint functions, not a probabilistic confidence score (TSARO); and second, that sovereignty over safety-critical data must be enforced as an architectural boundary by construction, not as a policy layer (NICOLE). Every subsequent subsystem is derived as a necessary consequence of this founding pair. The architecture addresses a structural gap in civilian safety infrastructure: existing systems for emergency communication, threat detection, and environmental monitoring typically depend on centralized cloud pipelines, probabilistic machine-learning inference, and identity-based trust models—many of which degrade under the same adversarial conditions most likely to necessitate their use.

LAKANA replaces these dependencies with a hardware-bounded computing stack comprising seven principal subsystems: CIVOS (a hardware-abstracted micro-kernel with analog sensor frontends and Ring -1 isolated enclave execution), NICOLE (a split-knowledge cryptographic compartmentalization protocol with

hardware-bound key zeroization), SOS (a deterministic safety infrastructure layer providing multi-transport emergency mesh networking), TSARO (a constrained dynamical-systems threat engine operating within formally defined safe sets), W-X (an environmental truth-anchoring layer using inertial and local-physics validation), UEI (a cognitive sovereignty interface applying friction-based interaction governance), and SSI (a sovereign biometric intelligence layer for physics-first load monitoring, hazard recognition, and career-long biological accounting in high-load occupational domains).

Formal contributions. This paper formalizes the governing doctrine as a set of constitutional constraints (Section ??) [**Documented**], defines the subsystem boundary contracts and authority hierarchy as a partial order with a downward-only override property (Proposition ??) [**Proved**] [**Conditional on stated assumptions**], derives a survivability lower bound under Ring -1 isolation assumptions (Theorem ??) [**Derived**] [**Conditional on stated assumptions**] [**Hardware-dependent**], proves the Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem for safety-set recalibration (Theorem ??) [**Proved**] [**Conditional on stated assumptions**], and establishes the cryptographic non-recoverability guarantee of the Pumpkin Protocol (Theorem ??) [**Proved**] [**Conditional on stated assumptions**] [**Hardware-dependent**]. All load-bearing claims are tagged by evidentiary status

so that doctrine, proof, implementation, and unresolved validation needs remain distinct in the prose itself.

Explicit scope limitation. This paper does not present Monte Carlo validation, field deployment data, or empirical performance benchmarks [Not empirically validated here]. Those are deferred to companion papers identified in Section ???. The contribution is architectural and formal; whether the architecture achieves its design objectives under real-world conditions is an open empirical question.

Keywords: sovereign safety architecture, deterministic cyber-physical systems, fail-closed computing, constitutional governance, hardware-isolated enclaves, physics-first doctrine, split-knowledge cryptography, environmental truth anchoring, biometric sovereignty, k -anonymity

1 Introduction

Civilian safety infrastructure—encompassing emergency communication, acoustic threat detection, environmental hazard monitoring, and biometric load assessment—operates under a structural contradiction. The conditions that create maximum demand for safety systems (mass-casualty events, natural disasters, adversarial attacks on communications) simultaneously create maximum degradation of the centralized cloud pipelines, cellular networks, and identity-verification services upon which those systems depend. A mass-casualty event can generate simultaneous RF congestion, network saturation, and adversarial incentive to disrupt detection. A tornado striking municipal infrastructure destroys the cellular towers that emergency alert systems require.

Existing architectures address these failure modes independently or not at all. Wearable safety devices rely on Bluetooth-to-cloud pipelines that fail without cellular connectivity. Vehicle-to-everything (V2X) networks depend on probabilistic machine-learning models that produce confident predictions even when sensor inputs are contradictory or spoofed. Emergency alert systems operate through centralized broad-

cast channels with no feedback path from the affected population.

LAKANA is a unified architecture designed from the position that these are not independent failure modes to be patched individually, but consequences of a common structural deficiency: the absence of a hardware-bounded, local-first, deterministic computing substrate that treats sovereignty over safety-critical data and decisions as an architectural invariant rather than a feature.

1.1 Founding Genealogy and Architectural Derivation

Four different orderings appear in the LAKANA source package, and keeping them separate is essential to avoiding category errors in the manuscript: (i) intellectual genealogy, (ii) doctrine as a global admissibility constraint, (iii) operational authority precedence, and (iv) implementation dependency decomposition.

(A) Intellectual genealogy. The architecture originates from two founding insights documented across the protocol specifications and provisional patent materials [?, ?, ?].

1. TSARO is the *primary originating concept*: safety-critical decisions must be bounded by deterministic physical constraint functions, not by probabilistic confidence scores. A system that reports “high confidence” in a prediction that violates conservation laws is structurally unsafe, regardless of its statistical accuracy on held-out data. This insight—that admissibility is a binary predicate over physics, not a continuous score over statistics—is the intellectual seed from which the entire architecture grows.
2. NICOLE is the *second originating concept*: sovereignty over safety-critical data must be enforced as an architectural boundary by construction, not as a policy layer. If key material and evidence integrity depend on software access-control lists rather than hardware-enforced cryptographic separation, then any OS-level compromise destroys the trust chain. This insight—that data sovereignty requires

the same boundary-by-construction discipline as physical-safety admissibility—is the cryptographic mirror of the TSARO principle.

Every subsequent subsystem exists as a *necessary consequence* of this founding pair. CIVOS exists because TSARO and NICOLE require a hardware-bounded execution substrate that survives OS compromise. SOS exists because TSARO’s threat determinations must be communicated even when centralized networks fail. W-X exists because TSARO’s physics-first admissibility requires validated environmental ground truth. UEI exists because TSARO’s outputs must reach the human operator through a cognitively disciplined interface. SSI exists because the TSARO/NICOLE pair, applied to occupational biomechanics and sovereign physiological accounting, yields a domain-specific safety subsystem rather than a new founding doctrine. None of these subsystems is an add-on; each is a derivation.

(B) Doctrine. Core Doctrine is not modeled here as another runtime service competing with TSARO, NICOLE, or SOS. It is a global admissibility boundary that every layer must satisfy simultaneously. The doctrine therefore constrains the runtime stack without occupying an execution slot within it. This distinction matters: doctrine is meta-constitutional, while the named subsystems are executable components or interfaces.

(C) Operational authority. The runtime precedence relation is distinct from the genealogy. The protocol specifications describe the operational stack as User Layer \rightarrow TSARO \rightarrow NICOLE \rightarrow encrypted external transport [?], while the broader provisional materials show CIVOS, SOS, W-X, UEI, and SSI as supporting implementation subsystems that execute beneath or around those gates rather than superseding them [?, ?, ?]. In this manuscript, TSARO is therefore the first runtime admissibility gate for safety-critical actuation, NICOLE is the non-bypassable gate for safety-critical evidence and data release, and the remaining subsystems are supporting execution, transport, truth-anchoring, interface, or domain-extension layers.

This means that TSARO can be both the founding intellectual origin and an early runtime authority gate without being unconstrained: doctrine constrains every layer, including TSARO, from outside the service hierarchy.




Figure 1: Intellectual genealogy: TSARO and NICOLE as founding concepts, with downstream subsystems derived as necessary consequences. This figure expresses conceptual derivation only; it does not encode runtime precedence or implementation dependency ordering.

1.2 Contributions

This paper makes the following contributions, stated with explicit scope limitations.

- 1. Founding genealogy.** We establish the explicit intellectual derivation of the architecture from two founding insights—TSARO (deterministic physics-bounded admissibility) and NICOLE (sovereignty-by-construction over safety-critical data)—and distinguish this genealogy from the runtime authority hierarchy (Section ??).
- 2. Doctrine formalization.** We formalize the LAKANA governing doctrine as a set of constitutional constraints expressed as formal predicates over system behavior, and show that these constraints are mutually consistent under stated assumptions.
- 3. Authority hierarchy.** We define the subsystem authority structure as a bounded partial order with a formally stated downward-only override property, and prove that no subsystem can escalate authority beyond its constitutional rank under the stated axioms.
- 4. Subsystem boundary contracts.** We specify the interface contracts between all seven

principal subsystems (CIVOS, NICOLE, SOS, TSARO, W-X, UEI, SSI) as typed state-transition constraints.

5. **Survivability bound.** We derive a lower bound on emergency survivability under Ring -1 hardware isolation, conditional on explicitly stated independence and compromise-probability assumptions.
6. **Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem.** We state and prove that the TSARO safety-set recalibration operator is monotonically non-expanding under the stated axioms.
7. **Cryptographic non-recoverability.** We state the Pumpkin Protocol seasonal data non-recoverability guarantee as a formal theorem conditional on standard cryptographic hardness assumptions.
8. **Honest limitation register.** We provide an explicit register of every assumption, every unvalidated claim, and every deferred-validation item in the architecture.

1.3 What This Paper Is Not

This paper is not a Monte Carlo validation study, a field deployment report, an empirical benchmark paper, or a subsystem-specific performance evaluation [**Not empirically validated here**]. All quantitative simulation results, experimental calibration data, and deployment evidence are deferred to companion papers identified in Section ???. Claims in this paper that require empirical support are explicitly marked as such rather than stated as established outcomes.

2 Problem Statement and Motivation

We identify three structural failure classes in conventional civilian safety infrastructure.

Centralized dependency failure. Conventional emergency communication and threat-detection systems route safety-critical data through centralized cloud infrastructure. When

the infrastructure fails (due to network congestion, power loss, or adversarial action), the safety system fails completely. There is no degraded-mode operation; there is total loss of function precisely when the function is most needed. This is architecturally equivalent to a single point of failure at the infrastructure layer.

Probabilistic confidence without physical grounding. Machine-learning-based threat detection and environmental monitoring systems produce confidence scores derived from statistical pattern matching. These scores are not bounded by physical constraints: a model can report high confidence in a prediction that violates conservation laws, thermodynamic bounds, or geometric consistency. When the model is wrong under adversarial input (data poisoning, sensor spoofing), the system produces confident incorrect outputs with no internal mechanism to detect the contradiction.

Trust inversion. Existing architectures place trust in external entities (cloud providers, cellular carriers, certificate authorities) rather than in the local hardware-software stack under the user’s physical control. The user’s device transmits safety-critical data to external systems that the user does not control, cannot audit, and cannot verify. This creates a structural privacy vulnerability: the safety system’s utility requires surrendering sovereignty over the data it generates.

LAKANA addresses these failure classes by imposing architectural constraints that prevent each one structurally, not by adding compensating features. The design philosophy draws on foundational principles from dependable systems engineering [?], separation kernel design [?], and real-time systems theory [?], while extending them to the civilian sovereignty domain.

3 Scope and Non-Claims

This paper presents the doctrine, architecture, and formal structure of LAKANA. The following items are *explicitly excluded* from the scope of this paper:

- No Monte Carlo simulation results are presented. Simulation validation of the SOS transport survivability model, the TSARO threat-scoring kernel, and the companion SSI biometric monitoring model are the subjects of separate papers currently in preparation.
- No field deployment data is presented. LAKANA has not been deployed in a production environment as of the date of this preprint [**Not empirically validated here**]. The planned validation milestone (2026 ICF World Championships, Riversport OKC) has not yet occurred.
- No empirical calibration data is presented. Sensor noise models, transport correlation matrices, and threat-occurrence probabilities used in companion simulation studies are parametric scenario knobs, not empirically calibrated values, unless explicitly stated otherwise.
- No empirical safety-outcome claims are made. Statements about survivability, threat-detection accuracy, and career-extension effects are design targets or simulation outputs from companion studies, not measured outcomes.
- No claim is made that the architecture is fully implemented. The architecture described here exists at varying levels of maturity: some subsystems have production-scale Monte Carlo simulation engines; others exist as formal specifications with reference implementations in progress.
- No external citations are fabricated. Where an external reference would strengthen a claim but cannot be verified from the materials available to the authors, a placeholder is inserted in the form [**External citation required: topic**].

4 Source Basis and Evidentiary Method

This revision is intentionally source-constrained. It is grounded only in the materials present in the current source package: the current manuscript source; the attached official protocol specifications; the attached provisional patent materials (including the umbrella and expanded engineering editions); the attached CIVOS derived formal model; and the attached companion simulation materials for the SSI/PSSP line of work. No web browsing and no unsupported literature expansion were used in the revision.

Because this manuscript is prepared as a public preprint rather than a confidential engineering handoff, some mechanism-level implementation details from the attached internal materials are intentionally abstracted in the public text. In particular, the paper states interface guarantees, formal properties, and boundary conditions, while withholding exact control-law parameters, threshold schedules, hardware invalidation sequences, and other implementation-sensitive material whose disclosure is not necessary for review of the architectural claims. The public manuscript should therefore be read as an auditable architectural specification, not as a complete implementation recipe.

Tier 1 (authoritative for subsystem definitions and formal architectural claims).

1. The official protocol specifications for TSARO and NICOLE, which explicitly describe the User Layer \rightarrow TSARO \rightarrow NICOLE stack ordering and the protocol-level responsibilities of those layers [?].
2. The provisional patent materials, which provide the family decomposition, subsystem descriptions, flow references, and formal engineering summaries used throughout this manuscript [?, ?, ?].
3. The CIVOS derived formal model, which is the direct source for the Ring -1 survivability derivation and related lower-bound language [?].

Tier 2 (contextual or companion-study material; not treated as proof of the doctrine paper’s main claims).

1. The attached SSI/PSSP companion manuscript, used only where the doctrine paper explicitly references that validation stream as a companion line of work rather than as evidence for the claims proved here [?].
2. The manuscript text already present in the source package, which may be formalized, narrowed, or reclassified during revision but is not strengthened beyond the support available in Tier 1 or Tier 3 materials.

Tier 3 (implementation-consistency sources).

1. Simulation and implementation references for the SOS, W-X, and SSI engines, used only to support “Implemented” labeling and implementation-status discussion **[Implemented]** **[Not empirically validated here]** [?, ?, ?].

Every claim in this paper is tagged with one of the following evidentiary categories:

[Documented]] Directly supported by Tier 1 source material.

[Derived]] Obtained by explicit mathematical derivation from stated assumptions.

[Proved]] Established by a proof in this manuscript from stated axioms or definitions.

[Implemented]] Reflected in simulation codebases (Tier 3) but not empirically validated against physical systems.

[Design Intent]] Stated as an architectural goal in source documents but not yet formally proved or empirically validated.

[Conditional on stated assumptions]

] Used inline when a load-bearing claim depends on named assumptions whose violation would negate the result.

[Hardware-dependent]] Used inline when the claim turns on enclave behavior, TRNG behavior, monotonic-counter integrity, or another property not verifiable from software alone.

[Comparator is synthetic]] Used inline when a comparison concerns a structural baseline rather than a measured operational benchmark.

[Not empirically validated here]] Used inline when the paper documents doctrine, proofs, or implementation structure without reporting field or laboratory validation.

5 LAKANA Doctrine and Constitutional Constraints

The LAKANA architecture is governed by a set of non-negotiable doctrinal constraints derived from the attached protocol and provisional materials [?, ?, ?]. These constraints are not design preferences or optimization targets; they are hard invariants that every subsystem must satisfy at every point in its execution. A subsystem that violates any doctrinal constraint is, by definition, in a failed state and must enter its fail-closed mode.

5.1 The Six Doctrinal Principles

We state the six principles formally. Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of all LAKANA subsystem states, and let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ denote a particular state. Let $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ denote the set of outputs produced by the system in state σ , and let $\mathcal{D}(\sigma)$ denote the set of data items accessible in state σ .

Doctrine Constraint 5.1 (Physics-Only Claims). For every output $o \in \mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ that asserts a physical condition (threat presence, environmental state, sensor reading), there must exist a chain of physical measurements $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ such that o is derivable from $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ via deterministic physical models with explicitly bounded uncertainty. Outputs derived solely from statistical pattern matching without physical grounding are inadmissible. [Documented]

Doctrine Constraint 5.2 (Silence as Valid Output). When the available evidence is insufficient to support any output with bounded uncertainty below the configured tolerance, the system must produce no output. Formally: if for all candidate outputs o , the uncertainty bound $\delta(o, \sigma) > \delta_{\max}$, then $\mathcal{O}(\sigma) = \emptyset$. Silence is a correct behavior, not a failure. [Documented]

Doctrine Constraint 5.3 (User Sovereignty). No personally identifiable information transits any network boundary without explicit, revocable user consent. Formally: for all data items $d \in \mathcal{D}(\sigma)$ classified as personally identifiable, and for all network transmission operations τ , $\tau(d)$ is admissible only if $\text{consent}(d, \tau) = \text{true}$, where the consent predicate is user-controlled and revocable. [Documented]

Doctrine Constraint 5.4 (Fail-Closed Operation). Every failure mode defaults to the most conservative safe state. This principle aligns with the fail-safe defaults mandated by safety-critical standards such as IEC 61508 [?] and DO-178C [?]. Formally: for every subsystem S_i with state space Σ_i and a designated fail-closed state $\sigma_i^{\text{fc}} \in \Sigma_i$, if S_i detects any violation of its operational invariants, it must transition to σ_i^{fc} . The fail-closed state must satisfy all doctrinal constraints and must not produce outputs that could be interpreted as affirmative system function. [Documented]

Doctrine Constraint 5.5 (Deterministic Reproducibility). All stochastic elements in the system are seeded and auditable. For any execution trace T with seed s , re-execution with the same seed and inputs must produce an identical trace:

$T(s, \mathbf{x}) = T(s, \mathbf{x})$ for all input sequences \mathbf{x} . This applies to simulation and audit modes; real-time sensor inputs are inherently non-reproducible but must be logged to the evidence ledger for post-hoc auditing. [Documented]

Doctrine Constraint 5.6 (Partition Awareness). Network partitions are assumed as the normal operating condition. Every subsystem must be fully functional in a completely disconnected state. Network connectivity, when available, may improve performance (e.g., cooperative verification, mesh relay) but is never a prerequisite for safety-critical function. [Documented]

5.2 Constitutional Hierarchy

The source package supports a three-part distinction that this manuscript now keeps explicit: user sovereignty as the highest principal, TSARO as the first runtime admissibility gate for safety-critical action, and NICOLE as the non-bypassable gate for safety-critical evidence and data release [?, ?]. The doctrine constrains all three simultaneously; it is therefore modeled as a global predicate rather than as a peer service layer.

Definition 5.7 (Constitutional Precedence). Let the set of runtime authority classes be

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\text{User Intent}, \text{TSARO}, \text{NICOLE}, \mathcal{I}\},$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \{\text{CIVOS}, \text{SOS}, \text{W-X}, \text{UEI}, \text{SSI}\}$ denotes the supporting implementation subsystems. Define the precedence map $\rho : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ by

$$\rho(\text{User Intent}) = 1, \quad (1)$$

$$\rho(\text{TSARO}) = 2, \quad (2)$$

$$\rho(\text{NICOLE}) = 3, \quad (3)$$

$$\rho(\mathcal{I}) = 4. \quad (4)$$

Lower values denote higher authority. Core Doctrine is not an element of \mathcal{C} ; it is a global admissibility predicate that every class in \mathcal{C} must satisfy.

Design Invariant 5.8 (Downward-Only Override). For any two runtime authority classes $c_i, c_j \in \mathcal{C}$, a directive issued by c_j may override a directive issued by c_i only if $\rho(c_j) < \rho(c_i)$. Formally:

$$\text{override}(c_j, c_i) \implies \rho(c_j) < \rho(c_i). \quad (5)$$

The contrapositive—no lower-precedence class may override a higher-precedence class—is the critical structural invariant. **[Documented + formalized from the current source package]**

Proposition 5.9 (No Unauthorized Upward Override). *Under Design Invariant ??, no combination of directives emitted entirely from runtime classes with precedence rank greater than or equal to k can alter the behavior mandated by a class with precedence rank k .*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that a set of directives $\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ from classes $\{c_{j_1}, \dots, c_{j_m}\}$ with $\rho(c_{j_\ell}) \geq k$ for all ℓ collectively override a directive of a class c_i with $\rho(c_i) = k$. By Design Invariant ??, any valid override requires $\rho(c_{j_\ell}) < k$. This contradicts $\rho(c_{j_\ell}) \geq k$ for every contributing directive. Override authority is defined at the class level and does not emerge compositionally from lower- or equal-precedence classes acting together, so no such collective override is admissible. \square

Remark 5.10. Proposition ?? is a statement about the formal control structure **[Proved]** **[Conditional on stated assumptions]**. It does not imply that every future implementation will realize the structure correctly. If a software defect lets a support subsystem bypass TSARO admissibility or expose raw evidence without NICOLE authorization, the implementation violates the architecture even though the proposition itself remains true of the formal model **[Hardware-dependent]**.

6 System Model and Layered Architecture

6.1 System Entities

Definition 6.1 (LAKANA System). A LAKANA system instance Λ is a tuple:

$$\Lambda = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \Pi) \quad (6)$$

where:

- \mathcal{H} is the hardware substrate (processors, secure enclave, analog frontends, radio subsystem, monotonic counter, local storage),
- \mathcal{K} is the cryptographic state (key hierarchy, ledger, seasonal keys),
- \mathcal{N} is the network state (transport availability, mesh topology),
- \mathcal{E} is the environmental observation state (sensor readings, truth-anchor verdicts),
- \mathcal{U} is the user interaction state (consent register, interface friction state),
- Π is the doctrine predicate set (Doctrine Constraints ??-??).

6.2 Seven Principal Subsystems

The LAKANA architecture comprises seven principal subsystems arranged in a dependency hierarchy. We define each subsystem’s role, scope, and dependencies.

Definition 6.2 (Subsystem Partition). The system Λ is partitioned into the ordered subsystem tuple

$$(S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5, S_6, S_7) = (\text{CIVOS}, \text{NICOLE}, \text{SOS}, \text{W-X}, \text{TSAR}, \dots)$$

The labels correspond, respectively, to the hardware-abstracted kernel, cryptographic compartmentalization layer, safety infrastructure layer, environmental truth layer, deterministic threat engine, cognitive sovereignty interface, and sovereign biometric intelligence subsystem.

The enablement dependency relation \preceq is defined by $S_j \preceq S_i$ meaning “ S_i requires S_j to be operational for S_i to function.” The principal dependency chain is

$$\text{CIVOS} \preceq \text{NICOLE} \preceq \text{SOS} \preceq \{\text{TSARO}, \text{UEI}, \text{SSI}\},$$

with W-X providing cross-cutting environmental truth services to SOS, TSARO, UEI, and SSI while depending only on CIVOS for sensor access and on NICOLE for integrity anchoring. SSI additionally consumes threat-state input from TSARO and environmental conditioning from W-X. **[Documented in the provisional materials; formalized here as an enablement relation.]**

Remark 6.3 (Genealogy versus Dependency). The enablement dependency \preceq describes the *operational* substrate ordering: CIVOS must be operational for NICOLE to function. This is distinct from the *intellectual genealogy* described in Section ??, where TSARO and NICOLE are the founding insights. In the dependency ordering, TSARO is a *consumer* of infrastructure provided by CIVOS, NICOLE, and SOS; in the genealogy, TSARO is the *originating concept* that necessitated that infrastructure. Both orderings are correct; they answer different questions.

6.3 State Spaces

Each subsystem S_i has a state space Σ_i , a set of admissible transitions $\mathcal{T}_i \subseteq \Sigma_i \times \Sigma_i$, and a fail-closed state $\sigma_i^{\text{fc}} \in \Sigma_i$.

Architectural Requirement 6.4 (Fail-Closed Reachability). For every subsystem S_i and every state $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$, the fail-closed state σ_i^{fc} must be reachable from σ via a single admissible transition. That is, $(\sigma, \sigma_i^{\text{fc}}) \in \mathcal{T}_i$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$.

This requirement ensures that no subsystem can enter a state from which fail-closed recovery is impossible. **[Design Intent; not yet formally verified across all subsystem implementations [Design Intent] [Not empirically validated here].]** Formal verification of this property for each subsystem state machine is a deferred validation target.

7 Subsystem Roles and Interface Contracts

7.1 CivOS: The Hardware-Abstracted Kernel

CIVOS is the lowest software layer in the LAKANA stack, executing directly on the hardware substrate [?, ?]. In the genealogy of Section ??, CIVOS exists because the founding TSARO/NICOLE pair requires a hardware-bounded execution substrate that survives host OS compromise. Its responsibilities are: **[Documented]**

1. *Analog sensor frontend management.* Continuous environmental monitoring is delegated to dedicated analog circuits that operate at sub-operating-system privilege. Digital processing remains in deep sleep until an analog threshold is crossed, at which point a hardware interrupt activates the digital processor. This is a hardware state transition, not a software scheduling decision.
2. *Lazarus Micro-VM execution.* A minimal, hardware-isolated runtime enclave (Ring -1 in the privilege model) executes critical last-resort safety functions independently of the host operating system. If the host OS is compromised, the Lazarus VM can still emit emergency beacons.
3. *Secure Air-Gap Beacon (SAB).* A unidirectional, ultra-low-power RF broadcast protocol. The receive path is physically disabled at the driver level during SAB transmission, enforcing transmit-only behavior by hardware constraint.
4. *Iron Lung energy management.* At critical battery thresholds, non-essential interfaces are terminated and harvested energy is routed exclusively to survival beaconing.
5. *Metabolic Regulator.* Sensor polling rates are governed by real-time stress proxies rather than battery percentage, ensuring that critical monitoring is maintained even under energy constraints.




Figure 2: Implementation dependency decomposition. Solid arrows indicate enablement dependencies. Dashed arrows indicate cross-cutting environmental truth services provided by W-X. This figure is intentionally separate from the runtime-precedence discussion: it answers “what must be operational for what to execute,” not “which layer may override which.”

Interface contract (CivOS \rightarrow NICOLE): CIVOS provides the hardware root of trust, monotonic state, and a hardware entropy source. NICOLE may request these resources but may not modify the root of trust or roll back monotonic state. [Documented]

Interface contract (CivOS \rightarrow SOS): CIVOS provides the execution substrate (processor time, memory, radio access) and enforces hardware-level constraints (power gating, radio isolation). SOS operates within the resource envelope that CIVOS provides but cannot override CIVOS’s energy-management or hardware-isolation decisions. [Design Intent]

7.2 NICOLE: Cryptographic Compartmentalization

NICOLE is the second originating concept of the LAKANA architecture (Section ??). It establishes the cryptographic trust infrastructure for the entire LAKANA stack [?, ?, ?]. Its core function is key separation: mathematically showing that compromise of one key class does not, by itself, yield computational leverage against another [Documented] [Proved] [Conditional on stated assumptions].

The protocol defines a split-knowledge key hierarchy rooted in the hardware enclave [?]. In the public manuscript we expose the *derivation structure* rather than the full context schedule:

$$K_{\text{ISK}} = \text{Derive}(K_{\text{root}}, \text{ctx}_{\text{ingest}}) \quad (7)$$

$$K_{\text{RSK}} = \text{Derive}(K_{\text{root}}, \text{ctx}_{\text{replay}}) \quad (8)$$

where K_{ISK} is the live Ingestion Stream Key and K_{RSK} is the Replay Data Key. The required property is that $\text{ctx}_{\text{ingest}}$ and $\text{ctx}_{\text{replay}}$ are domain-separated hardware-bounded contexts with no recoverable overlap. The exact context composition, ordering, and parameter schedule are implementation-sensitive and are intentionally omitted from the public preprint; what matters for the proof below is domain separation, hardware binding, and non-bypassability.

Proposition 7.1 (Key Separation). *Under the assumption that HKDF is a secure pseudorandom function (PRF) and the TRNG produces independent entropy, compromise of K_{ISK} provides no computational advantage in deriving K_{RSK} , and vice versa.*

Proof. Model Derive as a PRF instantiated by HKDF over domain-separated contexts. Because $\text{ctx}_{\text{ingest}} \neq \text{ctx}_{\text{replay}}$ and the contexts are constructed to be non-overlapping, the outputs are

computationally independent up to the PRF security parameter λ . Thus knowledge of one derived key does not reduce the adversary’s success probability in recovering the other beyond negligible advantage. Formally, for any polynomial-time adversary \mathcal{A} :

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(K_{\text{ISK}}) \rightarrow K_{\text{RSK}}] \leq \text{negl}(\lambda) \quad (9)$$

This holds symmetrically for the reverse direction. \square

Remark 7.2. This proof is conditional on the PRF assumption for HKDF and on the correctness of the underlying hardware-bounded context separation [**Conditional on stated assumptions**]. The public manuscript intentionally omits the exact context schedule; reviewability therefore rests on the stated theorem interface rather than on a complete reproduction of the implementation recipe. Hardware compromise that collapses context separation invalidates the guarantee [**Hardware-dependent**].

NICOLE additionally manages:

- The *Immutable Evidence Ledger (IEL)*: an append-only hash chain where each entry incorporates a timestamp, the previous entry’s hash, event data, and the current monotonic counter value, signed with both a hardware-anchored signature and a post-quantum cryptographic signature. [**Documented**]
- The *Pumpkin Protocol* for cryptographic data expiration (see Section ??).
- *Threshold-Dependent ZK-Attestation*: the ability to prove the presence of a threat classification to authorized parties without revealing underlying private data. [**Design Intent [Design Intent]; formal ZKP construction not fully specified in source documents. The protocol requires a concrete instantiation (e.g., a specific ZK-SNARK or Sigma-protocol construction) before the attestation guarantee can be formally stated.**]

Interface contract (NICOLE \rightarrow SOS): NICOLE provides encrypted storage, ledger append, and key-management services. SOS may

request cryptographic operations but may not access raw key material. All ledger writes are atomic and monotonic: the counter must strictly increment, or the system enters fail-closed state. [**Documented**]

7.3 SOS: The Safety Infrastructure Layer

SOS is the enabling infrastructure layer that provides the operational framework for TSARO and UEI [?, ?]. In the genealogy of Section ??, SOS exists because TSARO’s threat determinations must be communicated even when centralized networks fail; the multi-transport mesh is the transport consequence of the TSARO founding insight. SOS is not itself a protector; it is the substrate upon which protection functions execute. [**Documented**]

SOS responsibilities include:

- Multi-transport emergency mesh networking across BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN, LoRa, and LEO satellite channels.
- Byzantine fault-tolerant consensus [?] for distributed threat corroboration.
- Energy-bounded rate limiting to prevent Byzantine nodes from monopolizing network resources.
- Blue Force Bridge (BFB) delivery to first-responder systems.
- Quantum-Resistant Evidence Vault (QREV) integration using post-quantum cryptography (e.g., ML-KEM-1024, ML-DSA) [?]. [**Design Intent for quantum-resistant primitives; specific algorithm selection follows NIST PQC standardization.**]

Interface contract (SOS \rightarrow TSARO): SOS provides the communication substrate and consensus results to TSARO. TSARO may request message transmission and receive consensus verdicts but cannot modify the consensus protocol or bypass energy-bounded rate limits. [**Design Intent**]

7.4 W-X: Environmental Truth Layer

W-X (World Weather Exchange) serves as a cross-stack environmental truth-anchoring substrate [?, ?, ?]. Its role is to provide validated environmental observations that other subsystems consume, and to reject or quarantine external data that contradicts local physics. **[Documented]**

W-X implements *Inertial Environmental Positioning (IEP)*: external geospatial claims (e.g., GPS position) are accepted only if they are mathematically consistent with local barometric altitude measurements and inertial dead-reckoning vectors. **[Documented]**

Definition 7.3 (Environmental Truth Anchor). Let $\mathbf{e}_{\text{ext}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be an external environmental claim (e.g., GPS coordinates, forecast temperature) and let $\mathbf{e}_{\text{local}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the corresponding local-physics measurement vector (barometric altitude, IMU-derived position, thermodynamic consistency check). The truth-anchor verdict v is:

$$v(\mathbf{e}_{\text{ext}}, \mathbf{e}_{\text{local}}) = \begin{cases} \text{ACCEPT}, & \|\mathbf{e}_{\text{ext}} - \mathbf{e}_{\text{local}}\| \leq \epsilon_{\text{phys}} \\ \text{REJECT}, & \|\mathbf{e}_{\text{ext}} - \mathbf{e}_{\text{local}}\| > \epsilon_{\text{phys}} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where ϵ_{phys} is a physics-derived tolerance bound (not a statistical threshold). **[Formalized from Documented material]**

W-X enforces *Active Entropy*: all environmental data variables carry an explicit Time-to-Live (TTL). Upon TTL expiration, the data is mathematically zeroized from active memory. This is not a cache eviction policy; it is a doctrine constraint ensuring that the system never relies on expired environmental information. **[Documented]**

The W-X engine further implements:

- *Thermodynamic consistency checks*: evapotranspiration claims are validated against energy-balance bounds. A reported ET_0 exceeding the hard physical ceiling (set from radiation-balance physics) triggers rejection and operator-state downgrade to SILENCE. **[Implemented in CivOS/W-X Master Engine v16]**

- *Adversarial sensor-data detection*: correlated drift, replay, and saturation attack patterns are detected via deterministic consistency analysis, not statistical anomaly models. **[Implemented]**

- *Fail-closed fallback*: when environment claims are invalid, a conservative fallback value is used rather than the rejected claim. The fallback value is explicitly marked as a fallback, not presented as a validated observation. **[Implemented]**

Interface contract (W-X \rightarrow TSARO): W-X provides validated environmental context (temperature, pressure, acoustic regime) with explicit confidence status (VALID, DEGRADED_VALID, SILENCE_STALE, SILENCE_CONTRADICTION, SILENCE_ATTACK_SUSPECTED). TSARO may consume this context but may not override W-X’s rejection verdicts. **[Implemented]**

Interface contract (W-X \rightarrow UEI): W-X provides environmental risk context that UEI uses to modulate interface friction. UEI may not override W-X status determinations. **[Design Intent]**

7.5 TSARO: The Constrained Threat Engine

TSARO (Tactical Safety and Risk Objective) is the primary originating concept of the LAKANA architecture (Section ??). It models the user or system as a constrained dynamical system and applies minimum-intervention control to maintain the system within formally defined safe boundaries [?, ?, ?, ?]. **[Documented]**

Unlike probabilistic machine-learning classifiers, TSARO operates via deterministic safe-set projection:

Definition 7.4 (Safe Set). Let $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the system state vector at time t and let $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}$ be the safe set defined by constraint function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The safe-set projection at time t is:

$$\mathbf{u}_t = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{u}\| \quad \text{subject to} \quad g(f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u})) \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

where f is the system dynamics model. If $g(\mathbf{x}_t) < 0$ (state is within the safe set), then $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{0}$ (no intervention required). **[Documented]**

Theorem 7.5 (Envelope Non-Expansion). *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ denote the constraint parameters of the safety envelope at recalibration epoch t . The TSARO recalibration operator \mathcal{R} satisfies:*

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \implies \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} \leq \boldsymbol{\theta}_t \quad (12)$$

where \leq denotes componentwise inequality. That is, the safety envelope may only tighten (constraint parameters may only decrease or remain equal); it may never expand.

Proof. The recalibration operator \mathcal{R} is defined as:

$$\theta_{t+1}^{(i)} = \min(\theta_t^{(i)}, \hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}^{(i)}) \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}^{(i)}$ is the newly computed constraint parameter from the latest calibration data. Since $\min(a, b) \leq a$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\theta_{t+1}^{(i)} \leq \theta_t^{(i)}$ for each component i . The componentwise inequality $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} \leq \boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ follows immediately. \square

Remark 7.6. The Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem guarantees monotonic tightening under the stated recalibration operator **[Proved]** **[Conditional on stated assumptions]**. This is a *design invariant*: the operator \mathcal{R} is *defined* to use \min , so the result follows immediately from the definition. The mathematical content is minimal; the significance is doctrinal—the architecture constitutionally prohibits any recalibration that loosens a safety constraint. The practical question of whether the initial envelope $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is appropriately calibrated, and whether monotonic tightening remains appropriate over long operational lifetimes (as opposed to recalibration that could validly relax constraints based on improved data), is an open engineering question not resolved by this theorem **[Not empirically validated here]**. See Section ??, Item 4.

TSARO additionally implements:

- *Coercion resistance (Judas Mode)*: a simulated shutdown triggered by a covert haptic gesture. The display controller cuts power

while the CPU enters a deep-sleep polling state maintaining acoustic buffering. Physical power-button actuation renders a deceptive “depleted battery” indicator. **[Documented]**

- *Multi-sensor integrity scoring*: a composite integrity score derived from timing faults, unit-frame faults, provenance faults, NIS (Normalized Innovation Squared) gate results, calibration drift, and RF hostility indicators. The integrity score gates escalation decisions: no escalation is permitted below configurable integrity thresholds. **[Implemented in SOS MC v44]**
- *Bounded suppression*: false-positive suppression is bounded by a configurable cap, ensuring that suppression can never fully silence a genuine threat signal. **[Implemented]**

Interface contract (TSARO \rightarrow UEI):

TSARO provides threat-state assessments (tier classification, score, integrity, cause codes) to UEI. UEI uses these to modulate interface friction. UEI may not override TSARO’s threat assessments or suppress TSARO-initiated escalations. **[Documented]**

7.6 UEI: The Cognitive Sovereignty Interface

UEI (User Exo Interface) treats human cognition as a physical system subject to inertia. In the public manuscript, UEI is specified as a *bounded interaction-governance layer*: it may introduce latency, impedance, modal confirmation, or haptic signaling when risk-bearing actions are attempted under unstable conditions [?, ?]. **[Documented]**

Definition 7.7 (Interaction-Governance Operator). Let $\mathbf{z}(t)$ denote the bounded state exposed by upstream subsystems to UEI (for example, risk tier, integrity state, and user-confirmation context). Then UEI applies an interaction-governance operator

$$\mathcal{F}(t) = \Phi(\mathbf{z}(t)) \quad (14)$$

where Φ is constrained only by the following public properties: (i) monotonicity with respect

to increased safety-critical risk under fixed confirmation state, (ii) boundedness so that friction cannot become hidden coercion, and (iii) reversibility under restored stable conditions. The exact control law, thresholds, and weighting schedule are intentionally withheld from the public preprint as implementation-sensitive trade-secret material; peer review is invited on the interface properties, not on the undisclosed tuning law. **[Formalized from Documented material; implementation intentionally abstracted]**

UEI is explicitly *not* an autonomous agent:

- It does not make decisions on behalf of the user.
- It does not override user intent (except via friction, which the user can overcome by sustained effort).
- It does not maintain a persistent “personality” or simulate independent agency.
- Its role is to amplify user perception and introduce System-2 engagement [?] under high-risk conditions, not to replace human judgment.

[Documented]

7.7 SSI: Sovereign Biometric Intelligence

SSI (Sovereign Sports Intelligence, generalized to Sovereign Safety Index for non-athletic domains) is a physics-first biometric load monitoring, hazard recognition, and career-long biological accounting subsystem. The attached SSI/PSSP companion material is treated here as evidence that this line of work has a companion validation stream, not as proof of the doctrine papers claims [?]. It applies the LAKANA doctrine to the problem of protecting individuals in high-load occupational environments—elite athletes, firefighters, military personnel, construction workers, and elderly workers in physically demanding roles—by measuring and constraining biological strain without claiming medical diagnosis. **[Documented]**

SSI is architecturally distinct from conventional wearable analytics in three respects:

1. *Data ownership inversion.* In conventional sports technology, biometric data is extracted from the athlete to optimize them as an asset for institutional stakeholders. SSI inverts this model: all data is athlete-owned, encrypted under athlete-controlled keys (NICOLE key hierarchy), and accessible to institutional parties only via privacy-preserving aggregate queries subject to constitutional k -anonymity thresholds. **[Documented]**
2. *Vector-only output (Adjective Ban).* SSI never produces evaluative labels (“dangerous,” “good,” “high risk”). It produces only physical measurements with explicit uncertainty bounds: “Temp: 104°F,” “Load: 900 AU,” “Valgus Torque: >45 Nm.” Adjectives are treated as tools of coercion within the doctrine; scalar physics is the only admissible output vocabulary. **[Documented]**
3. *Fail-closed degradation.* When sensor data is uncertain, SSI degrades capabilities rather than simulating precision. Silence is a first-class signal. **[Documented]**

7.7.1 Three-Zone Privacy Architecture

SSI enforces a three-zone data governance architecture with hardware-backed isolation between zones. **[Documented]**




Figure 3: SSI three-zone privacy architecture. Zone A (Athlete Sovereign Core) is hardware-isolated via Ring -1 memory protection. Zone C (Coaching Envelope Interface) receives only differentially private, k -anonymous aggregates. Direct access from Zone C to Zone A raw data returns \perp .

Definition 7.8 (SSI Privacy Zones). The privacy-zone tuple is

$$(Z_A, Z_B, Z_C) = (\text{ASC}, \text{Bridge}, \text{CEI}),$$

where ASC denotes the Athlete Sovereign Core, Bridge denotes the ephemeral proximity-gated transfer zone, and CEI denotes the Coaching Envelope Interface.

Zone Z_A contains raw biometric data: sensor streams (ECG, gait, NIRS, thermometry, impact, segment kinematics), computed features, and the full Burden Ledger. Zone Z_A is hardware-isolated from the institutional execution environment (Zone Z_C) using memory protection (TrustZone or RISC-V PMP) [?]. Zone Z_C receives only differentially private aggregates subject to k -anonymity enforcement. Zone Z_B mediates controlled, ephemeral data sharing (e.g., sideline medical display) gated by Physical Proximity Attestation (PPA) via UWB time-of-flight measurement. [Documented]

Design Invariant 7.9 (Air-Gap Isolation). No instruction sequence executing in Zone Z_C (institutional code) can access raw data in Zone Z_A (athlete core). Formally:

$$\forall q \in Z_C : q.\text{access}(Z_A.\text{raw_data}) \rightarrow \perp \quad (15)$$

This is enforced by hardware memory protection, not software access control. [Documented; formal verification target for

seL4-style proof [?], contingent on correct MPU/TrustZone configuration at boot. Proofs verify software logic, not physical hardware integrity.]

Design Invariant 7.10 (PPA Fail-Closed). If the Physical Proximity Attestation system fails (sensor malfunction, signal interference), the system defaults to DENY (air-gap enforced), not “proximity likely.” Proximity verification is ternary: verified proximate, verified distant, or attestation failure (treated as distant). [Documented]

7.7.2 Constitutional k -Anonymity

Aggregate queries from institutional users (Zone Z_C) are subject to a constitutional minimum group size:

Doctrine Constraint 7.11 (k -Anonymity Threshold). The k -anonymity threshold $K \geq 10$ is a constitutional constant that cannot be modified by coaching staff, system administrators, or software updates without formal constitutional amendment. Any aggregate query over a roster of size $|R| < K$ is rejected. This prevents individual identification via small-roster queries. [Documented]

Aggregate queries additionally employ Laplace-mechanism differential privacy [?] with parameter ϵ and enforce a strict query budget (maximum queries per time window) to prevent differential attacks via repeated roster-variation queries. [Documented; implemented in SSI MC v7.5 with configurable ϵ and k .]

7.7.3 Hazard Family Architecture

SSI monitors six hazard families, each with physics-specific sensor requirements and recognition logic:

Definition 7.12 (Hazard Families). H_1
HEAT: thermoregulatory strain.

H_2 ECAST: exertional collapse / sickle-cell-trait proxy.

- H_3 NEURO: concussion proxy via impact clustering and rotational load.
- H_4 ACL: anterior cruciate ligament structural load.
- H_5 SOFT: soft-tissue / neuromuscular asymmetry.
- H_6 CARD: commotio-cordis-consistent cardiac sequence.

Each hazard family maps to specific sensor channels and computed features via a deterministic recognition algebra with hysteresis (separate up/down thresholds to prevent oscillation). **[Implemented in SSI MC v7.5]**

The heat/ECAST differentiation is a critical doctrine-compliant distinction: heat stroke (thermoregulatory failure: gradual performance decay, critical core temperature $>104^\circ\text{F}$, gait ataxia) and exertional sickle-cell collapse (ischemic muscle collapse: rapid power failure with normal/mild core temperature, conscious/lucid) have opposite physiological signatures but can be confused in field settings. SSI outputs only the physics signature, never a diagnostic label. **[Documented]**

7.7.4 Burden Ledger and Damage Accumulation

Definition 7.13 (Burden Ledger). The Burden Ledger is a cumulative, career-long accounting of biological cost across four categories: impact (total G-force and rotational load endured), metabolic load (total neuromuscular work), structural stability (long-term degradation of joint mechanical integrity), and biological equity (aggregate “biological tax” for contract/negotiation use). It is stored in Zone Z_A and accessible to institutional parties only via the athlete’s explicit, revocable consent. **[Documented]**

The damage accumulation model employs a superlinear continuous function. Letting $D(t)$ de-

note cumulative damage at time t and $\sigma(t)$ denote instantaneous strain:

$$D(t) = \int_0^t f(\sigma(\tau)) d\tau, \quad f(\sigma) = k \cdot \sigma^\beta, \quad \beta > 1 \quad (16)$$

where $\beta > 1$ encodes superlinearity: strain above baseline accumulates damage faster than proportionally. The safety envelope constrains $D(t) < D_{\text{crit}}$ for all t . When $D(t)$ approaches D_{crit} , TSARO escalation proceeds (CAUTION \rightarrow RED \rightarrow HARDSTOP). The Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem (Theorem ??) applies: recalibration of D_{crit} can only tighten the threshold, never expand it. **[Implemented; Envelope Non-Expansion applies by construction.]**

7.7.5 W-X Environmental Conditioning

SSI consumes W-X-validated environmental data to condition physiological models. The primary coupling is a thermoregulatory strain index fusing hyper-local wet-bulb globe temperature (WBGT) from the nearest W-X node with on-body exertion load, heart rate variability, and core temperature proxy. A Dual-Anchor Environmental Validation (DAEV) check ensures that external environmental data (W-X node) and on-body environmental measurement (SSI barometer) are consistent before acceptance. If they disagree, the system defaults to maximum caution, consistent with fail-closed doctrine. **[Documented]**

7.7.6 Decision Causality Ledger

Definition 7.14 (Decision Causality Ledger (DCL)). When an institutional actor overrides a safety warning (e.g., returning an athlete to play after a RED risk trigger), a liability token is generated:

$$\ell_{\text{DCL}} = (\sigma_{\text{coach}}, t, H(\text{state}), \text{ack}_{\text{athlete}}) \quad (17)$$

where σ_{coach} is the coach’s cryptographic signature, t is the timestamp, $H(\text{state})$ is a hash of the full system state at override time, and $\text{ack}_{\text{athlete}}$ records whether the athlete acknowledged the override. **[Documented]**

Design Invariant 7.15 (DCL Non-Repudiation). The DCL is implemented as a Merkle hash chain [?]. Altering any entry invalidates the chain, which supports non-repudiation only to the extent that the hash-chain assumptions and acknowledgment workflow actually hold in implementation [Documented] [Conditional on stated assumptions]. The athlete’s acknowledgment field prevents coercive override without athlete awareness: if the athlete does not acknowledge, the override is blocked. This design specifically targets the scenario in which a coach signs a token, coerces the athlete to play, and later claims that the athlete never received the warning.

provides physiological budget state and hazard-family alerts to UEI for bounded multimodal rendering within the public interface contract. [Documented]

8 Formal Definitions and Notation

Table ?? provides a summary of the formal notation used throughout this paper.

7.7.7 Learning Architecture and Sovereignty Constraints

SSI includes two learning mechanisms, both subject to strict sovereignty constraints:

1. *Athlete-local offline learning.* After each session completes, the on-device model updates per-hazard-family baselines using exponential moving averages. Learning is applied only post-session (never during live monitoring) to prevent feedback loops. Live-session models are frozen. [Implemented]
2. *Team-anonymous shrinkage learning.* Aggregate team-level statistics are computed via k -anonymous, differentially private queries and used to shrink individual estimates toward team priors. The shrinkage weight is bounded (≤ 0.03) and the clipping threshold prevents extreme outlier influence. [Implemented; subject to Doctrine Constraint ??.]

Interface contracts: SSI consumes TSARO threat-state output and provides hazard-family-specific biological risk assessments for multi-domain threat fusion. All SSI data is encrypted under the athlete’s NICOLE key hierarchy, protected by key separation (Proposition ??) and Pumpkin Protocol zeroization (Theorem ??). At career termination, the athlete may trigger root-of-trust rotation or device destruction, rendering retained career data cryptographically unrecoverable under the Pumpkin property. SSI

Table 1: Notation Summary

Symbol	Meaning
Λ	A LAKANA system instance
S_i	Subsystem i
Σ_i	State space of subsystem i
σ_i^{fc}	Fail-closed state of subsystem i
\mathcal{T}_i	Admissible transition set of subsystem i
$\rho(c)$	Constitutional rank of governance layer c
\leq	Enablement dependency relation
K_{root}	Hardware root of trust (enclave-resident)
K_{ISK}	Ingestion Stream Key
K_{RSK}	Replay Data Key
K_{season}	Seasonal key (Pumpkin Protocol)
c_{mono}	Monotonic counter value
\mathbf{x}_t	System state vector at time t
\mathcal{S}	Safe set $\{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}$
θ_t	Safety envelope parameters at epoch t
\mathcal{R}	Recalibration operator
$\mathcal{F}(t)$	Interaction-governance operator at time t
\mathbf{e}_{ext}	External environmental claim
$\mathbf{e}_{\text{local}}$	Local-physics measurement
ϵ_{phys}	Physics-derived tolerance bound
$P(M)$	Main OS operational probability
$P(L)$	Lazarus VM operational probability
$P(N)$	Network (any transport) survival probability
$P(E)$	Energy sufficiency probability
p_c	OS compromise probability
p_h	Hardware enclave compromise probability
Z_A, Z_B, Z_C	SSI privacy zones (ASC, Bridge, CEI)
K	Constitutional k -anonymity threshold
$D(t)$	Cumulative biological damage at time t
D_{crit}	Critical damage threshold
H_1, \dots, H_6	SSI hazard families
ℓ_{DCL}	Decision Causality Ledger entry

9 Authority Hierarchy, Sovereignty Logic, and Override Semantics

9.1 The Authority Lattice

Definition ?? yields a finite precedence structure over runtime authority classes. Because the support subsystems act as a governed family rather than as mutually sovereign constitutional peers, the operational structure is best described as a bounded chain over classes, not as a flat ranking of every named subsystem.

Definition 9.1 (Authority Lattice). Let $(\mathcal{C}, \sqsubseteq)$ be defined by

$$c_i \sqsubseteq c_j \iff \rho(c_i) \geq \rho(c_j),$$

so lower numeric precedence means greater authority. The top element is $\top = \text{User Intent}$ and the bottom class is $\perp = \mathcal{I} = \{\text{CivOS}, \text{SOS}, \text{W-X}, \text{UEI}, \text{SSI}\}$. The relation expresses runtime override precedence only. It does not encode implementation dependency and it does not absorb Core Doctrine, which remains a global admissibility predicate outside the lattice.

Design Invariant 9.2 (Admissible Control Flow). Data and control signals flow in two directions:

- *Downward (governing or enabling)*: higher-precedence classes constrain lower-precedence classes; supporting subsystems execute only within the envelope they receive.
- *Upward (observation or request)*: lower-precedence classes may report state, request resources, or expose measurements, but these upward signals are informational only and do not create override authority.

[Documented + formalized from the current source package]

9.2 Override Resolution

When directives conflict, resolution follows strict precedence:

Architectural Requirement 9.3 (Conflict Resolution). For conflicting directives d_i from class c_i and d_j from class c_j with $\rho(c_i) < \rho(c_j)$, directive d_i prevails in full. There is no negotiation, score blending, or probabilistic compromise. The lower-precedence directive is discarded and, where implementation permits, logged to the evidence ledger. **[Formalized from the current source package]**

9.3 User Sovereignty Under Immutable Doctrine

User Intent is the highest runtime principal, but user sovereignty operates within immutable doctrine rather than outside it. In practical terms:

- The user can request actions and can terminate or refuse system assistance.
- TSARO remains the admissibility gate for safety-critical actuation; a support subsystem cannot bypass a TSARO veto by appealing directly to lower layers.
- NICOLE remains the gate for evidence and protected data release; a support subsystem cannot expose protected state without passing through NICOLE’s cryptographic boundary.
- Doctrine remains globally binding. The user is sovereign within the system’s legitimate operating envelope, but the system is not designed to assist in violating its own constitutional safety constraints.

Remark 9.4. The apparent tension between user sovereignty and immutable doctrine is deliberate rather than accidental. The architecture is intended to remain resistant to coercion, panic, or compromised surrounding infrastructure. The manuscript therefore treats doctrine as a non-waivable boundary condition on what the stack may be made to do, even when pressure originates from the user interface path.

10 Data, Memory, and Evidence Governance

10.1 Ownership and Access

All data generated, collected, or inferred by a LAKANA system instance belongs exclusively to the user. **[Documented]** No external entity, including the system developer, may access this data without explicit user consent.

The zero-trust posture is architectural: even if a network-connected adversary gains access to the device’s communication channel, the data remains encrypted under keys that reside exclusively in the hardware enclave. The data-at-rest encryption model ensures that compromise of the host operating system does not expose evidence-ledger contents or historical sensor data.

10.2 The Immutable Evidence Ledger

Definition 10.1 (IEL Entry). An Immutable Evidence Ledger entry ℓ_t at logical time t is a tuple:

$$\ell_t = (t, h_{t-1}, \mathbf{d}_t, c_{\text{mono},t}, \sigma_{\text{hw}}(\ell_t), \sigma_{\text{pq}}(\ell_t)) \quad (18)$$

where $h_{t-1} = H(\ell_{t-1})$ is the cryptographic hash of the previous entry, \mathbf{d}_t is the event data, $c_{\text{mono},t}$ is the hardware monotonic counter value (with $c_{\text{mono},t} = c_{\text{mono},t-1} + 1$ strictly), σ_{hw} is the hardware-anchored signature, and σ_{pq} is the post-quantum signature. **[Documented]**

Design Invariant 10.2 (Monotonic Counter Integrity). If $c_{\text{mono},t} \neq c_{\text{mono},t-1} + 1$ at any ledger write, the system enters fail-closed state: network interfaces are disabled, the device enters constrained safe mode, and recovery requires physical user authentication. This prevents time-rollback and state-replay attacks without requiring external clock synchronization. **[Documented]**

10.3 The Pumpkin Protocol: Cryptographic Data Expiration

Definition 10.3 (Seasonal Key). A seasonal key is derived as:

$$K_{\text{season}} = \text{HKDF}(K_{\text{root}} \parallel \text{timestamp_bucket}) \quad (19)$$

Data is encrypted as $C = \text{AES-GCM}(K_{\text{season}}, D)$ [?]. **[Documented]**

Theorem 10.4 (Pumpkin Protocol Non-Recoverability). *Let AES-256-GCM be IND-CPA secure and let HKDF be a secure PRF. If the seasonal key K_{season} is irreversibly invalidated by a hardware-enforced destruction event and no recoverable copy exists, then for any polynomial-time adversary \mathcal{A} :*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(C) \rightarrow D] \leq \text{negl}(\lambda) \quad (20)$$

That is, the encrypted data becomes computationally unrecoverable.

Proof. By the IND-CPA security of AES-256-GCM, ciphertext C is computationally indistinguishable from random without knowledge of K_{season} . Since K_{season} is derived from the hardware root of trust under a temporal context, the only recovery path is through a live recoverable instance of K_{season} or a recoverable derivation path to it. Under the theorem assumptions, the destruction event invalidates that path and leaves no recoverable key instance in accessible storage. Therefore, $\Pr[\mathcal{A}(C) \rightarrow D] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ breaks AES-256-GCM}] = \text{negl}(\lambda)$. The public manuscript intentionally states the security property and required hardware condition, not the proprietary low-level invalidation sequence. \square

Remark 10.5. This guarantee is strictly stronger than policy-based data deletion. In conventional cloud systems, “deleted” data may persist in backups, logs, or replicated storage, and administrative keys may enable recovery. The Pumpkin Protocol achieves data destruction by eliminating the key, not the ciphertext. The ciphertext may persist indefinitely on the device without compromising the guarantee. **[Formal, under stated cryptographic assumptions]**

10.4 Post-Life Governance

The attached protocol specifications document bounded emergency-contact and incapacity workflows under user-controlled authorization lists [?]. Broader post-life governance modes described in the manuscript should therefore be read as **[Design Intent]** unless and until they are anchored to a distinct attached primary artifact or implementation record.

10.5 Formal IEL Tamper-Detection Properties

The dual-signature, counter-chained structure of the IEL provides several formally derivable tamper-detection guarantees.

Proposition 10.6 (Entry Deletion Detection). *Deletion of any interior entry ℓ_j from the ledger (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n) is detectable by any verifier with access to the complete chain.*

Proof. Entry ℓ_{j+1} contains $h_j = H(\ell_j)$. If ℓ_j is deleted, the verifier computes $H(\ell_{j-1})$ and observes that the hash field of ℓ_{j+1} does not match $H(\ell_{j-1})$ (since $h_j = H(\ell_j) \neq H(\ell_{j-1})$ with overwhelming probability under the collision resistance of H). Furthermore, the monotonic counter gap $c_{\text{mono},j+1} - c_{\text{mono},j-1} = 2 \neq 1$ exposes the missing entry. \square

Proposition 10.7 (Entry Modification Detection). *Modification of any entry ℓ_j to ℓ'_j (where $\ell'_j \neq \ell_j$) is detectable.*

Proof. If $j < n$, then ℓ_{j+1} contains $h_j = H(\ell_j)$. Replacing ℓ_j with ℓ'_j causes $H(\ell'_j) \neq h_j$ with overwhelming probability (collision resistance). Additionally, the hardware-anchored signature $\sigma_{\text{hw}}(\ell_j)$ will not verify against ℓ'_j (existential unforgeability of the signature scheme). The attacker cannot recompute $\sigma_{\text{hw}}(\ell'_j)$ without access to the hardware signing key, which resides in the enclave. \square

Proposition 10.8 (Replay Prevention). *Replaying an old valid entry ℓ_j at position $n + 1$ is detectable.*

Proof. A replayed entry would contain $c_{\text{mono},j}$ in its counter field, but the current counter value is $c_{\text{mono},n} > c_{\text{mono},j}$ (since the counter strictly increments). The verifier checks that $c_{\text{mono},n+1} = c_{\text{mono},n} + 1$, which the replayed entry fails. Even if the attacker forges a new counter value, the hardware signature σ_{hw} binds the counter value to the entry: the attacker cannot produce a valid hardware signature for a counter value the enclave has not issued. \square

Remark 10.9. Propositions ??-?? are conditional on the collision resistance of H , the existential unforgeability of the signature schemes, and the non-extractability of the hardware signing key. These are standard cryptographic assumptions. The post-quantum signature (σ_{pq}) provides an additional layer: even if the classical hardware signature is broken by a future quantum adversary, the post-quantum signature remains secure. This dual-signature approach provides defense-in-depth against algorithmic advances. **[Formal, under standard cryptographic assumptions]**

10.6 Sovereign Ledger and Forensic Use

The IEL serves as a *Sovereign Ledger*: a tamper-proof, local timeline of events. For forensic or legal use, the system can generate a *court-ready forensic bundle* containing signed entries only, without exposing raw sensor data or private content. External parties can verify the chain integrity and entry authenticity using only the public verification keys, without requiring access to the device or to the hardware enclave’s private key material.

The zero-knowledge attestation capability, if implemented with a concrete ZK construction (see Section ??), would extend this further: the system could prove properties about the ledger contents (e.g., “a gunshot-signature event was recorded between times t_1 and t_2 ”) without revealing the underlying audio or sensor data. **[Design Intent [Design Intent]; no specific ZK construction selected. IEL chain verification is Documented.]**

10.7 Multi-Phase Operational Lifecycle

The LAKANA system operates through a defined lifecycle of phases, as specified in the patent application (FIG. 6). **[Documented]**

Definition 10.10 (Operational Phases). The operational lifecycle comprises the following named phases:

- Φ_0 Secure Boot and Baseline Initialization.
- Φ_1 Real-Time Sensor Intake and Safety Evaluation.
- Φ_2 Aggregated Interface Presentation.
- Φ_3 Controlled External Access Layer.
- Φ_4 Dual-Anchor Environmental Validation.
- Φ_5 Session Termination and State Archiving.
- Φ_6 Offline Recalibration with Constraint Validation.
- Φ_7 Continuous Security Monitoring.

Phase Φ_6 (Offline Recalibration) is subject to a critical constraint:

Architectural Requirement 10.11 (Recalibration Authentication). Recalibration (Phase Φ_6) requires three conditions to be met simultaneously:

1. Secure docking (physical connection to a trusted calibration environment).
2. Biometric confirmation (user identity verification).
3. Cryptographic proof verification (the new calibration coefficients must be signed by an authorized source and validated against the evidence ledger).

Installation of updated coefficients is permitted only after all three conditions are satisfied. This prevents remote or unauthorized recalibration that could weaken safety envelopes. **[Documented]**

Phase Φ_7 (Continuous Security Monitoring) runs concurrently with all other phases and continuously checks:

- Integrity hashes of critical code and data segments.
- Drift violations (sensor outputs that deviate from expected baselines beyond configurable tolerance).
- Tamper detection signals from hardware sensors.
- Constraint enforcement across all subsystems (verifying that doctrinal constraints remain satisfied).

Any violation detected by Phase Φ_7 triggers the appropriate fail-closed transition for the affected subsystem. **[Documented]**

11 Environmental Truth Layer as Cross-Stack Substrate

W-X is not a peripheral sensor module; it is a cross-cutting truth substrate that conditions the behavior of multiple other subsystems. This section details the specific interactions.

11.1 W-X Conditioning of TSARO

TSARO’s threat-scoring kernel consumes W-X-validated environmental context to adjust sensitivity. Specifically: **[Implemented]**

- *Acoustic regime classification:* W-X determines whether the acoustic environment is QUIET, STRUCTURED_NOISE, or CHAOTIC_NOISE based on place/time/activity context. This affects the minimum corroboration threshold required for TSARO escalation: in chaotic acoustic environments, more independent sensor channels must agree before escalation is permitted.
- *RF hostility assessment:* W-X assesses the RF environment. Under high RF aggression, ranging/proximity sensors become unreliable and are dropped from the TSARO sensor

bank, with compensating adjustments to the integrity score.

- *Barometric/altitude context:* W-X provides validated altitude and pressure context used by TSARO’s place-based baseline adjustment.

11.2 W-X Conditioning of SOS Transport

W-X environmental observations affect transport-layer decisions in SOS:

- RF congestion estimates influence transport selection (e.g., switching from BLE to LoRa under 2.4 GHz saturation).
- Atmospheric conditions (severe weather, ionospheric disturbance) affect satellite transport availability estimates.

[Design Intent; transport-selection logic exists in simulation but is not empirically calibrated to real environmental conditions.]

11.3 W-X Truth-Anchoring Logic

The core truth-anchoring mechanism is a deterministic rejection gate **[Documented]** **[Implemented]**:

Architectural Requirement 11.1 (External Data Rejection). An external data feed (GPS, weather forecast, remote sensor claim) is accepted only if it is consistent with locally measured physics within the tolerance bound ϵ_{phys} (Definition ??). If inconsistent, the external data is rejected and the event is logged to the IEL with reason code SILENCE_CONTRADICTION. The system does not attempt to “fuse” contradictory data; it silences the contradicted channel entirely. **[Documented]**

This is a deliberate departure from conventional sensor-fusion approaches, which typically compute a weighted average of conflicting inputs. In LAKANA’s doctrine, a contradiction between external and local physics is not noise to be averaged away; it is evidence of either sensor failure

or adversarial spoofing, and the correct response is silence.

12 CivOS and Hardware-Bounded State Continuity

12.1 Ring -1 Isolation Model

The central contribution of CIVOS to the LAKANA survivability model is the Ring -1 hardware isolation between the host operating system and the Lazarus Micro-VM. We formalize the survivability analysis following the derivation in the CivOS Derived Formal Model. [Documented]

Definition 12.1 (Emergency Survivability). Emergency survivability is the probability that an emergency payload is successfully emitted and reaches at least one responder-accessible gateway within time T :

$$S = E \cap N \cap (M \cup L) \quad (21)$$

where E is the event that sufficient energy exists, N is the event that at least one transport path is available, M is the event that the main OS is operational, and L is the event that the Lazarus VM is operational.

Definition 12.2 (Compromise Model). Let $p_c = \mathbb{P}(C)$ denote the main OS compromise probability and $p_h = \mathbb{P}(H)$ denote the hardware enclave compromise probability. Then:

$$\mathbb{P}(M) = 1 - p_c \quad (22)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(L) = 1 - p_h \quad (23)$$

Engineering Hypothesis 12.3 (Independence of OS and Enclave Compromise). Main OS compromise does not imply Lazarus VM compromise. That is, the events C (OS compromise) and H (enclave compromise) are independent: $\mathbb{P}(C \cap H) = p_c \cdot p_h$.

Justification: This hypothesis is motivated by the architectural separation between the host OS execution environment and the hardware-isolated enclave. The enclave has a separate execution context, separate memory, and (in the

SAB mode) a physically separate transmission path. However, this independence assumption has not been empirically validated. In practice, certain supply-chain attacks or hardware-level backdoors could compromise both layers simultaneously, violating independence. [Engineering Hypothesis; not yet validated]

Theorem 12.4 (Ring -1 Survivability Bound). *Under Engineering Hypothesis ?? and Definition ??:*

$$\mathbb{P}(M \cup L) = 1 - p_c \cdot p_h \quad (24)$$

and the full survivability lower bound is:

$$\mathbb{P}(S) \geq \mathbb{P}(E) \cdot \left[1 - \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - \mathbb{P}(N_i)) \right] \cdot (1 - p_c \cdot p_h) \quad (25)$$

where $\{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$ are the individual transport survival events.

Proof. By inclusion-exclusion,

$$\mathbb{P}(M \cup L) = \mathbb{P}(M) + \mathbb{P}(L) - \mathbb{P}(M \cap L). \quad (26)$$

Using Definition ?? and Engineering Hypothesis ??,

$$\mathbb{P}(M \cap L) = (1 - p_c)(1 - p_h), \quad (27)$$

so $\mathbb{P}(M \cup L) = 1 - p_c p_h$.

For the network term, $\mathbb{P}(N) = \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_i N_i) \geq 1 - \prod_i (1 - \mathbb{P}(N_i))$; this is an equality under independence and a lower bound under positive correlation. For the energy term, if the energy partition includes both main battery and an isolated capacitor bank with independent failure probability p_e , then $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - p_{\text{main}} p_e$ by the same argument. Substituting these bounds into $\mathbb{P}(S) = \mathbb{P}(E) \cdot \mathbb{P}(N) \cdot \mathbb{P}(M \cup L)$ yields (?). \square

Remark 12.5 (Multiplicative vs. Additive Fault Reduction). Without Ring -1 isolation, $\mathbb{P}(M) = 1 - p_c$. With isolation, $\mathbb{P}(M \cup L) = 1 - p_c \cdot p_h$. The improvement factor is:

$$\frac{1 - p_c \cdot p_h}{1 - p_c} \quad (28)$$

For the illustrative parameterization $p_c = 0.20$ and $p_h = 10^{-5}$, this yields $\mathbb{P}(M \cup L) = 0.999998$

versus $\mathbb{P}(M) = 0.80$ **[Derived]** **[Conditional on stated assumptions]** **[Not empirically validated here]**. These parameter values are scenario knobs chosen to illustrate the structural effect of multiplicative fault reduction; they are not empirically calibrated to any specific platform or deployment. The point is structural: Ring -1 isolation turns single-path survivability into multiplicative fault reduction rather than additive redundancy.

12.2 Iron Lung Energy Partition

At critical battery thresholds, CIVOS activates the Iron Lung protocol:

1. Non-essential interfaces are terminated (display, non-emergency radio, application-layer services).
2. Harvested energy (from ambient RF, kinetic, or solar sources, where available) is routed exclusively to the emergency partition.
3. The Lazarus VM and SAB transmission are powered from an isolated capacitor bank when available.

This energy partitioning ensures that the survivability bound (??) includes an energy independence term: the emergency system’s energy source is decoupled from the host system’s battery state. **[Documented]**

12.3 Analog Wake Architecture

CIVOS’s analog monitoring layer operates below the OS privilege level:

1. A low-power analog comparator continuously measures physical variables (acceleration, pressure, RF anomaly).
2. When a threshold is exceeded, a hardware interrupt line activates the secure enclave interrupt handler directly, bypassing the host OS scheduler.
3. The enclave evaluates whether to: wake the host CPU, trigger a broadcast, log to the ledger, or enter fail-closed state.

The critical property is that threshold detection occurs in analog hardware, not in software. The host OS cannot prevent or delay the detection event. **[Documented]**

13 Formal TSARO Sensor and Integrity Model

This section provides a detailed formal treatment of the TSARO threat-scoring kernel as implemented in the companion simulation engine. The formalization here describes the *structural logic* of the scoring pipeline; specific numerical parameters are scenario knobs unless otherwise noted. **[Implemented in SOS MC v44]**

13.1 Multi-Sensor Channel Abstraction

TSARO operates over k sensor channels (in the current simulation, $k = 5$: acoustic, IMU, heart-rate proxy, barometer, and ranging/proximity). Each channel i produces a standardized observation $z_i \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 13.1 (Sensor Correlation Model). The joint sensor observation vector $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_k)^T$ is modeled with a multivariate t -distribution with ν degrees of freedom (default $\nu = 4$ for heavy-tailed robustness) and correlation matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$:

$$\mathbf{z} \sim t_\nu(\boldsymbol{\mu}, R) \tag{29}$$

Under null conditions (no threat), $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$. Under threat type j , $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_j$ with threat-specific mean shifts per channel. The heavy-tailed t -distribution is chosen to model sensor outliers without requiring Gaussian tail assumptions. **[Implemented]**

Remark 13.2. The correlation matrix R is a simulation parameter. The current implementation offers two modes: (1) an equicorrelation fallback with a single ρ parameter, and (2) a physics-informed heterogeneous matrix where channels sharing the same frequency band (BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN all at 2.4 GHz) have higher correlation ($\rho \approx 0.70$) than channels on different bands

(LoRa sub-GHz: $\rho \approx 0.35$; satellite: $\rho \approx 0.15$). The physics-informed matrix is more realistic but has not been calibrated against empirical data. **[Implemented; not empirically calibrated]**

13.2 Robust Scoring via Huberized Mahalanobis Distance

The raw threat score is computed as a Huberized Mahalanobis distance:

Definition 13.3 (Huberized Score). For observation vector \mathbf{z} and inverse correlation matrix R^{-1} , the Huberized score is:

$$S_H(\mathbf{z}) = \sqrt{\psi_k(\mathbf{z})^T R^{-1} \psi_k(\mathbf{z})} \quad (30)$$

where ψ_k is the componentwise Huber function with robustness parameter k_H :

$$\psi_{k_H}(z_i) = \begin{cases} z_i & |z_i| \leq k_H \\ k_H \cdot \text{sign}(z_i) & |z_i| > k_H \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

The Huber function limits the influence of extreme outliers on any single channel, preventing a single spoofed or malfunctioning sensor from dominating the composite score. **[Implemented]**

13.3 Fault Detection and Exclusion (FDE)

When a single sensor produces observations grossly inconsistent with the remaining channels, the FDE mechanism identifies and excludes it:

Architectural Requirement 13.4 (FDE Gate). If $\max_i |z_i| > z_{\text{FDE}}$ (default $z_{\text{FDE}} = 4.0$), the most inconsistent sensor is identified by:

$$i^* = \arg \max_i |z_i| \quad (32)$$

The score is then recomputed on the $(k - 1)$ -channel subset excluding sensor i^* . The exclusion event is recorded in the cause-mask, and the subsequent integrity computation penalizes the exclusion appropriately. **[Implemented]**

13.4 Integrity Score

The integrity score $I \in [0, 1]$ models trust in the sensing, timing, and compute environment. It is computed as:

$$I = 1 - \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} w_f \cdot \mathbf{1}[f \text{ is active}] \quad (33)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the set of fault indicators (timing fault, unit-frame fault, provenance fault, NIS gate failure, calibration staleness, RF hostility, OS compromise, hardware compromise) and w_f is the penalty weight for each fault type.

Design Invariant 13.5 (Integrity-Gated Escalation). No escalation action (Tier 2 or Tier 3) is permitted when $I < I_{\text{min}}$. Specifically:

- Tier 2 escalation requires $I \geq I_{\text{tier2}}$ (default 0.55).
- Tier 3 escalation requires $I \geq I_{\text{tier3}}$ (default 0.35).
- Below I_{tier3} , the system enters a hard-veto state: no threat escalation is possible regardless of the raw score, because the sensing environment is too degraded to support confident action. **[Implemented]**

This design embodies the fail-closed doctrine: when integrity is low, the system does not attempt to “push through” with degraded data. It silences.

13.5 Bounded Suppression

False-positive suppression is bounded by a configurable cap $\kappa \in (0, 1]$:

$$S_{\text{effective}} = S_H \cdot (1 - \min(\kappa, \text{supp}(\mathbf{z}, \text{context}))) \quad (34)$$

where supp is the suppression function that aggregates contributions from FDE exclusion fraction, sensor drop fraction, and contextual factors. The critical property is that suppression can never fully zero out a genuine threat signal: a fraction $(1 - \kappa)$ of the raw score always survives. **[Implemented]**

Design Invariant 13.6 (Suppression Floor). For any sensor observation and any suppression configuration:

$$S_{\text{effective}} \geq S_H \cdot (1 - \kappa) > 0 \quad \text{whenever } S_H > 0 \quad (35)$$

A nonzero threat signal is never completely suppressed. **[Implemented]**

13.6 Corroboration Requirement

Escalation beyond Tier 1 (passive monitoring) requires independent corroboration across multiple sensor channels:

Architectural Requirement 13.7 (Corroboration Gate). Let $\text{corr}(\mathbf{z}) = |\{i : |z_i| > z_{\text{corr}}\}|$ count the number of channels with standardized residuals exceeding the corroboration threshold z_{corr} . Full escalation requires $\text{corr}(\mathbf{z}) \geq c_{\text{min}}$, where $c_{\text{min}} = 2$ in standard acoustic environments and $c_{\text{min}} = 3$ in chaotic acoustic environments (where acoustic channel noise makes single-channel corroboration unreliable). **[Implemented]**

13.7 Sentinel Path

For extreme threat signals with credible integrity, a sentinel escalation path bypasses the normal suppression chain:

Architectural Requirement 13.8 (Sentinel Escalation). If $S_H > S_{\text{sentinel}}$ (default 5.50, well above null $p_{99} \approx 4.97$) and $I \geq I_{\text{sentinel}}$ (default 0.60), escalation proceeds regardless of suppression. This prevents the “talked itself out” failure mode where every suppression channel is slightly degraded but the underlying threat signal is extreme. The sentinel path still respects the hard integrity veto ($I < I_{\text{hard}}$ blocks all escalation). **[Implemented]**

14 SOS Multi-Transport Architecture

14.1 Transport Diversity Model

The SOS emergency mesh operates across five transport channels with distinct physical characteristics:

Table 2: Transport Channel Characteristics

Transport	Band / Mechanism	Range
BLE	2.4 GHz ISM	~50 m
UWB	3.1–10.6 GHz	~30 m
WiFi NAN	2.4/5 GHz ISM	~100 m
LoRa	Sub-GHz ISM	~5 km
Satellite	LEO (e.g., L-band)	Global

The transport diversity is not merely an availability optimization; it is a structural defense against correlated failure. Transports sharing the 2.4 GHz ISM band (BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN) are expected to exhibit correlated failure under broadband jamming. LoRa operates in a different frequency band and is therefore partially decorrelated. Satellite operates via an entirely different physical mechanism and is the most decorrelated transport.

14.2 Correlated Failure Model

Definition 14.1 (Transport Correlation Structure). Let $\mathbf{F} = (F_1, \dots, F_5)^T$ be the binary failure vector for the five transports (1 = failed, 0 = operational). The joint failure distribution is modeled via a t -copula [?] with degrees-of-freedom parameter ν_T and correlation matrix $R_T \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$.

The physics-informed correlation matrix assigns higher correlation to co-band transports:

$$R_T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{12} & r_{13} & r_{14} & r_{15} \\ r_{12} & 1 & r_{23} & r_{24} & r_{25} \\ r_{13} & r_{23} & 1 & r_{34} & r_{35} \\ r_{14} & r_{24} & r_{34} & 1 & r_{45} \\ r_{15} & r_{25} & r_{35} & r_{45} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$

where indices 1–3 are BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN (2.4 GHz co-band: $r_{ij} \approx 0.70$), index 4 is LoRa

(cross-band: $r_{i4} \approx 0.35$ for $i \leq 3$), and index 5 is satellite ($r_{i5} \approx 0.15$ for $i \leq 4$). **[Implemented; not empirically calibrated]**

Open Question 14.2. Virtually no empirical data exists for WiFi Neighbor Awareness Networking (NAN) under dense deployment ($>10,000$ nodes). The correlation structure for WiFi NAN failure is therefore extrapolated from the 2.4 GHz co-band assumption, not measured. This is a significant gap in the evidence base that can only be resolved through field deployment testing.

14.3 Transport Survivability Composition

Under the correlated failure model, the probability that at least one transport survives is:

$$\mathbb{P}(N) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^5 F_i\right) \quad (37)$$

Under the independence lower bound (valid when failures are positively correlated):

$$\mathbb{P}(N) \geq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^5 \mathbb{P}(F_i) \quad (38)$$

The independence bound is a conservative estimate: positive correlation among 2.4 GHz transports makes simultaneous failure more likely than the independence bound suggests, but the decorrelated satellite channel provides a substantial floor.

Engineering Hypothesis 14.3 (Satellite Transport Floor). Under the assumption that satellite transport failure is approximately independent of terrestrial RF conditions (justified by the distinct physical mechanism), the transport survivability under complete terrestrial jamming has a lower bound

$$\mathbb{P}(N) \geq \mathbb{P}(N_{\text{sat}}). \quad (39)$$

This provides a non-trivial survivability floor as long as satellite connectivity is available and not independently jammed **[Conditional on stated assumptions]** **[Not empirically validated here]** **[Hardware-dependent]**.

14.4 Blue Force Bridge Delivery

When a threat is detected and corroborated, the SOS layer delivers an alert payload to first-responder systems via the Blue Force Bridge (BFB). The BFB is not a separate transport; it is a delivery protocol that uses whichever transport(s) are available to reach responder-accessible gateways.

The BFB delivery model in the simulation tracks:

- Whether BFB delivery is needed (threat detected and transport available).
- Whether delivery succeeds (gateway reachable within the time window).
- The delivery latency (time from threat detection to responder notification).

[Implemented in SOS MC v44; delivery latency distribution is simulated, not empirically measured.]

15 Compositional Reasoning Across the Stack

The LAKANA architecture is designed for compositional verification [?]: the properties of the whole system can be derived from the properties of individual subsystems plus their interface contracts. This section formalizes the compositional structure.

15.1 Subsystem Composition Operator

Definition 15.1 (Sequential Composition). For two subsystems S_i and S_j where $S_i \preceq S_j$ (i.e., S_j depends on S_i), the composed system $S_j \circ S_i$ has the following properties:

1. If S_i is in its fail-closed state σ_i^{fc} , then S_j must also enter its fail-closed state σ_j^{fc} (dependency propagation).
2. If S_i is operational and S_j is in its fail-closed state, S_i remains operational (failure does not propagate upward).

- The composed state space is $\Sigma_i \times \Sigma_j$ restricted to admissible pairs: states where S_j is operational but S_i is in fail-closed are inadmissible.

Proposition 15.2 (Fail-Closed Propagation). *Under the dependency chain $\text{CIVOS} \preceq \text{NICOLE} \preceq \text{SOS} \preceq \{\text{TSARO}, \text{UEI}\}$, if CIVOS enters fail-closed state, then all downstream subsystems also enter fail-closed state.*

Proof. By induction on the dependency chain. Base case: CIVOS in fail-closed \implies NICOLE cannot access hardware root key, TRNG , or monotonic counter \implies NICOLE enters fail-closed (no cryptographic operations possible). Inductive step: if S_i is in fail-closed, then S_{i+1} cannot access S_i 's services \implies S_{i+1} enters fail-closed. By the chain structure, fail-closed propagates from CIVOS through NICOLE through SOS to TSARO and UEI . \square

Corollary 15.3 (Graceful Degradation). *Failure of a higher-numbered (lower-authority) subsystem does not force failure of lower-numbered (higher-authority) subsystems. Specifically: TSARO failure leaves SOS , NICOLE , and CIVOS fully operational. The system can continue emergency beaconing (CIVOS), evidence logging (NICOLE), and mesh networking (SOS) even if threat classification (TSARO) fails.*

15.2 Cross-Cutting Service Composition

W-X does not fit neatly into the linear dependency chain because it provides services to multiple layers. The composition is modeled as:

Definition 15.4 (W-X Cross-Cut). W-X has dependency on CIVOS (for sensor access) and NICOLE (for data integrity). It provides services to SOS , TSARO , and UEI . If W-X enters fail-closed state, its consumers receive a SILENCE status on all environmental queries. Consumers must handle the SILENCE case without assuming any environmental context — they must operate in a “zero-context” mode where no environmental information is available.

This ensures that W-X failure degrades the *quality* of decisions made by SOS , TSARO , and UEI (by removing environmental context) but does not prevent those subsystems from operating at all. Environmental truth is an enhancer, not a prerequisite.

15.3 End-to-End Survivability Composition

Combining the results of this section with the Ring -1 survivability bound (Theorem ??), the full end-to-end emergency survivability can be expressed compositionally:

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{e2e}) \geq \mathbb{P}(E) \mathbb{P}(N) (1 - p_c p_h) \mathbb{P}(L_{ok}) \quad (40)$$

The four factors correspond, respectively, to energy sufficiency, transport availability, execution survivability under Ring -1 isolation, and evidence-ledger consistency. Here L_{ok} denotes the event that the evidence ledger remains consistent (monotonic counter intact, hash chain valid). Under normal operation, $\mathbb{P}(L_{ok})$ is intended to be near one, but it decreases under tampering that compromises the monotonic counter [**Documented**] [**Conditional on stated assumptions**] [**Hardware-dependent**].

Remark 15.5. Equation (??) is a formal composition of independent-term lower bounds. The actual joint probability may be higher (if failure events are negatively correlated, which is unlikely) or lower (if failure events are positively correlated beyond the modeled dependencies). The bound is useful for worst-case analysis under the stated independence assumptions. [**Formal, under stated assumptions**]

16 Formal Subsystem State Machines

To support future verification efforts, we define abbreviated state machines for the two most safety-critical subsystems.

16.1 TSARO Escalation State Machine

The TSARO threat-response state machine has four states:

Definition 16.1 (TSARO States). q_0
 MONITOR: passive monitoring,
 no action.

q_1 TIER-2: elevated awareness, local alert.

q_2 TIER-3: escalation, mesh broadcast.

q_{fc} FAIL-CLOSED: integrity veto, silence.

Transition guards:

- $q_0 \rightarrow q_1$: requires $S_{\text{effective}} > T \cdot f_{\text{tier2}}$ and $I \geq I_{\text{tier2}}$ and $\text{corr}(\mathbf{z}) \geq c_{\text{min}}$.
- $q_1 \rightarrow q_2$: requires $S_{\text{effective}} > T$ and $I \geq I_{\text{tier3}}$ and $\text{corr}(\mathbf{z}) \geq c_{\text{min}}$.
- Any state $\rightarrow q_{fc}$: triggered when $I < I_{\text{hard}}$ (integrity hard veto).
- Sentinel path: $q_0 \rightarrow q_2$ directly when $S_H > S_{\text{sentinel}}$ and $I \geq I_{\text{sentinel}}$ (bypasses normal escalation ladder).
- $q_{fc} \rightarrow q_0$: requires integrity recovery ($I \geq I_{\text{tier2}}$) and sensor stabilization.




Figure 4: TSARO escalation state machine. MON = MONITOR, T-2 = TIER-2, T-3 = TIER-3, F-C = FAIL-CLOSED. Red transitions are integrity-veto triggers. Recovery from fail-closed must pass through MONITOR.

Design Invariant 16.2 (No Escalation from Fail-Closed). From the fail-closed state q_{fc} , the only permitted transition is to q_0 (MONITOR). Transitions from q_{fc} directly to q_1 or q_2 are inadmissible. Recovery must pass through the base monitoring state. [**Design Intent**]

16.2 Civos Power State Machine

CIVOS has five power states reflecting the energy-management lifecycle:

Definition 16.3 (CIVOS Power States). p_0
 DEEP-SLEEP: analog monitoring only.

p_1 ENCLAVE-ACTIVE: enclave executing, host sleeping.

p_2 FULL-ACTIVE: host and enclave active.

p_3 IRON-LUNG: emergency-only; non-essential functions disabled.

p_{fc} FAIL-CLOSED: minimum power, SAB-only if energy remains available.

The critical transition is $p_2 \rightarrow p_3$ (Iron Lung activation): this is triggered by battery level falling below a configurable threshold and is irreversible without external charging (ensuring that once Iron Lung is active, it cannot be deactivated by a software decision, only by a physical change in energy state).




Figure 5: CIVOS power state machine. The IRON-LUNG transition is triggered by hardware energy condition and cannot be reversed by software. Recovery requires physical charging above the restore threshold.

Design Invariant 16.4 (Iron Lung Irreversibility). Once CIVOS enters the IRON-LUNG state,

transition to FULL-ACTIVE or DEEP-SLEEP requires a physical energy condition (battery above a restore threshold) that cannot be simulated or spoofed by software. This prevents an adversary who has compromised the OS from deactivating the emergency energy partition. [**Design Intent; hardware-dependent**]

17 Threat Model and Adversarial Assumptions

17.1 Adversary Capabilities

The LAKANA threat model assumes an adversary with the following capabilities:

1. **Network-level:** The adversary can jam, spoof, or intercept RF communications across any subset of transport channels (BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN, LoRa). Satellite channels are assumed harder to jam but not immune.
2. **OS-level:** The adversary may compromise the host operating system with probability p_c per device. Compromise grants full control over the OS including access to RAM, storage, and application-level keys. Compromise does *not* grant access to the hardware enclave or the Lazarus VM (by the isolation assumption).
3. **Hardware-level:** The adversary may compromise the hardware enclave with probability $p_h \ll p_c$. This represents supply-chain attacks, side-channel extraction, or physical tampering.
4. **Sensor-level:** The adversary may inject false sensor data (GPS spoofing, acoustic injection, barometric manipulation). Sensor spoofing is detected by W-X truth-anchoring when the spoofed data contradicts local physics.
5. **Coercion:** The adversary may physically coerce the user to unlock the device, reveal data, or disable safety features. Coercion resistance is provided by Judas Mode and the immutability of Core Doctrine.

6. **Temporal:** The adversary may attempt time-rollback attacks (setting the clock backward to replay expired sessions). Defense is provided by the hardware monotonic counter, which cannot be decremented.

17.2 Explicitly Excluded Threats

The following threats are acknowledged but not fully addressed by the current architecture:

- *Supply-chain compromise of the hardware enclave itself* (e.g., a backdoor inserted during chip manufacturing). If the enclave is compromised at the hardware level, the independence assumption (Engineering Hypothesis ??) fails and the survivability bound degrades. [**Not Yet Validated**]
- *Side-channel attacks against the enclave* (power analysis, electromagnetic emanation, timing attacks). Mitigation depends on the specific hardware platform’s side-channel resistance, which is not under LAKANA’s architectural control. [**Not Yet Validated**]
- *Quantum attacks on symmetric cryptography.* The current architecture uses AES-256, which provides 128-bit security against Grover’s algorithm. Post-quantum signatures (ML-DSA) [?] are specified for the evidence ledger but not yet implemented in all subsystems. [**Design Intent**]

17.3 Adversarial Cost Structure

A useful analytical lens for the LAKANA threat model is the cost structure imposed on an adversary attempting to defeat each defense layer.

Definition 17.1 (Layer Defeat Cost). For each defense layer L_i , define the adversarial defeat cost $\mathcal{C}(L_i)$ as the minimum resources (computation, physical access, time) required to render L_i ineffective for a single target device.

The LAKANA architecture is designed so that defeat costs are not merely additive but require qualitatively different adversary capabilities:

- *Defeating CIVOS analog wake*: requires physical modification of the analog comparator circuit or continuous electromagnetic interference at the device’s location. This is a physical-access requirement that does not scale to multiple targets without proportional physical presence. [**Design Intent**]
- *Defeating NICOLE key separation*: requires extraction of K_{root} from the hardware enclave. Under current enclave security models, this requires physical device access and sophisticated side-channel or invasive analysis. Cost scales linearly with the number of target devices. [**Design Intent; conditional on enclave security**]
- *Defeating the IEL*: requires forging both a hardware-anchored signature *and* a post-quantum signature, *and* incrementing the hardware monotonic counter without enclave cooperation. These three requirements target different cryptographic primitives and different hardware mechanisms, forcing the adversary to maintain multiple independent attack capabilities simultaneously. [**Formal, under cryptographic assumptions**]
- *Defeating W-X truth anchoring*: requires spoofing environmental data that is simultaneously consistent with local barometric, inertial, and thermodynamic measurements. Spoofing GPS alone is insufficient; the adversary must also control the local atmospheric pressure, IMU readings, and temperature at the device’s physical location, which is thermodynamically non-trivial. [**Design Intent**]
- *Defeating TSARO integrity gating*: requires either (a) generating sensor data that passes the Huberized Mahalanobis distance test, the FDE gate, the corroboration requirement, and the integrity threshold simultaneously, or (b) suppressing TSARO entirely, which requires OS-level compromise *and* enclave compromise (by the isolation model). [**Design Intent**]

The architectural claim is that no single attack vector defeats all layers, and the cost of defeating

multiple layers simultaneously exceeds the cost of defeating any single layer by a multiplicative (not additive) factor. This claim is structural; it has not been quantified through formal adversarial game analysis. [**Design Intent; quantitative adversarial cost modeling is deferred to future work.**]

17.4 Radio Isolation and Ghost Signal Mesh

The patent application (FIG. 7) specifies a radio isolation protocol for use under coercion, jamming, or boundary-breach conditions. [**Documented**]

The protocol proceeds as follows:

1. The secure enclave monitors for distress or isolation signals while ingesting real-time physics data to detect signal spoofing.
2. If coercion, jamming, or boundary-breach conditions are detected, a *physical radio cut-off* is executed via power-gating of the RF front-end. This is not a software radio-disable; it is a hardware power-gate that removes electrical power from the RF circuitry.
3. The system transitions to a low-power mesh mode with ephemeral identifier rotation.
4. The radio isolation state is logged to the IEL.
5. A minimal-power mesh connection is maintained if possible (using the lowest-power transport that remains unjammed).

Design Invariant 17.2 (Physical Radio Isolation). Radio isolation is enforced at the hardware level (power-gating), not the software level (driver disable). An adversary who has compromised the host OS cannot re-enable radio transmission once the enclave has executed a radio cut-off. Re-enabling transmission requires either enclave authorization or physical power-cycle of the RF front-end. [**Documented; hardware-dependent**]

The Omerta variant of radio isolation is more extreme: not only is transmission disabled, but

the device emits no signals of any kind—no acknowledgments, no rejection packets, no probe responses. The device becomes electromagnetically silent, indistinguishable from a powered-off device to an external observer. This prevents an adversary from confirming device presence via probe-response analysis. [Documented]

18 Safety, Privacy, and Non-Coercion Constraints

18.1 Safety Constraints

Safety in LAKANA is defined as maintaining the system state within the safe set \mathcal{S} (Definition ??). The Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem (Theorem ??) ensures that recalibration never weakens safety constraints. The fail-closed requirement (Doctrine Constraint ??) ensures that any failure defaults to the most conservative state.

18.2 Privacy Architecture

Privacy is enforced at four levels:

1. *Local-first processing*: All computation occurs on-device. No raw sensor data, biometric data, or personally identifiable information is transmitted to external servers.
2. *Cryptographic compartmentalization*: NICOLE’s key separation ensures that even if one data class is compromised, other classes remain protected.
3. *Identity-free mesh*: The W-X/S-V2K mesh transmits kinetic state vectors without persistent identifying metadata. Ephemeral identifiers rotate continuously.
4. *Pumpkin Protocol*: Historical data becomes cryptographically unrecoverable after the seasonal key is zeroized.

18.3 Non-Coercion

The architecture provides multiple layers of coercion resistance:

- *Judas Mode*: Simulates device shutdown under duress while maintaining acoustic monitoring.
- *Haptic Silent Language*: Covert communication via haptic patterns that are imperceptible to an observer.
- *Immutable Core Doctrine*: Even under coercion, the user cannot be forced to disable safety features that are constitutionally immutable.
- *Omerta Protocol*: Under interrogation or spoofing attacks on the mesh, the transmission path is physically disconnected, rendering the device a passive receiver that emits no signals—not even rejection signals that would confirm its presence. [Documented]

19 Failure, Silence, Contradiction, and Fail-Closed Semantics

19.1 Silence Semantics

Silence is not an error state; it is a valid and correct system output. The system produces silence when:

- Sensor data is insufficient to bound uncertainty below the configured threshold (Doctrine Constraint ??).
- Environmental data contradicts local physics (Architectural Requirement ??).
- The integrity score falls below the minimum threshold for any escalation action.
- The evidence ledger detects a monotonic counter anomaly.

19.2 Contradiction Handling

When two data sources produce contradictory claims (e.g., GPS claims altitude h_1 but barometer measures altitude h_2 with $|h_1 - h_2| > \epsilon_{\text{phys}}$), the system does not attempt fusion:

1. The external claim is rejected.
2. The local measurement is retained as the truth anchor.
3. The event is logged to the IEL with a contradiction reason code.
4. Downstream subsystems are notified that the contradicted data channel is in SILENCE state.

19.3 NaN and Zero-Substitution Doctrine

Substituting NaN values with zero (or any default) is a doctrine violation. If a computation produces NaN, the result is undefined and must propagate as a failure signal, not be silently replaced with a plausible value. This is consistent with the fail-closed doctrine: an undefined computation result is a failure, and failures must be handled explicitly, not masked. **[Documented in CivOS/W-X implementation]**

20 Related Work and Positioning

LAKANA draws on and extends several established research traditions. This section positions the architecture relative to closely related prior work, using only references available in the supplied bibliography.

Dependable and safety-critical systems. The foundational taxonomy of Avizienis et al. [?] defines the fault-error-failure chain and the concepts of fault tolerance, fault removal, and fault prevention that underpin LAKANA’s fail-closed doctrine. The real-time systems design principles of Kopetz [?] inform the deterministic, time-bounded execution model. IEC 61508 [?] and DO-178C [?] provide the safety-integrity-level framework that motivates the hardware-bounded state continuity design, though LAKANA does not claim formal SIL or DAL certification. **[Documented]**

Separation kernels and formal isolation. Rushby’s separation kernel concept [?] provides

the architectural template for CivOS’s Ring –1 isolation model: the requirement that execution domains be provably non-interfering. The seL4 formally verified microkernel [?] demonstrates that such proofs are achievable for operating-system kernels; LAKANA identifies seL4-style formal verification of the SSI air-gap isolation as a deferred validation target (DV-11 in Table ??). LAKANA extends the separation-kernel paradigm by combining hardware-enforced execution isolation with cryptographic key separation (NICOLE) and physics-based environmental truth anchoring (W-X)—a layered defense combination not present in classical separation-kernel designs, which focus on information-flow control alone. **[Documented; extension claim is structural, not empirically validated]**

Control barrier functions and safe-set methods. TSARO’s safe-set projection (Definition ??) builds on the control barrier function (CBF) framework of Ames et al. [?], which provides formally guaranteed forward-invariance of safe sets under constrained control inputs. LAKANA’s contribution relative to the CBF literature is not a new control-theoretic result; rather, it applies the CBF principle to civilian safety (threat admissibility as a binary physics predicate) and enforces monotonic envelope non-expansion (Theorem ??) as a constitutional constraint on recalibration. The Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem is a design invariant rather than a novel mathematical result; its significance is doctrinal, not proof-theoretic. **[Documented + Proved under stated operator definition]**

Split-knowledge and privacy-preserving architectures. NICOLE’s key separation draws on the split-knowledge tradition originating with Shamir’s secret sharing [?] and the HKDF construction [?]. The Pumpkin Protocol’s cryptographic data expiration is architecturally related to key-rotation schemes in cloud storage, but differs in that it enforces non-recoverability via hardware key zeroization rather than policy-based deletion. The differential privacy primitives used in SSI’s aggregate queries follow the foundational framework of Dwork [?]. LAKANA’s contribution is not a new cryptographic primitive but a specific *composition* of split-knowledge

key hierarchies, hardware-bound zeroization, and constitutional k -anonymity within a fail-closed safety architecture. [Documented + Proved under cryptographic assumptions]

Positioning summary. Within the attached source materials and the cited literature retained in this manuscript, we are not aware of a published civilian safety architecture that combines: (i) physics-grounded deterministic inference with formal safe-set invariants, (ii) fail-closed operation under explicit constitutional constraints, (iii) local-first data sovereignty with hardware-enforced cryptographic compartmentalization, (iv) multi-transport emergency mesh with correlated-failure modeling, (v) environmental truth anchoring with physics-based rejection of contradictory data, and (vi) a sovereign biometric layer integrated into the same stack. This is a claim about the combination rather than any individual ingredient, and it is offered cautiously rather than as an exclusivity proof. Whether the combination yields measurable advantage over existing approaches is an empirical question this paper does not answer [Not empirically validated here].

21 Comparison to Conventional Architectures

Table ?? compares the LAKANA design posture to a conventional civilian-safety baseline across key structural dimensions. The “conventional architecture” column is a structural comparator synthesized from the failure classes discussed in Section ??; it is not a measured benchmark cohort [Comparator is synthetic] [Not empirically validated here].

Remark 21.1. This comparison describes *design postures*, not validated outcomes [Comparator is synthetic] [Not empirically validated here]. The claim is that LAKANA is *architecturally structured* to avoid each conventional failure mode, not that it has been empirically demonstrated to do so in production. Whether the architectural intent translates to real-world advantage is an empirical question deferred to validation studies.

22 Implementation Status and Validation State

Table ?? summarizes the current implementation and validation status of each subsystem, with companion-simulation evidence distinguished from proof and from field validation [Implemented] [Not empirically validated here].

23 Limitations and Assumption Register

23.1 Explicit Limitations

1. **No field deployment.** All technical claims are based on formal analysis and computational simulation. No component of LAKANA has been deployed in a real-world environment [Not empirically validated here].
2. **Hardware isolation is assumed, not verified.** The Ring -1 survivability bound (Theorem ??) depends on the independence of OS and enclave compromise (Engineering Hypothesis ??). This has not been empirically validated on any specific hardware platform [Conditional on stated assumptions] [Hardware-dependent] [Not empirically validated here].
3. **Sensor models are parametric.** All sensor noise parameters, correlation structures, and threat-occurrence probabilities in the simulation engines are configurable scenario knobs, not empirically calibrated values.
4. **Transport correlation is approximate.** The multi-transport correlation model (BLE, UWB, WiFi NAN sharing 2.4 GHz band; LoRa sub-GHz; satellite independent) is physics-motivated but uses simplified correlation structures. Real-world dense-deployment RF correlation data is virtually nonexistent for WiFi NAN and sparse for other transports [Not empirically validated here].
5. **Post-quantum cryptography is specified but not fully implemented.** The architec-

Table 3: Structural Comparison of Design Postures (Architectural Baseline; Not Empirical Performance)

Dimension	Conventional Architecture	LAKANA Design Posture
Cloud Dependency	Safety-critical functions require cloud connectivity	All safety functions operate fully offline
Inference Model	Probabilistic ML; confidence scores without physical bounds	Deterministic physics-first; outputs bounded by physical constraints
Trust Model	Trust delegated to external entities (cloud, CA, carrier)	Trust rooted in local hardware enclave
Failure Mode	Fail-open (best-effort output under degradation)	Fail-closed (silence under insufficient evidence)
Evidence Governance	Data stored in provider-controlled infrastructure	Data encrypted under user-controlled, hardware-bound keys
System State	Often hidden; internal state not user-inspectable	Explicit; all actions, logic, and data flows auditable
Data Expiration	Policy-based deletion (backups may persist)	Cryptographic destruction via key zeroization
Sensor Contradiction	Weighted fusion of conflicting inputs	Rejection and silence on contradiction

ture specifies ML-KEM (FIPS 203) and ML-DSA (FIPS 204) for the evidence ledger, but implementation across all subsystems is incomplete [**Design Intent**] [**Implemented**].

- UEI friction model is untested.** The interaction-governance mechanism is specified at the interface level, but no human-factors study has been conducted to validate its effectiveness or acceptability.
- Scalability limits are simulation-derived.** The $O(N^{1.45})$ runtime scaling and $O(N^{0.97})$ memory scaling reported in companion simulation studies are measured on synthetic workloads, not production environments [**Not empirically validated here**] [**Comparator is synthetic**].

23.2 Assumption Register

Table ?? provides the complete assumption register for all formal results in this paper. Each assumption is also traceable to the Open-Questions Register (Section ??) where its validation path is specified.

24 Open-Questions Register

The following open questions are consolidated from throughout the manuscript. Each entry identifies the originating section, the current evidence status, and a concrete validation path. Items marked with a companion-paper designation are intended for resolution outside this manuscript.

- WiFi NAN dense-deployment behavior** (Section ??). Virtually no empirical data exists for WiFi NAN under dense deployment (>10,000 nodes). The correlation structure used in the transport model is extrapolated from the 2.4 GHz co-band assumption, not measured. *Status:* Unvalidated. *Validation path:* Field deployment testing at stadium scale. *Companion paper:* SOS MC Validation.
- LoRa scalability at >50,000 nodes** (Section ??). Fundamental packet error rate limitations at stadium scale are a documented constraint. *Status:* Simulation-identified limitation. *Validation path:* Simulation with empirical calibration, then field deployment. *Companion paper:* SOS MC Validation.

Table 4: Subsystem Implementation and Validation Status

Subsystem	Implementation	Validation	Notes
CivOS	Design specification	Not validated	Lazarus VM, SAB, Iron Lung are specified in patent; no hardware prototype
NICOLE	Design specification	Formal proof of key separation (Prop. ??), Pumpkin non-recoverability (Thm. ??)	Conditional on cryptographic hardness assumptions
SOS	Monte Carlo simulation engine (v44, 8,800+ lines)	Companion simulation study reported; not reproduced here	Not field-validated; RF model uses synthetic fading
W-X	Monte Carlo simulation engine (v16, 4,500+ lines)	Companion simulation study reported; not reproduced here	Soil/atmosphere physics from literature; no site-specific calibration
TSARO	Implemented in SOS MC (v44) and SSI MC (v7.5)	Implemented in simulation; empirical validation deferred	Sensor parameters are scenario knobs, not empirically calibrated
UEI	Design specification	Not validated	interaction-governance mechanism referenced in patent materials; public control law intentionally abstracted
SSI	Monte Carlo simulation engine (v7.5, 2,400+ lines)	Companion simulation study reported; not reproduced here	Not field-validated; epidemiological parameters from published literature, not prospective cohort

3. **Independence of OS and enclave compromise** (Engineering Hypothesis ??). The survivability bound (Theorem ??) depends on this assumption, which has not been empirically validated on any specific hardware. Supply-chain or side-channel attacks could violate independence. *Status:* Engineering hypothesis. *Validation path:* Hardware prototype testing on specific enclave implementations.
4. **Envelope non-expansion over long operational lifetimes** (Theorem ??, Remark). Monotonic tightening is proved for the stated operator, but whether monotonic tightening remains appropriate (as opposed to recalibration that validly relaxes constraints based on improved data) over multi-year deployments is an open engineering question. *Status:* Design trade-off, not formally resolved. *Validation path:* Longitudinal simulation and domain-expert review.
5. **Pumpkin Protocol zeroization completeness on specific hardware** (Theorem ??). The non-recoverability guarantee is conditional on complete key zeroization from the hardware keystore. Whether specific hardware implementations (StrongBox, TrustZone) achieve complete zeroization is platform-dependent and must be audited per device. *Status:* Hardware-dependent. *Validation path:* Hardware-specific security audit.
6. **UEI friction effectiveness** (Section ??). The interaction-governance mechanism is

Table 5: Assumption Register

ID	Assumption	Used In	Status
A1	HKDF is a secure PRF	Prop. ??, Thm. ??	Standard assumption
A2	TRNG produces independent entropy	Prop. ??	Platform-dependent
A3	AES-256-GCM is IND-CPA secure	Thm. ??	Standard assumption
A4	OS/enclave compromise independent	Thm. ??	Engineering hypothesis
A5	Hardware root key non-extractable	Thm. ??	Platform-dependent
A6	Monotonic counter non-decrementable	DI ??	Hardware-dependent
A7	Analog comparator operates below OS	Section ??	Hardware-dependent
A8	Authority lattice correctly implemented	Prop. ??	Implementation-dependent
A9	Transport survival events not perfectly correlated	Thm. ??	Engineering hypothesis
A10	Recalibration operator uses min	Thm. ??	By construction

specified at the interface level but the internal control law is intentionally abstracted in this public preprint. Whether bounded interaction governance improves decision quality without unacceptable usability degradation is unknown. *Status:* Design intent. *Validation path:* Controlled human-factors study.

7. **Adversarial cost quantification** (Section ??). The claim that multi-layer defeat cost is multiplicative rather than additive is structural; it has not been quantified through formal adversarial game analysis. *Status:* Design intent. *Validation path:* Formal adversarial game-theoretic modeling.
8. **SSI career-extension effect** (Section ??). Whether physics-first biometric monitoring translates to measurable career extension in occupational populations is an open empirical question. *Status:* Simulation-derived (SSI MC v7.5). *Validation path:* Multi-year prospective longitudinal cohort study. *Companion paper:* SSI Biometric Monitoring Validation.

9. **SSI k -anonymity under differential attack** (Doctrine Constraint ??). Whether the constitutional k -anonymity threshold ($K \geq 10$) with differential privacy is sufficient to resist differential attacks under realistic query patterns is not formally established. *Status:* Documented + Implemented. *Validation path:* Formal analysis + red-team testing.

10. **Multi-transport t -copula calibration** (Definition ??). The physics-informed correlation matrix uses simplified correlation structures that have not been calibrated against empirical dense-deployment RF data. This is a genuine uncertainty in the simulation assumptions. *Status:* Implemented, not empirically calibrated. *Validation path:* Field deployment data collection. *Companion paper:* SOS MC Validation.

25 Future Validation Roadmap

The following companion papers and validation activities are planned or in progress:

1. **SOS Monte Carlo Validation.** Full-scale simulation validation of the multi-transport survivability model, TSARO threat-scoring kernel, transport correlation structure, and adversarial robustness. Status: simulation engine at v44; paper in preparation.
2. **SSI Biometric Monitoring Validation.** Paired Monte Carlo comparison of biometric load monitoring (SSI) versus industry-standard practice across simulated career lifetimes. Status: simulation engine at v7.5; preliminary results available.
3. **CivOS/W-X Environmental Truth Validation.** Monte Carlo validation of the environmental truth-anchoring engine under adversarial sensor attack, heat-wave shock, and sensor degradation scenarios. Status: simulation engine at v16; paper in preparation.
4. **Field Deployment: 2026 ICF World Championships.** Planned initial deployment at Riversport OKC for the 2026 ICF World Championships, providing the first real-world validation data for the SOS mesh network under stadium-scale conditions. Status: pre-deployment planning.
5. **Hardware Prototype.** CivOS Ring -1 isolation, SAB transmission, and Iron Lung energy partition require hardware prototyping to validate the independence assumption (A4) and analog wake architecture (A7). Status: not yet initiated.
6. **Human Factors Study.** The UEI interaction-governance layer requires a controlled human-factors study to validate that bounded interaction governance improves decision quality under high-risk conditions without unacceptable usability degradation. Status: not yet initiated.

26 Conclusion

This paper has presented LAKANA as a doctrine-constrained, deterministic, local-first, fail-closed cyber-physical architecture for sovereign safety.

The contribution is architectural and formal, not empirical.

Formal results. We have: (i) established the explicit intellectual genealogy deriving the full architecture from the founding TSARO/NICOLE pair (Section ??); (ii) formalized the governing doctrine as six constitutional constraints expressed as predicates over system behavior (Section ??); (iii) defined the subsystem authority hierarchy as a bounded lattice with a proved downward-only override property (Proposition ??); (iv) derived a survivability lower bound under Ring -1 hardware-isolation assumptions (Theorem ??); (v) proved the Envelope Non-Expansion Theorem for monotonic safety-set recalibration (Theorem ??); and (vi) established the Pumpkin Protocol cryptographic non-recoverability guarantee under standard hardness assumptions (Theorem ??). Each result is explicitly conditional on stated assumptions catalogued in Table ??.

Architectural contribution. The architecture originates from two founding insights—deterministic physics-bounded admissibility (TSARO) and sovereignty-by-construction over safety-critical data (NICOLE)—from which the remaining five subsystems are derived as necessary consequences. At runtime, that genealogy becomes a gated precedence relation rather than an inversion: user intent enters first, TSARO evaluates admissibility for safety-critical action, NICOLE enforces the non-bypassable evidence and data boundary, and the remaining subsystems execute within those gates. Within the attached source materials and the cited literature retained here, we are not aware of a civilian safety stack that combines physics-grounded inference, fail-closed operation, local-first data sovereignty, hardware-bounded state continuity, environmental truth anchoring, explicit override semantics, and a sovereign biometric extension in the specific way formalized in this manuscript. Whether that combination yields measurable real-world safety improvement remains an open empirical question that this paper deliberately does not answer.

Evidentiary discipline. Every formal result is conditional on stated assumptions, ev-

ery design claim is labeled by evidentiary status, and every unvalidated item is registered in Tables ??–?? and the Open-Questions Register (Section ??). The architecture is offered as a contribution to the research literature on deterministic safety-critical systems [?], sovereign computing, and constitutional cyber-physical governance. Its empirical validation—including the planned field deployment at the 2026 ICF World Championships (Riversport OKC)—is the subject of ongoing and future work described in Section ??.

References

- [1] M. K. Fails, “Official Protocol Specifications (TSARO + NICOLE),” internal protocol specification, LAKANA Systems, 2026.
- [2] M. K. Fails, “Provisional Patent Application: Deterministic Hardware-Bound State Continuity, Environmental Truth Validation, and Fail-Closed Cyber-Physical Architecture,” provisional patent source document, LAKANA Sovereign Systems, Feb. 2026.
- [3] M. K. Fails, “Provisional Patent Application (Expanded Engineering Edition): Deterministic Hardware-Bound State Continuity, Environmental Truth Validation, and Fail-Closed Cyber-Physical Architecture,” engineering source document, LAKANA Sovereign Systems, 2026.
- [4] M. K. Fails, “LAKANA Umbrella Provisional Patent Application,” umbrella-family source document, LAKANA Sovereign Systems, 2026.
- [5] M. K. Fails, “CivOS Derived Formal Model: Lower Bound on Emergency Survivability,” internal technical note, LAKANA Systems, 2025.
- [6] M. K. Fails, “LAKANA SOS Apex Monte Carlo Validation Stack, v44,” simulation implementation reference, LAKANA Systems, 2026.
- [7] M. K. Fails, “CivOS/W-X Agronomic Master Engine, v16,” simulation implementation reference, LAKANA Systems, 2026.
- [8] M. K. Fails, “LAKANA SSI Monte Carlo, v7.5,” simulation implementation reference, LAKANA Systems, 2026.
- [9] M. K. Fails, “Production-Scale Stratified Monte Carlo Validation of Deterministic Constraint-Envelope Safety Enforcement,” companion simulation manuscript, LAKANA Sovereign Systems, 2026.
- [10] D. Kahneman, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- [11] National Institute of Standards and Technology, “Module-Lattice-Based Key-Encapsulation Mechanism Standard,” FIPS 203, Aug. 2024; “Module-Lattice-Based Digital Signature Standard,” FIPS 204, Aug. 2024.
- [12] H. Krawczyk and P. Eronen, “HMAC-based Extract-and-Expand Key Derivation Function (HKDF),” RFC 5869, Internet Engineering Task Force, May 2010.
- [13] M. J. Dworkin, “Recommendation for Block Cipher Modes of Operation: Galois/Counter Mode (GCM) and GMAC,” NIST Special Publication 800-38D, Nov. 2007.
- [14] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease, “The Byzantine Generals Problem,” *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 382–401, Jul. 1982.
- [15] A. D. Ames, S. Coogan, M. Egerstedt, G. Notomista, K. Sreenath, and P. Tabuada, “Control Barrier Functions: Theory and Applications,” in *Proc. 18th European Control Conf. (ECC)*, Naples, Italy, Jun. 2019, pp. 3420–3431.
- [16] Arm Ltd., “Arm TrustZone Technology for Armv8-M Architecture,” Reference Manual PRD29-GENC-009492C, 2020. See also Google, “StrongBox Keymaster,” Android Keystore documentation, 2023.

- [17] Semtech Corp., “LoRa and LoRaWAN: A Technical Overview,” LoRa Developer Portal, Technical Paper, 2019.
- [18] IEEE, “IEEE Standard for Information Technology—Telecommunications and Information Exchange between Systems—Local and Metropolitan Area Networks—Specific Requirements—Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications: Amendment 2: Sub 1 GHz License Exempt Operation,” IEEE Std 802.11ah-2016, 2017. See also Bluetooth SIG, “Bluetooth Core Specification v5.4,” 2023.
- [19] A. Shamir, “How to Share a Secret,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 612–613, Nov. 1979.
- [20] G. Klein *et al.*, “seL4: Formal Verification of an OS Kernel,” in *Proc. 22nd ACM Symp. Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, Big Sky, MT, Oct. 2009, pp. 207–220.
- [21] H. Kopetz, *Real-Time Systems: Design Principles for Distributed Embedded Applications*, 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2011.
- [22] A. Avizienis, J.-C. Laprie, B. Randell, and C. Landwehr, “Basic Concepts and Taxonomy of Dependable and Secure Computing,” *IEEE Trans. Depend. Secure Comput.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 11–33, Jan. 2004.
- [23] J.M. Rushby, “Design and Verification of Secure Systems,” in *Proc. 8th ACM Symp. Operating Systems Principles*, Pacific Grove, CA, Dec. 1981, pp. 12–21.
- [24] C. Dwork, “Differential Privacy,” in *Proc. 33rd Int. Colloq. Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, Venice, Italy, Jul. 2006, pp. 1–12.
- [25] R. C. Merkle, “A Certified Digital Signature,” in *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO ’89*, Santa Barbara, CA, Aug. 1989, pp. 218–238.
- [26] R. Ross, M. McEvilley, and J. C. Oren, “Systems Security Engineering: Considerations for a Multidisciplinary Approach in the Engineering of Trustworthy Secure Systems,” NIST Special Publication 800-160, Vol. 1, Rev. 1, Nov. 2022.
- [27] RTCA, Inc., “Software Considerations in Airborne Systems and Equipment Certification,” DO-178C, Dec. 2011.
- [28] International Electrotechnical Commission, “Functional Safety of Electrical/Electronic/Programmable Electronic Safety-Related Systems,” IEC 61508, Ed. 2.0, Apr. 2010.
- [29] IEEE, “IEEE Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Networks,” IEEE Std 802.15.4-2020, 2020.
- [30] R.B. Nelsen, *An Introduction to Copulas*, 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2006.

A Subsystem Glossary

- BFB** Blue Force Bridge. Delivery layer connecting LAKANA mesh to first-responder systems.
- CivOS** CivilizationOS. The hardware-abstracted micro-kernel layer.
- IEL** Immutable Evidence Ledger. Append-only, dual-signed hash chain.
- IEP** Inertial Environmental Positioning. Local-physics validation of external geospatial claims.
- Iron Lung** Emergency energy-partition protocol within CivOS.
- Judas Mode** Coercion-resistant simulated device shutdown.
- Lazarus VM** Hardware-isolated Ring -1 micro-virtual machine for last-resort safety functions.
- NICOLE** Cryptographic compartmentalization protocol with split-knowledge key hierarchy.
- Omerta** Passive-receive protocol under interrogation (no transmission, no rejection signals).
- PSAI** Term used in the source materials for the cognitive-sovereignty behavior associated with the UEI path. This manuscript does not treat PSAI as a standalone subsystem separate from the composed TSARO/NICOLE/UEI stack.
- Pumpkin Protocol** Cryptographic data expiration via seasonal key zeroization.
- QREV** Quantum-Resistant Evidence Vault. Post-quantum cryptographic evidence storage.
- SAB** Secure Air-Gap Beacon. Unidirectional transmit-only emergency broadcast.
- SOS** Safety Operating System. The enabling infrastructure layer.
- SSI** Sovereign Sports Intelligence / Sovereign Safety Index. Physics-first biometric load monitoring and career-long biological accounting subsystem.
- ASC** Athlete Sovereign Core. Zone A of the SSI three-zone privacy architecture; hardware-isolated raw data enclave.
- CEI** Coaching Envelope Interface. Zone C of the SSI architecture; receives aggregate-only data.
- DCL** Decision Causality Ledger. Immutable override-accountability chain for institutional actors.
- DAEV** Dual-Anchor Environmental Validation. Cross-check between W-X node and on-body sensors.
- PPA** Physical Proximity Attestation. UWB-based proximity verification for ephemeral data sharing.
- S-V2K** Sovereign V2K Communications Transport. Identity-free kinetic telemetry network.
- TSARO** Tactical Safety and Risk Objective. Constrained dynamical-systems threat engine.
- UEI** User Exo Interface. Cognitive sovereignty interface with bounded interaction governance.
- W-X** World Weather Exchange. Environmental truth-anchoring layer.

B Design Invariants Summary

Table 6: Design Invariants and Architectural Requirements

ID	Statement	Status
DI-1	Downward-only override (no lower-rank layer overrides higher-rank)	Proved (Prop. ??)
DI-2	Fail-closed reachability (every state can reach fail-closed in one step)	Design requirement
DI-3	Monotonic counter integrity (non-increment triggers fail-closed)	Documented
DI-4	Admissible control flow (upward signals are informational only)	Documented
DI-5	Silence on contradiction (no fusion of conflicting data)	Documented
DI-6	No NaN substitution (undefined results propagate as failures)	Implemented
DI-7	Envelope non-expansion (recalibration only tightens)	Proved (Thm. ??)
DI-8	Key separation (ISK/RSK computationally independent)	Proved (Prop. ??)
DI-9	Seasonal non-recoverability (zeroized key makes data unrecoverable)	Proved (Thm. ??)
DI-10	Survivability multiplicative reduction (Ring -1 isolation)	Proved (Thm. ??)
DI-11	SSI air-gap isolation (Zone C cannot access Zone A raw data)	Documented; verification target
DI-12	SSI PPA fail-closed (attestation failure \rightarrow deny)	Documented
DI-13	SSI DCL non-repudiation (Merkle chain, athlete acknowledgment)	Documented
DI-14	Constitutional k -anonymity ($K \geq 10$, immutable)	Documented

C Deferred Validation Register

Table 7: Items Requiring Future Validation

ID	Item	Planned Validation
DV-1	OS/enclave independence assumption (A4)	Hardware prototype testing
DV-2	Analog wake below-OS operation (A7)	Hardware prototype testing
DV-3	Transport correlation under real RF conditions	Field deployment (ICF 2026)
DV-4	TSARO threat-scoring accuracy with real sensors	Controlled laboratory experiments
DV-5	UEI friction effectiveness on human decision quality	Human-factors study
DV-6	WiFi NAN behavior at stadium density ($>10k$ nodes)	Field deployment
DV-7	LoRa scalability at $>50k$ nodes	Simulation + field deployment
DV-8	Post-quantum signature performance on mobile hardware	Implementation benchmarking
DV-9	Pumpkin Protocol zeroization completeness on specific hardware	Hardware-specific audit

ID	Item	Planned Validation
DV-10	BFT consensus convergence under real network partitions	Simulation + field deployment
DV-11	SSI air-gap isolation via seL4-style formal proof	Formal verification
DV-12	SSI hazard-family detection accuracy with real sensor data	Controlled laboratory + field study
DV-13	SSI career-extension effect validated against prospective longitudinal cohort	Multi-year prospective study
DV-14	SSI k -anonymity resistance to differential attack under realistic query patterns	Formal analysis + red-team testing
DV-15	SSI DCL non-repudiation validated in legal/forensic context	Legal review + simulated proceedings

D Citation Coverage Register

This appendix records the main citation classes used in the revised manuscript. The purpose is not to claim literature completeness; it is to show that every citation family appearing in the paper is explicit and traceable to the bibliography retained in this source file.

1. Official protocol specifications used for runtime-layer ordering and protocol responsibilities \rightarrow [?].
2. Provisional patent materials used for subsystem architecture, figures, formal engineering summaries, and enablement language \rightarrow [?, ?, ?].
3. CivOS formal derivation source used for the Ring -1 survivability bound \rightarrow [?].
4. Companion simulation references used only for implementation-status or companion-paper context \rightarrow [?, ?, ?, ?].
5. Retained external literature for dependable systems, separation kernels, control-barrier methods, cryptography, privacy, wireless transport, and systems security engineering \rightarrow [?, ?].

E Source-to-Claim Traceability

Rows are included only when the current source package contains a distinct attached or bibliographically named source that materially supports the claim. Claims omitted from this appendix are either purely in-manuscript formalizations or are intentionally carried as design intent without a separate attached primary artifact.

Table 8: Source-to-Claim Traceability Matrix

Claim	Source	Category
Operational User Layer \rightarrow TSARO \rightarrow NICOLE ordering	Official Protocol Specifications [?]	Documented
Founding TSARO/NICOLE pair and family decomposition	Provisional materials [?, ?, ?]	Documented
CivOS analog wake architecture	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
Lazarus VM Ring -1 isolation	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
SAB unidirectional transmission	Provisional materials [?]	Documented
NICOLE key separation (ISK/RSK)	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented + Proved

Claim	Source	Category
Pumpkin Protocol zeroization	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented + Proved
IEL dual-signature hash chain	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
W-X inertial environmental positioning	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
W-X Active Entropy (TTL + silence on expiry)	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
TSARO safe-set projection	Provisional materials [?, ?, ?]	Documented
Envelope non-expansion as constitutional tightening rule	Expanded engineering edition [?]	Documented + Proved
Judas Mode coercion resistance	Provisional materials [?]	Documented
Omerta passive-receive protocol	Provisional materials [?]	Documented
UEI interaction-governance layer	Provisional materials [?, ?]	Documented
Ring -1 survivability lower bound	CivOS Derived Formal Model [?]	Derived + formalized
Transport correlation as a physics-prior implementation choice	SOS MC v44 reference [?]	Implemented
TSARO integrity-scoring pipeline	SOS MC v44 reference [?]	Implemented
W-X adversarial attack detection logic	CivOS/W-X engine reference [?]	Implemented
SSI companion validation stream exists	PSSP companion manuscript [?]	Documented
SSI hazard-family, aggregate-privacy, and learning claims marked Implemented	SSI MC v7.5 reference [?]	Implemented
Emergency-contact / incapacity workflow	Official Protocol Specifications [?]	Documented