


The shape everything shares

Four vaults, one chain, different segments of it:

AIUC-1	standard -> control -> requirement -> attestation -> con
LICENCE	grant -> mandate -> DELTA -> policy -> covered / not cov
THIS VAULT	entity -> instrument -> provision -> obligation -> contr

They overlap at **control**, **evidence** and **acceptance**. That is not a coincidence — it is the same risk-acceptance grammar applied to three different sources of obligation: a standard, a mandate, and a statute.

This vault supplies the third one, which none of the others had.



Seven vaults from across the family, each opening in the page from its own read key.

What we take: the two-edge rule

The AIUC-1 conformance vault keeps two edges *"never traversed in one query without the query naming which it used"*:

EDGE	ANSWERS	ABSENT MEANS
evidenced_by	does the standard say this?	a build defect
attested_by	does this subject do this?	the control is unevidenced — which is the finding

We do the same thing on a different axis. ung: is what UnGovr publish; sg: is our model; exactly one edge crosses between them and it is drawn inferred.

Their rule is enforced by a test that goes red if a layer edge reaches a source_observation. Ours is enforced by a build check that fails if any page names sg:resolvesTo without marking it inferred.

What we take: unevidenced is a state

From the same vault: *"Every control in scope gets a row whether or not anyone has looked at it, so an absent row is never quietly read as compliance."*

Their first build of one subject across 53 controls: **2 evidenced, 48 unevidenced, 3 contradicted** — *"the designed answer, not a failure to finish."*

Our evidence node ships `unevidenced` **and our acceptance node ships with no owner.** Both are the default, both stay, and both mean *nobody has looked* rather than *nothing is wrong*.

What we contribute: a jurisdiction layer

327,138 entities. 398 records laws. 254 of them sub-national.

A `policy/v1` that covers an agent acting for a public body has to know **which body, and which law binds it**. Neither the Licence to Operate vault nor the conformance layer carries that, and neither should have to build it.

This vault is that lookup — with the honest caveat attached, which is that the entity-to-law edge is **inferred**, reaches 96.6%, and hands 20.5% of matches to a human.

ungovr.providers.sgit.ai

part ofsgit.ai

PROVIDER REPORT

v0.1.15

The report

The finding

The vault

Patterns

Try it

Evidence

★ Source

Independent. No commercial relationship with UnGovr — no funding, no agreement, no conversation of any kind — checked 9 September 2026. Disclosures · how every claim here is evidenced

ungovr.providers.sgit.ai / The seven-step join — one entity, one clause, one acceptance

The seven-step join — one entity, one clause, one acceptance

One county. One law. One acceptance. And a refusal to widen it — because one instrument modelled properly beats forty sketched, and a vault that tries to be a complete ontology of government ships nothing.

Prose from the government-graph vault `dkecltsr`, 9 September 2026. The join was built in this session from bytes retrieved in this session. When the vault moves ahead, this page is behind — and says so rather than guessing.

ON THIS PAGE

How to read it · The three rules that are the argument · Two vocabularies, and why they must not merge · What is out of this MVP, said here rather than left to be noticed

How to read it

Two things are being said about every node, and they are different questions:

- **Origin** — whose claim is this? `ung`: is transcribed from UnGovr and **never edited, corrected, enriched or re-typed**. `akn`: is the instrument. `sg`: is our model.
- **Assertion class** — how strongly is it held? `asserted` or `inferred`.

Origin is carried by border and shape; assertion class by colour. Hue is already spent on the second, so the first cannot also use it. Merging them would lose both, and a reader checking this work should check that separation first.

How to read this.

`ung`: transcribed from UnGovr, never edited · `akn`: the instrument, anchored to its published citation · `sg`: our model. Origin is carried by border and shape; assertion class by colour. They are two different questions and merging them would lose both.

1

ung:us/ca/santa-barbara

UNG

ASSERTED

The jurisdiction layer this vault contributes, drawn as the graph it is.

What we contribute: a clock nobody negotiates

The conformance layer's headline mechanism is that **time breaks the policy**: move the date to 2027-01-15, *"with nothing edited by anybody"*, and one condition becomes **53 exclusions** — because the attestations behind them expire.

Our obligations expire on a different clock, and it is not ours.

Gov. Code § 7922.535(a): the agency shall determine and notify **within 10 calendar days**, extendable by 14 in unusual circumstances. Calendar days — office closures do not toll it.

An attestation expiry is a policy parameter somebody chose. **A statutory deadline is a fact about the world.** A conformance model that can carry both is strictly better than one that can only carry the first.

The delta, at zero

Licence to Operate's argument, made countable:

		IN THEIR DEMO
CAN DO — the grant	what the agent can technically reach	12 capabilities
MAY DO — the mandate	what is actually expected, and all the policy insures	4
THE DELTA	inside reach, outside authority. Nothing covers these	8

This vault's app declares `"permissions": []`.

CAN DO equals MAY DO. **The delta is zero** — not managed down, absent. It is the smallest possible instance of their argument, and it is why a stranger can open this vault read-only and be asked for nothing.


Where the three meet: an unowned acceptance

Our chain ends on `sg:acceptance/unassigned` — **no named owner, no review interval, no revocation path.**

Read through the conformance layer's vocabulary, that is not a gap in the diagram. It is a **conformance state**, and it is `unevidenced`.

Read through Licence to Operate's, it is not a condition on a policy. **It is an exclusion** — and the exclusion carries its reason in the control's own words: *an acceptance without an owner is a note.*

Three vaults, three vocabularies, one unfilled field, and all three agree on what it means. That is the strongest evidence so far that the grammar is real rather than a house style.



Where the three meet: the conformance layer, Licence to Operate and this vault, side by side.

What we took from the family, concretely

FROM	WHAT WE USED
Risk Graph Explorer	<code>PUBLIC.md</code> 's three rules for a vault whose read key is published. We added a fourth: nothing whose licence forbids republication
Regulation Graph	law-as-a-citable-graph, hash-verified to source bytes — the closest analogue to this work
AIUC-1 conformance	the two-edge rule, and <code>unevidenced</code> as a default rather than an absence
Licence to Operate	grant / mandate / delta, and the <code>policy/v1</code> shape
Risk Mandate	that a real application ships <i>as</i> a vault, with a release history
sgit.ai	the embed protocol — the read key posted to a pinned origin after a handshake, never in a URL


The one thing to build next

Make the obligation layer a `policy/v1` producer.

This vault already has the pieces: an entity, an instrument, an addressable-enough provision, a statutory deadline as a scalar, a control, and an acceptance with a named hole in it.

The missing step is emitting the conformance row — **one obligation, one control, one state, one `valid_until` driven by the statute rather than by an attestation** — in the shape the conformance layer already reads.

Then a policy could say: *this agent may file a records request on behalf of this body, in this jurisdiction, under this law, with this deadline* — and say what it does **not** prove.



The vault's own app — six views, and the version pill that says which release you are looking at.

What this does not prove

Borrowed deliberately from the conformance layer's own `does_not_prove` field:

- It does **not** prove Santa Barbara County complies with anything. The evidence node is `unevidenced` because **nobody has observed the county**.
- It does **not** prove UnGovr intend any of this. **No conversation has taken place**; every statement about their intentions is inference from what they publish.
- It does **not** prove the inferred edge is right for any particular entity. It reaches 96.6% and hands 20.5% of those to a human.
- It does **not** make anything citable by version. That release channel was **withdrawn**, and acceptance test 9 regressed to `unevidenced` rather than being left looking satisfied.