Part Bibliography and Relation Register

Part 3 (Sections 3a–3c): The Epistemic Method | Bibliographic consolidation and relation-control | Source-locked | Issue 1

Control field	Value
Document ID	TEM-P3-3A3B3C-SD04-BIBLIOGRAPHY
Version / issue	Issue 1 - aligned to the Issue 1 paper sequence
Date	2026-09-24
Status	Controlled Part 3 support document aligned to the eight Issue 1 canonical papers, GOT-V1-3a-1 through GOT-V1-3c-8. Secondary to the canonical papers.
Supersedes	Bibliography and Relation Register - Issue 1 - Formatted.docx. This content reconciliation preserves the eight-paper sequence and updates source identities, ownership, locators, and support dependencies. Earlier release history remains recoverable in that source copy.
Function	Consolidates the admitted bibliographies of Papers 3a-1–3c-8 into one deduplicated Part bibliography while preserving paper-local relation status, cross-paper differences, hold/exclusion branch-memory, residual, internal 3a/3b/3c boundaries, and Series handoff.
Canonical rule	Paper bibliographies and local endnotes remain authoritative for reader-facing scholarly use. This register does not create citation, warrant, adjacency, dependency, or inheritance status by aggregation.
Internal split rule	Section 3a, Section 3b, and Section 3c remain distinct canonical regions inside one Part-level support control. Downstream papers may inherit and apply upstream architecture but do not retroactively redefine it.
Source-lock rule	Use the eight Issue 1 papers and the current Part 3 SD-01–SD-03 controls. Existing bibliographic classifications are retained from the prior support release; current paper references and endnotes govern their local source relations. The separately listed bibliographic protocol remains historical context.
Template rule	Retain the established support-document layout and control schema. Earlier support copies retain historical evidence; the eight Issue 1 papers govern current content. Parts 1 and 2 remain inherited-control references only.

0. Part-level consolidation and source discipline

The bibliography is consolidated upward only after paper-level discovery and posture work. Publication identity may be deduplicated; paper-local relation may not. A repeated source may carry different comparator, provenance, dependency, or adjacency relations in different papers, and recurrence does not promote inheritance.

0.1 Canonical source-lock register

Paper keys 3a-1 to 3c-8 abbreviate the full GOT-V1 identifiers below. Section locators refer to the numbered headings in the Issue 1 papers; endnote locators use their Arabic note numbers. SHA16 records the first 16 hexadecimal characters of SHA-256.

Seq.	Current canonical source	Canonical paper	Canonical ownership / use
GOT-V1-3a-1	GOT-V1-3a-1 - The Gödel Horizon - Issue 1.docx | sha16 44a8b20a68541a55	The Gödel Horizon	Horizon grammar: relational availability; availability/closure boundary conditions; Soft Horizon; Gödel Horizon; Procedural Availability Horizon; coupled loci; abstraction boundaries; comparator and stabilisation discipline.
GOT-V1-3a-2	GOT-V1-3a-2 - The Discipline of the Unknown - Issue 1.docx | sha16 04d3becc2b5a5029	The Discipline of the Unknown	Unknown-statuses; residual; positive exclusion; live formulations; Best Available Formulation; Weighted Residual; action threshold, safeguard, monitoring, stop condition, update, and branch-memory.
GOT-V1-3b-3	GOT-V1-3b-3 - On the Origin of Power - Issue 1.docx | sha16 d6d961fbb277a77c	On the Origin of Power	Primitive Power as IPL-indexed distinction-conditioned branch potential; Counterfactual Inclusion Field; potential/application/consequence separation; Counterfactual Exclusion; thermodynamic grounding.
GOT-V1-3b-4	GOT-V1-3b-4 - On the Origin of Responsibility - Issue 1.docx | sha16 ef17be5480bc49e7	On the Origin of Responsibility	Primitive Responsibility as locus-indexed attribution; Responsibility Provenance; distributed and temporal provenance; Responsibility Gradient; Immediate-Frame Principle; Responsibility Warrant.
GOT-V1-3b-5	GOT-V1-3b-5 - On the Origin of Trust - Issue 1.docx | sha16 d8a68ac35982e5a0	On the Origin of Trust	Trust as reliance closure under residual; primitive audit; branch-space economy; trust thresholds; vicarious trust; Epistemic Authority and the minimum Structural Authority distinction (§8); trust carriers; laundering; betrayal, repair, and formalisation handoff.
GOT-V1-3c-6	GOT-V1-3c-6 - The Case for Formalisation - Issue 1.docx | sha16 b4d11bd226838155	The Case for Formalisation	Load-bearing language; recoverable authority; distinct epistemic grounding and structural authorisation (§1); epistemic debt; institutions and machines; formalisation as preservation; auditable claim packet; proportional formalisation; retrospective review.
GOT-V1-3c-7	GOT-V1-3c-7 - The Constitutional Governance of Formalisation - Issue 1.docx | sha16 a3540c539c730360	The Constitutional Governance of Formalisation	Governance of formalisation; constitutional/technical/application levels; application of Epistemic Authority inherited from 3b-5; custodial and operational applications of Structural Authority (§6); amendment, forks, certification, and capture controls.
GOT-V1-3c-8	GOT-V1-3c-8 - The Epistemic Method - Issue 1.docx | sha16 dc08048b02787be4	The Epistemic Method	Integrated relational audit of claim-strength and reliance-strength; indexed relation; claim and reliance paths; comparator, residual, reliance limit; preferential reliance and carrier-path preservation (§6); conditional Power/Responsibility audits; method-compliance is not closure.

0.2 Upstream inherited-control references

Control ID	Current source	Permitted use
P1-SD01	Part 1 - Concept Compression Map - Issue 1.docx | sha16 a256c5229849f993	Upstream architecture compression for NTC, BD, IPL, DTS, life-threshold and localisation discipline.
P1-SD02	Part 1 - Glossary - Issue 1.docx | sha16 e97712ced4e2b095	Upstream controlled vocabulary for inherited Part 1 terms.
P1-SD03	Part 1 - Guardrail and Failure-Mode Register - Issue 1.docx | sha16 794360cc1ff16519	Upstream comparator, localisation, source-lock, and anti-inflation guardrails.
P1-SD04	Part 1 - Bibliography and Relation Register - Issue 1.docx | sha16 7b0b194c1552979b	Upstream bibliographic relation-control reference only; no citation transfer into Part 3.
P2-SD01	Part 2 - Concept Compression Map - Issue 1.docx | sha16 eee99287e2cfaa10	Upstream control for RRP, signal, OP/OA/OR/RAS/RSD, knowledge, intelligence, observation, abstraction, scale, and observation-program architecture.
P2-SD02	Part 2 - Glossary - Issue 1.docx | sha16 b144e7dc2eac7133	Upstream controlled vocabulary for inherited informational and observational terms.
P2-SD03	Part 2 - Guardrail and Failure-Mode Register - Issue 1.docx | sha16 f955341321f11d30	Upstream failure-control for local locus, information/signal, observation, abstraction, scale, and descriptor discipline.
P2-SD04	Part 2 - Bibliography and Relation Register - Issue 1.docx | sha16 12dc458d0e940e8c	Upstream bibliographic relation-control reference only; no citation transfer into Part 3.
Protocol	Historical reference: GOT - Bibliographic Identification Classification and Adjacency Discovery Protocol - Issue 1(1).docx | sha16 03dec29bfa52830c	Retained classification context from the prior support release. This protocol file is not in the current supplied control set; its recorded hash is historical and is not represented as a newly verified source. Existing classifications are retained, with no new promotion of inheritance.

0.3 Part-level support-control chain

Control ID	Current control file	Permitted use
P3-SD01	Concept Compression Map - Issue 1.docx | sha16 874e44c76caf3061	Architecture compression and source-discipline control.
P3-SD02	Glossary - Issue 1.docx | sha16 8e0c4e96367405e7	Controlled vocabulary and canonical-home control.
P3-SD03	Guardrail and Failure-Mode Register - Issue 1.docx | sha16 eb6b6a5a864111dc	Failure-control and release-discipline reference.

Excluded source class: superseded Part 3 paper revisions as current identities; contextual essay-series material; downstream extension proposals; prior generated answers; unverified or unadmitted external material; and any later Part 3 concept not present in the current eight-paper canonical sequence. Bibliographic recurrence does not create technical inheritance.

SD-01, sections 9–10, preserves the identity migration and the deferred Toolkit update control. The eight-paper lock remains active; the future Toolkit does not yet supply a Part 3 definition, guardrail, or bibliography entry.

0.4 Internal section bibliography accounting

Region	Paper-local occurrences	Unique publication identities inside region	Control
Section 3a	21	20	Papers 3a-1–3a-2; horizon/unknown relations remain local.
Section 3b	29	29	Papers 3b-3–3b-5; Power/Responsibility/Trust relations remain distinct.
Section 3c	34	31	Papers 3c-6–3c-8; Formalisation/Governance/Method relations remain distinct.
Whole Part	84	77	Deduplicate identity only; preserve all 84 paper-local relation records.

1. Consolidation architecture

Layer	Function	Control rule
Paper bibliography	Reader-facing scholarly apparatus.	The paper decides why a source is present; local endnotes state the relation.
Part bibliography	Deduplicated publication identity across eight papers.	One record per publication with occurrence markers; no flattening of local relations.
Relation register	Preserves source-to-paper relation actually earned.	Use local endnote/audit relation; no Part-level promotion by repetition.
Cross-paper controls	Expose exact duplicates and materially different uses.	Prevents authority transfer or silent inheritance.
Hold/exclusion branch-memory	Carries material candidates not admitted locally.	Preserves reasons/update conditions without publishing held sources.
Part residual	Carries search limits upward.	No exhaustive prior-art claim.
Series handoff	Feeds Series Master Bibliography and dependency/provenance controls.	Deduplicate identity again at Series level while retaining every Part/paper-local relation.

2. Part 3 deduplicated publication bibliography

The eight current papers contain 84 paper-local bibliographic occurrences. After exact publication-identity deduplication, the Part contains 77 unique publications. The occurrence field is descriptive only and does not assign one Part-wide scholarly meaning to a source.

Part ID	Deduplicated bibliographic record	Paper(s)
PB01	Albantakis, L., Marshall, W., Hoel, E., & Tononi, G. (2019). What caused what? A quantitative account of actual causation using dynamical causal networks. Entropy, 21(5), 459. https://doi.org/10.3390/e21050459	3b-3
PB02	Albantakis, L., & Tononi, G. (2015). The intrinsic cause-effect power of discrete dynamical systems—From elementary cellular automata to adapting animats. Entropy, 17(8), 5472-5502. https://doi.org/10.3390/e17085472	3b-3, 3c-8
PB03	Alfano, M. (2016). The topology of communities of trust. Sotsiologicheskoe Obozrenie, 15(4), 30-56. https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192X-2016-4-30-56	3b-5
PB04	Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. Ethics, 96(2), 231-260. https://doi.org/10.1086/292745	3b-5
PB05	Baron, J., & Hershey, J. C. (1988). Outcome bias in decision evaluation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(4), 569–579. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.569	3c-6
PB06	Bartlett, S. J. (2024). Causal leverage density: A general approach to semantic information. arXiv:2407.07335. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.07335	3b-3
PB07	Bloomfield, R., & Rushby, J. (2022). Assessing Confidence with Assurance 2.0 (CSL Technical Report SRI-CSL-2022-02). SRI International.	3c-6
PB08	Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences. MIT Press.	3c-6
PB09	Cartwright, N. (1989). Nature's capacities and their measurement. Clarendon Press.	3b-3
PB10	Cartwright, N., Hardie, J., Montuschi, E., Soleiman, M., & Thresher, A. C. (2022). The tangle of science: Reliability beyond method, rigour, and objectivity. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198866343.001.0001	3c-8
PB11	Chamberlin, T. C. (1890). The method of multiple working hypotheses. Science, 15(366), 92-96. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ns-15.366.92	3a-2
PB12	Chockler, H., & Halpern, J. Y. (2004). Responsibility and blame: A structural-model approach. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 22, 93-115. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1391	3b-4, 3c-8
PB13	Cihon, P., Kleinaltenkamp, M. J., Schuett, J., & Baum, S. D. (2021). AI certification: Advancing ethical practice by reducing information asymmetries. IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society, 2(4), 200-209.	3c-7
PB14	Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2(3), 201-215. https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830020303	3b-3
PB15	Douglas, H. E. (2000). Inductive risk and values in science. Philosophy of Science, 67(4), 559-579. https://doi.org/10.1086/392855	3a-2
PB16	Elish, M. C. (2019). Moral crumple zones: Cautionary tales in human-robot interaction. Engaging Science, Technology, and Society, 5, 40-60. https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2019.260	3b-4
PB17	Fearnley, L. C. A. (2026). Causal responsibility through omission. American Philosophical Quarterly, 63(3), 281-294. https://doi.org/10.5406/21521123.63.3.06	3b-4
PB18	Fischhoff, B. (1975). Hindsight ≠ foresight: The effect of outcome knowledge on judgment under uncertainty. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1(3), 288-299. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.1.3.288	3a-2
PB19	Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations (pp. 213-237). Basil Blackwell.	3b-5

Part ID	Deduplicated bibliographic record	Paper(s)
PB20	Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Vaughan, J. W., Wallach, H., Daumé III, H., & Crawford, K. (2021). Datasheets for datasets. Communications of the ACM, 64(12), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723	3c-6
PB21	Gillespie, N., & Dietz, G. (2009). Trust repair after an organization-level failure. Academy of Management Review, 34(1), 127-145. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.35713319	3b-5
PB22	Gilly, T. (2026). Reviewed for quality and security: Advertising injection through a verified connector, trust laundering, and the limits of directory verification. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.7130058	3b-5
PB23	Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik, 38, 173-198. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692	3a-1
PB24	Gross, M. (2007). The unknown in process: Dynamic connections of ignorance, non-knowledge and related concepts. Current Sociology, 55(5), 742-759. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392107079928	3a-2
PB25	Habets, D., Rietveld, E., Kiverstein, J., & Denys, D. (2024). Trusted urban places. Adaptive Behavior, 32(5), 421-438. https://doi.org/10.1177/10597123241229735	3b-5
PB26	Hardwig, J. (1991). The role of trust in knowledge. The Journal of Philosophy, 88(12), 693-708. https://doi.org/10.2307/2027007	3b-5
PB27	Hart, H. L. A. (1961). The Concept of Law. Clarendon Press.	3c-7
PB28	Hart, H. L. A. (1968). Punishment and responsibility: Essays in the philosophy of law. Clarendon Press.	3b-4
PB29	Hawley, K. (2014). Trust, distrust and commitment. Noûs, 48(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12000	3b-5
PB30	Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Harvard University Press.	3c-7
PB31	Hu, J., Huang, X., He, Q., Sun, Y., Dong, Y., & Huang, X. (2026). Responsible agentic AI requires explicit provenance. arXiv:2605.17169. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2605.17169	3b-4
PB32	Humphreys, P. (2009). The philosophical novelty of computer simulation methods. Synthese, 169(3), 615-626. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-008-9435-2	3a-1
PB33	Husserl, E. (1982). Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy, first book: General introduction to a pure phenomenology (F. Kersten, Trans.). Martinus Nijhoff. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7445-6	3a-1
PB34	Hutchins, E. (1995). Cognition in the wild. MIT Press.	3a-1
PB35	Ionescu, T. B., Schlund, S., & Schmidbauer, C. (2019). Epistemic debt: A concept and measure of technical ignorance in smart manufacturing. In I. L. Nunes (Ed.), Advances in Human Factors and Systems Interaction (pp. 81–93). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20040-4_8	3c-6
PB36	Johansson, I.-L., & Baldvinsdottir, G. (2003). Accounting for trust: Some empirical evidence. Management Accounting Research, 14(3), 219-234. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1044-5005(03)00045-3	3b-5
PB37	Klyubin, A. S., Polani, D., & Nehaniv, C. L. (2005). Empowerment: A universal agent-centric measure of control. 2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation, 1, 128-135. https://doi.org/10.1109/CEC.2005.1554676	3b-3
PB38	Knobloch, L. K., & Solomon, D. H. (1999). Measuring the sources and content of relational uncertainty. Communication Studies, 50(4), 261-278. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510979909388499	3c-8
PB39	Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed., enlarged). University of Chicago Press.	3a-1, 3a-2
PB40	Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. Human Factors, 46(1), 50-80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392	3b-5
PB41	Lempert, R. J., Popper, S. W., & Bankes, S. C. (2003). Shaping the next one hundred years: New methods for quantitative, long-term policy analysis. RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/MR1626	3a-2
PB42	Li, H. (2026). The calibration turn in AI-assisted research: A conceptual and methodological framework for evidence-licensed claims. arXiv:2606.31273.	3c-6
PB43	Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. Russell Sage Foundation.	3c-6

Part ID	Deduplicated bibliographic record	Paper(s)
PB44	Lipton, P. (2004). Inference to the best explanation (2nd ed.). Routledge.	3a-2
PB45	Longino, H. E. (1990). Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry. Princeton University Press.	3c-7
PB46	Luhmann, N. (1979). Trust and power: Two works (H. Davis, J. Raffan, & K. Rooney, Trans.). John Wiley & Sons.	3b-5
PB47	Mayo, D. G. (2018). Statistical inference as severe testing: How to get beyond the statistics wars. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107286184	3c-8
PB48	Merton, R. K. (1987). Three fragments from a sociologist's notebooks: Establishing the phenomenon, specified ignorance, and strategic research materials. Annual Review of Sociology, 13, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.13.080187.000245	3a-2
PB49	Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550	3c-7
PB50	Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., Spitzer, E., Raji, I. D., & Gebru, T. (2019). Model cards for model reporting. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 220–229. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596	3c-6
PB51	Moreau, L., Groth, P., Cheney, J., Lebo, T., & Miles, S. (2015). The rationale of PROV. Web Semantics, 35, 235-257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2015.04.001	3c-8
PB52	Nissenbaum, H. (1996). Accountability in a computerized society. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2, 25–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02639315	3c-6
PB53	Nyman, L. (2015). Understanding Code Forking in Open Source Software: An Examination of Code Forking, Its Effect on Open Source Software, and How It Is Viewed and Practiced by Developers. Hanken School of Economics.	3c-7
PB54	O'Mahony, S., & Ferraro, F. (2007). The emergence of governance in an open source community. Academy of Management Journal, 50(5), 1079-1106. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.27169153	3c-7
PB55	Ostrom, E. (2005). Understanding Institutional Diversity. Princeton University Press.	3c-7
PB56	Parrondo, J. M. R., Horowitz, J. M., & Sagawa, T. (2015). Thermodynamics of information. Nature Physics, 11(2), 131-139. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3230	3b-3
PB57	Platt, J. R. (1964). Strong inference. Science, 146(3642), 347-353. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.146.3642.347	3a-1
PB58	Power, M. (1999). The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198296034.001.0001	3c-6, 3c-7, 3c-8
PB59	Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., Smith-Loud, J., Theron, D., & Barnes, P. (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873	3c-6
PB60	Rudner, R. (1953). The scientist qua scientist makes value judgments. Philosophy of Science, 20(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1086/287231	3a-2, 3c-8
PB61	Sahdev, D., Sundararaman, R., & Modgil, M. S. (2006). The Gödel universe: A practical travel guide. arXiv:gr-qc/0611093. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.gr-qc/0611093	3a-1
PB62	Sartorio, C. (2004). How to be responsible for something without causing it. Philosophical Perspectives, 18, 315-336. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1520-8583.2004.00031.x	3b-4
PB63	Selbst, A. D., boyd, d., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598	3c-6
PB64	Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99-118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852	3a-1
PB65	Smithson, M. (1989). Ignorance and uncertainty: Emerging paradigms. Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3628-3	3a-2

Part ID	Deduplicated bibliographic record	Paper(s)
PB66	Sperber, D., Clément, F., Heintz, C., Mascaro, O., Mercier, H., Origgi, G., & Wilson, D. (2010). Epistemic vigilance. Mind & Language, 25(4), 359-393. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0017.2010.01394.x	3b-5
PB67	Stanford, P. K. (2006). Exceeding our grasp: Science, history, and the problem of unconceived alternatives. Oxford University Press.	3a-2
PB68	Stewart, K. J. (2003). Trust transfer on the World Wide Web. Organization Science, 14(1), 5-17. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.1.5.12810	3b-5
PB69	Stigler, G. J. (1971). The theory of economic regulation. The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science, 2(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003160	3c-7
PB70	Szangolies, J. (2018). Epistemic horizons and the foundations of quantum mechanics. Foundations of Physics, 48(12), 1669-1697. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-018-0221-9	3a-1
PB71	Thompson, D. F. (1980). Moral responsibility of public officials: The problem of many hands. American Political Science Review, 74(4), 905-916. https://doi.org/10.2307/1954312	3b-4
PB72	Timmermans, S., & Berg, M. (1997). Standardization in action: Achieving local universality through medical protocols. Social Studies of Science, 27(2), 273-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631297027002003	3c-7
PB73	Toulmin, S. E. (1958). The Uses of Argument. Cambridge University Press.	3c-6, 3c-8
PB74	Ulrich, W. (1987). Critical heuristics of social systems design. European Journal of Operational Research, 31(3), 276-283. https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(87)90036-1	3c-8
PB75	Walker, M. U. (2006). Moral repair: Reconstructing moral relations after wrongdoing. Cambridge University Press.	3b-5
PB76	Wittgenstein, L. (1969). On certainty (G. E. M. Anscombe & G. H. von Wright, Eds.; D. Paul & G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Basil Blackwell.	3b-5
PB77	Wolpert, D. H. (2008). Physical limits of inference. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 237(9), 1257-1281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2008.03.040	3a-1

3. Cross-paper publication-identity control

Publication identity	Paper-local uses	Control
Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed., enlarged). University of Chicago Press.	3a-1: C / OVL / 0; §11, endnote 8. Paradigm stabilisation and retrospective reconstruction provide a science-historical specialisation of stabilisation and lost branch visibility; paradigm theory is not inherited. 3a-2: C / OVL / 0; §11, endnote 7. Paradigm stabilisation supplies a science-historical comparator for retrospective inevitability. The paper generalises stabilisation and branch-memory without inheriting paradigm theory.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.
Rudner, R. (1953). The scientist qua scientist makes value judgments. Philosophy of Science, 20(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1086/287231	3a-2: C / OVL / 0; §10, endnote 5. Inductive risk makes consequences of error relevant to acceptance. This paper keeps action thresholds under residual distinct from stronger truth or explanatory closure. 3c-8: C / SPEC / 0; §8, endnote 7. Inductive risk specialises consequence-sensitive acceptance and action thresholds. Action under residual remains distinct from truth or closure status.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.

Publication identity	Paper-local uses	Control
Albantakis, L., & Tononi, G. (2015). The intrinsic cause-effect power of discrete dynamical systems—From elementary cellular automata to adapting animats. Entropy, 17(8), 5472-5502. https://doi.org/10.3390/e17085472	3b-3: C / OVL / 0; §5, endnote 4. Intrinsic cause-effect power is a comparator for physically constrained counterfactual fields. CIF does not inherit IIT's intrinsic integration requirements. 3c-8: C / SPEC / 0; §4, endnote 3. Intrinsic cause-effect repertoires formally specialise physically supported counterfactual possibility fields in conditional Power audits. IIT is not inherited as technical ground.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.
Chockler, H., & Halpern, J. Y. (2004). Responsibility and blame: A structural-model approach. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 22, 93-115. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1391	3b-4: C / OVL / 0; §7, endnote 4. Structural-model degrees of responsibility are an examined comparator. The Responsibility Gradient is ordinal and relational, not their universal scalar allocation. 3c-8: C / SPEC / 0; §4, endnote 3. Structural-model responsibility formally specialises conditional counterfactual attribution. TEM retains NTC/IPL/Power and Provenance/Warrant distinctions without inheriting a universal scalar.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.
Power, M. (1999). The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198296034.001.0001	3c-6: C / SPEC / 0; §10, endnote 9. Institutional auditing supplies a critical comparator for proportional formalisation. Forms, compliance, and auditability must not replace relation-preservation. 3c-7: C / SPEC / 0; §2, endnote 1. Verification limits and dysfunctional audit effects supply a comparator for form-as-authority. Governance retains relation-preservation, residual, comparison, safeguard, and update. 3c-8: C / SPEC / 0; §9, endnote 8. Institutional auditing is a direct comparator for method-compliance hardening into compliance ritual. Procedural completion does not establish relation-preservation.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.
Toulmin, S. E. (1958). The Uses of Argument. Cambridge University Press.	3c-6: C / SPEC / 0; §9, endnote 7. Structured practical justification is a historical comparator. The claim packet does not adopt the Toulmin model and includes distinct finite-access and reliance-path burdens. 3c-8: C / OVL / 0; §2, endnote 1. Practical argumentation is a structural neighbour. The claim path additionally carries indexed finite-access, carrier, reliance, residual, safeguard, and update burdens without adopting the Toulmin framework.	Same publication identity; each paper-local relation remains separately recoverable. Recurrence does not strengthen inheritance.

4. Paper-local relation register

Local relation descriptions below are bounded support summaries of the cited Issue 1 endnotes. Existing publication IDs, maturity codes, class/tag/inheritance values, holds, and residuals are retained. Paper numbering and note/section locators have been reconciled; repeated citations remain separate local relations.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB23	3a-1	Gödel	—	F / DEP / 1	§9, endnote 7. Gödel's incompleteness theorem is the exact formal exemplar and a narrowly scoped operational dependency. The wider horizon grammar is not inherited from Gödel.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB32	3a-1	Humphreys	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§6, endnote 4. Computational epistemic opacity supplies a procedural-path comparator. Procedural Availability Horizon generalises beyond computation and remains distinct from internally disclosed closure limits.
PB33	3a-1	Husserl	—	P / N-A / 0	§3, endnote 1. Horizon terminology has phenomenological provenance. The paper's locus-relative, non-conscious availability/closure grammar is not inherited from phenomenology.
PB34	3a-1	Hutchins	A3	C / OVL / 0	§6, endnote 3. Distributed cognition provides a comparator for coupled loci. Coupling here does not establish a distributed mind or cognition.
PB39	3a-1	Kuhn	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 8. Paradigm stabilisation and retrospective reconstruction provide a science-historical specialisation of stabilisation and lost branch visibility; paradigm theory is not inherited.
PB57	3a-1	Platt	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§11, endnote 9. Discriminating alternatives through strong inference specialises comparator discipline. The paper generalises beyond empirical hypotheses and distinguishes epistemic alternatives from causal branches.
PB61	3a-1	Sahdev	—	P / N-A / 0	§8, endnote 5. Terminological disambiguation only: the Gödel-spacetime use of "Gödel horizon" is unrelated to this epistemic and methodological grammar.
PB64	3a-1	Simon	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§4, endnote 2. Bounded rationality supplies a restricted decision-theoretic comparator. Soft Horizon generalises purpose-indexed provisional closure and retains residual and update; no bounded-rationality machinery is inherited.
PB70	3a-1	Szangolies	A3	C / OVL / 0	§8, endnote 6. Quantum-foundational epistemic horizons are an examined comparator. The broader typed availability/closure grammar inherits no quantum or categorical machinery.
PB77	3a-1	Wolpert	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§13, endnote 10. Physical inference limits supply a formal specialisation. The claim that finite systems move rather than abolish horizons does not adopt the inference-device formalism.
PB11	3a-2	Chamberlin	—	P / N-A / 0	§7, endnote 3. Multiple working hypotheses provide a methodological precursor. The live field adds admissibility, positive exclusion, heterogeneous weighting, residual, and branch-memory.
PB15	3a-2	Douglas	A3	C / OVL / 0	§10, endnote 5. Inductive risk makes consequences of error relevant to acceptance. This paper keeps action thresholds under residual distinct from stronger truth or explanatory closure.
PB18	3a-2	Fischhoff	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 7. Hindsight bias supplies a comparator for outcome knowledge distorting what was previously knowable. Preserve contemporaneous alternatives and avoid retrospective inevitability.
PB24	3a-2	Gross	A3	C / OVL / 0	§2, endnote 1. Differentiated and dynamic not-knowing supplies an unknown-status comparator. This paper indexes unknown-status to relation, locus, availability, and closure demand without technical inheritance.
PB39	3a-2	Kuhn	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 7. Paradigm stabilisation supplies a science-historical comparator for retrospective inevitability. The paper generalises stabilisation and branch-memory without inheriting paradigm theory.
PB41	3a-2	Lempert	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§10, endnote 6. Robust adaptive policy under deep uncertainty specialises corrigible action. The quantitative decision method is not inherited.
PB44	3a-2	Lipton	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§9, endnote 4. Inference to the best explanation is a comparator. Best Available Formulation is broader in purpose and weaker in closure; explanatory bestness does not supply truth.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB48	3a-2	Merton	—	P / N-A / 0	§6, endnote 2. Specified ignorance is historical provenance for making unknowns inquiry-directing. Residual adds an unmet closure condition, a blocked stronger claim, and an update route.
PB60	3a-2	Rudner	A3	C / OVL / 0	§10, endnote 5. Inductive risk makes consequences of error relevant to acceptance. This paper keeps action thresholds under residual distinct from stronger truth or explanatory closure.
PB65	3a-2	Smithson	A3	C / OVL / 0	§2, endnote 1. Differentiated and dynamic not-knowing supplies an unknown-status comparator. This paper indexes unknown-status to relation, locus, availability, and closure demand without technical inheritance.
PB67	3a-2	Stanford	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 7. Unconceived alternatives challenge the inference that eliminating considered candidates exhausts the serious live field. Finite-field incompleteness remains residual.
PB01	3b-3	Albantakis	A3	C / OVL / 0	§8, endnote 5. Actual-causation exclusion is a comparator, not this paper's Counterfactual Exclusion: a relevant alternative already in the CIF is not equivalently realised. No IIT formalism is imported.
PB02	3b-3	Albantakis	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 4. Intrinsic cause-effect power is a comparator for physically constrained counterfactual fields. CIF does not inherit IIT's intrinsic integration requirements.
PB06	3b-3	Bartlett	A3	C / OVL / 0	§3, endnote 1. Causal leverage density is an intervention-based semantic-information comparator. Primitive Power instead uses NTC/IPL-localised branch potential without requiring semantic status, viability, or a universal scalar.
PB09	3b-3	Cartwright	A3	C / OVL / 0	§4, endnote 2. Causal capacities provide a potential-before-manifestation comparator. Primitive Power retains its own IPL, operative-distinction, comparator, and branch-field discriminator.
PB14	3b-3	Dahl	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 7. Relational social power supplies a counterfactual difference-making comparator. Primitive Power requires no person, intention, compliance, or social role.
PB37	3b-3	Klyubin	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§5, endnote 3. Empowerment is an agent-centric action-channel specialisation of potential influence. CIF requires neither an agent, sensorimotor loop, nor scalar channel capacity.
PB56	3b-3	Parrondo	—	F / DEP / 1	§9, endnote 6. Narrow thermodynamic dependency for physical carriers, work, entropy, and lawful energetic accounting. The distinction-conditioned branch architecture is not inferred from thermodynamics alone.
PB12	3b-4	Chockler	A3	C / OVL / 0	§7, endnote 4. Structural-model degrees of responsibility are an examined comparator. The Responsibility Gradient is ordinal and relational, not their universal scalar allocation.
PB16	3b-4	Elish	A3	C / CON / 0	§10, endnote 7. Moral crumple zones specialise proximity and role distortions. The audit must recover distributed transformations rather than assign provenance from the nearest accountable human.
PB17	3b-4	Fearnley	A3	C / OVL / 0	§8, endnote 5. Omission responsibility supplies a non-application comparator. This paper additionally requires Immediate-Frame availability, governance of application or withholding, and material contribution under comparison.
PB28	3b-4	Hart	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§10, endnote 6. The responsibility taxonomy is a precursor to separating causal contribution, role, and liability. The Provenance/Warrant distinction is not inherited from that taxonomy.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB31	3b-4	Hu	—	P / N-A / 0	§5, endnote 2. Agentic-AI responsibility provenance is a functionally significant adjacency and independent convergence. The primitive locus-indexed account does not inherit its tensor or agentic framework.
PB62	3b-4	Sartorio	A3	C / CON / 0	§2, endnote 1. Moral responsibility without causation is an adversarial boundary comparator. Primitive Responsibility remains causal-attributional; mature Responsibility Warrants may use additional grounds.
PB71	3b-4	Thompson	A3	C / OVL / 0	§6, endnote 3. The many-hands problem supplies a mature-domain comparator for distributed responsibility. Provenance remains a graph of local distinction-conditioned transformations.
PB03	3b-5	Alfano	—	P / N-A / 0	§7, endnote 6. Exact-term provenance for vicarious trust in mediated interpersonal reliance with delegation and ratification. The paper generalises to outsourced closure-work across persons and other carriers.
PB04	3b-5	Baier	A3	C / CON / 0	§10, endnote 9. Vulnerability and betrayal in mature interpersonal trust provide adversarial scope pressure. Primitive reliance closure is intentionally lower-level; mature normative structures are recovered separately.
PB19	3b-5	Gambetta	A3	C / OVL / 0	§6, endnote 5. Expectation under uncertainty supplies a threshold comparator. The paper's trust threshold is not inherently probabilistic or restricted to agent-to-agent relations.
PB21	3b-5	Gillespie	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§11, endnote 10. Organisational trust repair specialises correction of failure-generating conditions. General repair must restore, narrow, or refuse reduced audit; reassurance alone is insufficient.
PB22	3b-5	Gilly	A3	C / OVL / 0	§10, endnote 8. Platform-specific trust laundering is an examined comparator and independent-convergence candidate. No developmental dependence or inheritance is established.
PB25	3b-5	Habets	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 4. Basic trust in skilled environmental engagement is a human ecological comparator. The paper grounds a broader retained and updateable reliance function under residual.
PB26	3b-5	Hardwig	A3	C / OVL / 0	§7, endnote 6. Epistemic dependence is a comparator for reliance where individuals cannot reconstruct all evidence locally. Outsourced closure-work retains residual and refuses automatic warrant transfer.
PB29	3b-5	Hawley	A3	C / CON / 0	§10, endnote 9. The commitment-based distinction between trust and mere reliance supplies adversarial scope pressure. The paper explicitly uses a lower reliance-closure function.
PB36	3b-5	Johansson	—	P / N-A / 0	§9, endnote 7. Prior trust-carrier terminology in organisational accounting is acknowledged. Carrier status is generalised while reliance-strength remains distinct from Responsibility Provenance.
PB40	3b-5	Lee	A3	C / OVL / 0	§12, endnote 11. Human-automation trust specialises calibration of reliance. The paper generalises carrier, residual, threshold, safeguard, update, and affected-locus controls without inheriting a human-factors primitive.
PB46	3b-5	Luhmann	—	P / N-A / 0	§2, endnote 2. Social complexity reduction supplies a precursor. Branch-space economy is broader, indexed to finite locus, closure demand, residual, threshold, audit, and update; systems theory is not inherited.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB66	3b-5	Sperber	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§3, endnote 3. Epistemic vigilance specialises rechecking in communication. Primitive audit extends relation-revalidation beyond communicative, propositional, or human cases.
PB68	3b-5	Stewart	—	P / N-A / 0	§9, endnote 7. Trust transfer through organisational association and linkage is a separate provenance relation. The paper generalises carrier-mediated reliance without transferring Responsibility Provenance.
PB75	3b-5	Walker	A3	C / CON / 0	§10, endnote 9. Moral repair of damaged normative trust supplies adversarial scope pressure. The paper distinguishes primitive trust failure from richer agency- and norm-sensitive repair.
PB76	3b-5	Wittgenstein	—	P / N-A / 0	§2, endnote 1. Practical limits to repeated justification provide philosophical provenance. The finite-locus reliance account inherits no language-game epistemology and does not make continuation closure.
PB05	3c-6	Baron	—	E / N-A / 1	§12, endnote 11. Outcome-bias evidence supports the separation of decision quality from outcome success. It is an empirical operational dependency only, without wider framework inheritance.
PB07	3c-6	Bloomfield	A3	C / OVL / 0	§9, endnote 8. Assurance 2.0 is a close methodological specialisation organising claims, evidence, defeaters, and residual doubts. The paper generalises beyond assurance of critical properties.
PB08	3c-6	Bowker	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 4. Infrastructural classifications and standards supply a comparator. TEM adds the recoverable relation, locus, abstraction, evidence, residual, safeguard, and update burden.
PB20	3c-6	Gebru	—	P / N-A / 0	§7, endnote 6. Dataset documentation specialises provenance, composition, intended use, and limitations. The general claim packet carries additional relation, closure, comparison, residual, and action burdens.
PB35	3c-6	Ionescu	—	P / N-A / 0	§4, endnote 3. Epistemic debt as accumulated technical ignorance in smart manufacturing supplies prior terminology. The present usage concerns deferred grounding of load-bearing claims; no inheritance is claimed.
PB42	3c-6	Li	—	P / N-A / 0	§4, endnote 3. Epistemic debt as deferred verification in AI-assisted research is an independent terminology use. The present load-bearing-grounding account makes no priority or inheritance claim.
PB43	3c-6	Lipsky	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§3, endnote 1. Street-level discretion specialises situated judgement under rules and resource limits. The paper generalises recoverability of consequential judgement without inheriting the institutional theory.
PB50	3c-6	Mitchell	—	P / N-A / 0	§7, endnote 6. Model documentation specialises evaluation conditions, intended use, and limitations. The general claim packet carries additional relation, closure, comparison, residual, and action burdens.
PB52	3c-6	Nissenbaum	A3	C / OVL / 0	§3, endnote 2. Computerised accountability barriers are a comparator for non-transfer and non-erasure of responsibility. Responsibility Provenance/Warrant remains inherited from GOT.
PB58	3c-6	Power	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§10, endnote 9. Institutional auditing supplies a critical comparator for proportional formalisation. Forms, compliance, and auditability must not replace relation-preservation.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB59	3c-6	Raji	A3	C / OVL / 0	§11, endnote 10. Lifecycle algorithmic auditing specialises prospective and retrospective recoverability. The general claim path does not make documentation or organisational audit epistemic warrant.
PB63	3c-6	Selbst	A3	C / OVL / 0	§7, endnote 5. Fairness abstraction traps specialise the failure of machine execution to repair upstream under-specification. The argument extends beyond fairness and machine learning.
PB73	3c-6	Toulmin	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§9, endnote 7. Structured practical justification is a historical comparator. The claim packet does not adopt the Toulmin model and includes distinct finite-access and reliance-path burdens.
PB13	3c-7	Cihon	A3	C / OVL / 0	§9, endnote 8. AI certification specialises the certification-closure guardrail. A certificate remains a scoped operational trust carrier with residual and re-audit conditions, not epistemic ground.
PB27	3c-7	Hart	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§7, endnote 6. Legal rules of change specialise amendment grammar. Legitimate epistemic revision requires demonstrated relational failure and comparative preservation, beyond authorised procedure.
PB30	3c-7	Hirschman	A3	C / OVL / 0	§8, endnote 7. Exit and voice supply an organisational-response comparator for dissent and alternatives. A method fork is not merely exit and dissent is not merely voice.
PB45	3c-7	Longino	A3	C / OVL / 0	§4, endnote 3. Social critical interaction supplies an objectivity comparator. Public challenge can expose relational failure but participation or consensus does not establish epistemic standing.
PB49	3c-7	Meyer	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§2, endnote 1. Institutional decoupling supplies a comparator for formal legitimacy without corresponding practice. Governance carriers must preserve recoverable relation rather than symbolic authority.
PB53	3c-7	Nyman	A3	P/C / SPEC / 0	§8, endnote 7. Competitive forks supply prior terminology and an open-source operational specialisation. A rival method must preserve comparison, residual, scope, and update to serve correction.
PB54	3c-7	O'Mahony	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§6, endnote 5. Corrigible authority in an open-source community is an operational governance comparator. Democratic or custodial authority may govern correction without creating epistemic strength by status.
PB55	3c-7	Ostrom	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 4. Institutional operational/collective/constitutional choice levels specialise level separation. The method's own three levels do not inherit IAD or institutional rule-making authority.
PB58	3c-7	Power	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§2, endnote 1. Verification limits and dysfunctional audit effects supply a comparator for form-as-authority. Governance retains relation-preservation, residual, comparison, safeguard, and update.
PB69	3c-7	Stigler	A3	C / OVL / 0	§3, endnote 2. Regulatory capture is a restricted domain specialisation. The wider capture account covers pressures weakening relation-preserving burdens; no public-choice framework is inherited.
PB72	3c-7	Timmermans	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 4. Local universality specialises workable situated adaptation of protocols. It does not supply the method's governance framework.

Part ID	Paper	Source	Maturity	Class / tag / inheritance	Locator and local relation
PB02	3c-8	Albantakis	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§4, endnote 3. Intrinsic cause-effect repertoires formally specialise physically supported counterfactual possibility fields in conditional Power audits. IIT is not inherited as technical ground.
PB10	3c-8	Cartwright	A3	C / CON / 0	§9, endnote 8. Heterogeneous scientific reliability supplies adversarial pressure against a universal method guarantee. TEM cannot replace domain judgement or create closure by completion.
PB12	3c-8	Chockler	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§4, endnote 3. Structural-model responsibility formally specialises conditional counterfactual attribution. TEM retains NTC/IPL/Power and Provenance/Warrant distinctions without inheriting a universal scalar.
PB38	3c-8	Knobloch	—	P / N-A / 0	§3, endnote 2. Relational uncertainty has prior interpersonal-communication usage. TEM uses a different indexed relation-preservation meaning; this is terminology provenance and disambiguation, not inheritance.
PB47	3c-8	Mayo	A3	C / OVL / 0	§6, endnote 6. Evidential severity specialises discriminatory comparator pressure. The method neither inherits error-statistical formalism nor restricts comparison to statistical inference.
PB51	3c-8	Moreau	A3	C / OVL / 0	§5, endnote 5. PROV-style provenance specialises recoverable entity/activity/agent paths. Provenance or record recovery does not by itself supply epistemic warrant.
PB58	3c-8	Power	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§9, endnote 8. Institutional auditing is a direct comparator for method-compliance hardening into compliance ritual. Procedural completion does not establish relation-preservation.
PB60	3c-8	Rudner	A3	C / SPEC / 0	§8, endnote 7. Inductive risk specialises consequence-sensitive acceptance and action thresholds. Action under residual remains distinct from truth or closure status.
PB73	3c-8	Toulmin	A3	C / OVL / 0	§2, endnote 1. Practical argumentation is a structural neighbour. The claim path additionally carries indexed finite-access, carrier, reliance, residual, safeguard, and update burdens without adopting the Toulmin framework.
PB74	3c-8	Ulrich	A3	C / OVL / 0	§4, endnote 4. Critical Systems Heuristics specialises explicit boundaries and affected parties. The method is broader than normative systems design and does not inherit that framework.

5. Hold / exclusion branch-memory

Paper	Held / excluded candidates	Control and update condition
3a-1	Turing (1937); Clark & Chalmers (1998); Floridi (2008).	Retain as formal computability, extended-mind, and abstraction neighbours where locally redundant or scope-misaligned. Reopen only if those narrower relations become load-bearing in Paper 3a-1.

Paper	Held / excluded candidates	Control and update condition
3a-2	Alchourrón, Gärdenfors & Makinson (1985); Knight (1921); Simon (1955); Walley (1991); adaptive-management literature including Williams et al.	Retain formal belief-revision, risk/uncertainty, satisficing, imprecise-probability, and adaptive-management neighbours. Reopen only if Paper 3a-2 adopts the corresponding formal or decision architecture.
3b-3	Woodward interventionism; Kolchinsky & Wolpert semantic information; control-theoretic controllability; Hoel causal emergence; Cheng causal-power accounts.	Hold where the neighbour either imports a stronger architecture, duplicates the admitted causal/potential comparators, or shifts from primitive branch potential into higher-order causal or control structure.
3b-4	Fan Mingdi terminology lead; Fischer & Ravizza; Matthias; van de Poel; Cheney-style provenance; Meliou-style responsibility/accountability formalisms.	Hold mature moral-responsibility, responsibility-gap, distributed-responsibility, and provenance programmes unless Paper 3b-4 adopts their stronger agency, normative, or formal machinery. Terminology-only leads remain non-published.
3b-5	O'Neill (2014); Jacovi et al. (2021); Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995); Giddens (1990); Ratcliffe (2008); Hoff & Bashir (2015).	Hold normative trustworthiness, explainability/trust, organisational, phenomenological, and automation specialisations where redundant with the admitted set or stronger than the primitive reliance-closure claim.
3c-6	W3C PROV / provenance standards; Gallie-style essentially contested concepts; Kroll et al. accountability; broader assurance/audit frameworks already locally redundant.	Reopen only if provenance formalism, contested-concept theory, or algorithmic accountability becomes a direct technical dependency rather than a comparator to recoverability.
3c-7	Lessig and wider code/regulation programmes; broader standards, accreditation, conformity-assessment, and institutional capture literatures.	Hold where operational governance is informative but does not improve the paper-specific discriminator: amendment and authority remain answerable to demonstrated relation-preservation.
3c-8	Metcalf et al. (2023); O'Neill (2014); Tim Kelly, Arguing Safety (1998); generic 'epistemic method', 'epistemic audit', and 'relational audit' term families.	Hold machine-specific accountability, normative trustworthiness, safety-case assurance, and generic terminology where they do not reproduce the full integrated audit architecture or are redundant with stronger admitted comparators.

6. Paper-level search residual

Paper	Residual carried forward
3a-1	Further proof-theoretic families; phenomenology/direct realism; institutional ignorance; legal access; archival/lost alternatives; verification/interpretability; non-English and inaccessible work.

Paper	Residual carried forward
3a-2	Further formal revision/uncertainty calculi; risk traditions; adaptive management; imprecise probability; non-English/inaccessible scholarship; terminology-independent analogues.
3b-3	Control theory; interventionist causation; causal emergence; semantic information; agency/control measures; social-power genealogies; thermodynamic work-channel formalisms; unrecognised cross-disciplinary branch-potential analogues.
3b-4	Moral/legal responsibility; omission; distributed agency; accountability; provenance; responsibility gaps; formal causal responsibility; institutional allocation; non-English/inaccessible work.
3b-5	Attachment/developmental trust; phenomenology; games; fiduciary/legal reliance; legitimacy/certification; trust transfer and repair; machine trust; non-English/inaccessible work.
3c-6	Legal/administrative formalisation; public-sector discretion; standards/certification; organisational categories; assurance/safety cases; algorithmic audit; non-English/inaccessible work.
3c-7	Jurisprudential amendment; accreditation/conformity assessment; metascience; fork governance; public participation; verification/validation; AI certification; non-English/inaccessible work.
3c-8	Further formal epistemology; legal evidence; systems assurance; audit standards; reliability theory; methodology critique; domain-specific implementations; non-English/inaccessible work.

7. Inheritance and dependency controls

Control	Rule
Citation does not transfer warrant	A publication remains evidence of a recoverable relation, not authority for the paper's discriminator.
Adjacency does not imply inheritance	A2/A3 relations remain comparator/adjacency relations unless a separate inheritance audit promotes them.
Indexed Inheritance	No current Part 3 paper-level bibliography relation is promoted here to inheritance level 2.
Formal / technical dependency	Gödel (1931) is F / DEP / 1 in Paper 3a-1 for the formal incompleteness exemplar. Parrondo, Horowitz & Sagawa (2015) is F / DEP / 1 in Paper 3b-3 only for the thermodynamic ground of information processing/work/entropy. Neither transfers the wider originating framework.
Empirical dependency	Baron & Hershey (1988) is E / N-A / 1 in Paper 3c-6 for outcome bias; the wider decision-psychology framework is not inherited.
Provenance remains local	P-class entries recover terminology or intellectual provenance without importing external machinery.

Control	Rule
Comparator pressure remains local	C-class entries state overlap, contradiction, or specialisation without becoming a Part-wide dependency.
Conditional audit repetition	Albantakis & Tononi and Chockler & Halpern recur in Paper 3c-8 because the integrated method audits Power/Responsibility claims; that repetition does not make their formalisms TEM dependencies.

8. Part residual and bounded discovery statement

This reconciliation checks the Issue 1 reference lists and local endnotes; it does not conduct a new external discovery pass or promote relation classifications. The earlier paper-level discovery and delta/posture work is not an exhaustive prior-art search. The consolidated register preserves the strongest examined neighbourhoods, holds, exclusions, and current source identities. No further material adjacency was identified within the searched fields and search conditions for the completed paper-level passes. Unsearched, inaccessible, non-English, later-published, or unrecognised terminology-independent adjacency remains residual.

9. Series handoff

This register is ready to feed the Series Master Bibliography. At Series level, the 77 Part 3 publication identities may be deduplicated again against Parts 1 and 2, but each Part 3 paper-local relation must remain separately recoverable. The Series pass must not treat repeated authors, repeated publications, or repeated comparator neighbourhoods as evidence of framework-level inheritance.

10. Release checklist

Checklist item	Required condition
Current paper lock	GOT-V1-3a-1 through GOT-V1-3c-8, all Issue 1: current filenames and SHA16 values match the eight canonical papers.
Directional support dependency	SD-01 -> SD-02 -> SD-03 -> SD-04; no circular hash dependency.
Paper-local authority	Paper endnotes/references remain authoritative for local reader-facing source relations.
Deduplication	77 unique publication identities from 84 local occurrences; duplicate identities remain explicitly controlled.
Inheritance	No Indexed Inheritance created by consolidation. Operational dependencies remain scoped and local.
Branch-memory	Held/excluded/scoped candidates remain recoverable with update conditions.
Residual	No exhaustive prior-art claim; search limits remain explicit.

Checklist item	Required condition
Support scope	Only Papers 3a-1–3c-8 enter the Part 3 canonical support lock; contextual essays and downstream extensions remain outside it.
Release discipline	Any later saved edit to a source-locked paper or support document requires hash refresh and downstream reconciliation.