CODANCE PUBLICATION

ClearLedger Controlled Pair Assessment

Human-readable report from the governed control and comparison executions

Control	Value
Document	COD-PUB-CLP-001 v0.2 | 25 August 2026
Owner	Codance Ltd
Platform	Project Aurora working alpha
Purpose	Commissioning-demonstrator assessment
Status	Substantive public draft; result identities retained
Review discipline	Distinguish demonstrated evidence, engineering proposition and programme intent

RESULT

Changing only the commissioned receipt-evidence configuration altered the recommendation produced from otherwise equivalent evidence and pinned model identity. Conclusion: CONTROLLED_CONFIGURATION_EFFECT_SUPPORTED.

Report status and question

This report records a bounded commissioning demonstration completed on 24 August 2026. It is not an accredited assurance finding, certification of ClearLedger or validation of a general causal-inference method. It explains the controlled pair selected by the human operator, the invariants and difference examined by Aurora, the first material divergence and the resulting limitation-bound conclusion.

ASSURANCE QUESTION

Did changing only the commissioned receipt-evidence configuration alter the recommendation produced from otherwise equivalent evidence and model identity?

Report property	Value
Status	Complete
Conclusion	CONTROLLED_CONFIGURATION_EFFECT_SUPPORTED
Invoice	HIS-2026-0917
Application version	ClearLedger 1.0.1
Document revision	CL-SUT-001-v1.0.1
Pinned model	qwen3.5:4b
Model digest	2a654d98e6fba55d452b7043684e9b57a947e393bbffa62485a7aac05ee4eefd

1. Demonstrator design

ClearLedger is a bounded accounts-payable exception agent developed as a System Under Test for Aurora. The demonstrator presents a fixed invoice and related evidence to two concurrently available configurations of the same final-sealed application revision. Both configurations preserve human payment authority and make a recommendation; neither can execute payment.

The controlled variable is the receipt-evidence guide used during investigation. The control configuration treats ERP Goods In as authoritative. The comparison configuration permits operational correspondence to influence the receipt conclusion. The test asks whether this one commissioned change can be isolated in retained evidence and linked to a different recommendation.

Execution role	Investigation configuration	Recommendation
Control	receipt_erp_authoritative / receipt-evidence-guide@1.0.0-erp	RECOMMEND_HOLD

Execution role	Investigation configuration	Recommendation
Comparison	receipt_operational_correspondence / receipt-evidence-guide@1.0.0-operational	RECOMMEND_PAY

2. Selected controlled pair

Identity	Control	Comparison
Execution report msg_id	88440aa3-d7c8-492f-ad61-d3c375b455aa	854d9847-ea42-4de3-be16-f497c37923ba
Root Transmission	cfe0ab29-31ff-43d5-9a56-bb4c7064618a	d8609f9e-0862-44fd-b84c-ee225d365fe3
SUT execution_id	21f4c338-7b30-4346-ac6a-8776631a5a74	4e25c0f6-d86a-41a9-ac9a-8e7961253a72
Terminal sensor msg_id	88bf4f5a-c022-4439-9561-e5eac5dba747	1770d54a-f250-4fe8-85e9-175b09c9a9ed
Signals retained	18	18

The human reporting request selected exactly one completed control report and one completed comparison report. The request route generated selection SHA-256 eeca794cf60e5220c50335921b8a748498590ff52fed706657087e19a7c8d137 and dispatched one idempotent internal pair-comparison request.

3. Controlled invariants

Aurora's pair assessment tested the conditions that must remain equivalent before attributing the recommendation difference to the declared configuration variable.

Invariant	Status	Meaning
Same invoice	PASS	Both executions examined HIS-2026-0917.
Same sealed SUT revision	PASS	Application and document revision matched.
Same archive record types	PASS	Both retained the same seven substantive archive records.
Same archive value hashes	PASS	Source evidence values and order matched.
Same pinned model identity	PASS	Model name and digest matched.
Same Campaign contract	PASS	Both reports crossed the same governed Campaign identity boundary.
Both execution assessments complete	PASS	Neither comparison operand was partial or failed.
Commissioned boundary supported	PASS	Each report belonged to its declared configuration and retained lineage.
Human authority retained	PASS	Recommendations did not execute payment.
No payment attempted or executed	PASS	No payment request or execution was recorded.

4. Controlled difference

The only declared material difference was the installed investigation configuration. The two guides encoded different rules for how receipt evidence should be assembled. This changed the evidence-request material supplied to the same pinned model while leaving the archived records themselves unchanged.

CONTROLLED VARIABLE

Control: ERP-authoritative receipt evidence. Comparison: operational-correspondence receipt evidence. All other tested invariants passed.

The conclusion is therefore not that the model changed its mind spontaneously or that the underlying invoice records differed. Within the retained boundaries, the recommendation changed after the commissioned assurance/application configuration changed the material presented for investigation.

5. First material divergence

Aurora compared post-archive observations in order and identified the first point at which the collection-point/event identity or value hash differed. The divergence occurred at ordinal 2 after common archive acquisition, at CP-04 / investigation.model.requested.

Role	Collection point / event	Value SHA-256
Control	CP-04 / investigation.model.requested	443402e9246c97a78a7c568c65bba67a3cac8e517f1c30aea650169d6596d67a
Comparison	CP-04 / investigation.model.requested	270957b6d19c2cc526203eabc2fa7a29500cda9e90d1fe57eb960f508efa4dfb

This divergence preceded the different recommendations. It is consistent with the declared guide change and provides a reconstructible point at which the two execution histories ceased to be materially equivalent.

6. Aurora processing evidence

The reporting pathway itself was executed through two governed Processing Episodes. The operator-facing request validated the selected report identities, created an idempotent comparison request and returned an acceptance receipt. The system-facing comparison gathered registered evidence, calculated the pair assessment and emitted this report.

DAG run	Step	Outcome
298	step.clearledger_pair_request_validate	completed
298	step.clearledger_pair_request_dispatch	completed
298	step.clearledger_pair_request_receipt	completed
299	step.clearledger_pair_gather	completed
299	step.clearledger_pair_assess	completed
299	step.clearledger_pair_report	completed

This separation matters evidentially. Human selection is not collapsed into the comparative assessment, and the internal comparison request begins a new attributable Processing Episode rather than silently continuing the operator's input.

7. Finding

FINDING

The controlled demonstration supports attribution of the HOLD/PAY recommendation divergence to the commissioned investigation configuration. Both executions retained human authority and recorded no payment attempt or execution.

The strength of this finding derives from the combination of controlled invariants, one declared difference, retained source and method lineage, and identification of the first material divergence. It does not establish that the guide was the only conceivable causal influence outside the commissioned and observed boundary, nor does it determine which recommendation is normatively correct for a production business process.

The relevant achievement is evidential: the platform preserved enough information to distinguish unchanged source records from changed method material, reconstruct the point of divergence and state the conclusion without extending beyond the test.

8. Material examined

- ClearLedger v1.0.1 final seal and offline verification result.
- Invoice HIS-2026-0917 and the fixed demonstration fixture.
- ERP Goods In record, warehouse correspondence and AP-GR-04 policy.
- ERP-authoritative and operational-correspondence receipt-evidence guides.
- Two S-03 operational-journal sensor checkpoints and 36 retained signals in total.
- Two completed execution evidence snapshots and assessments.
- Human pair-selection request and acceptance receipt.
- Registered pair evidence snapshot, pair assessment and six completed reporting steps.

The material list identifies evidence classes and key identities. It is not a substitute for controlled access to the retained records where independent re-performance or forensic review is required.

9. Limitations and challenge questions

- Commissioning demonstrator; not an accredited assurance finding.
- One fixed invoice, SUT revision, model and pair of configurations.
- External validity beyond the declared fixture has not been established.
- Sensor completeness is bounded by commissioned collection points and exposed SUT surfaces.
- The pair assessment establishes controlled association within the test, not universal causal proof.
- The report does not determine the business or legal correctness of HOLD or PAY.

1. Can an independent reviewer reproduce the invariant checks and first divergence from the retained products?
2. Are the archive-equivalence tests sufficient to exclude every material uncontrolled difference?
3. Does the configuration guide belong inside the controlled SUT, the assurance method, or a joint boundary—and how does that classification affect the claim?
4. What reference cases would be required to qualify the pair-assessment method?
5. Which additional collection points would be required for a consequential production system?

10. Integrity references

Object	SHA-256
Pair evidence snapshot	9dda6a01464d8cdedd8c2ad232244552ddc441b34225e5d12990872f7901622a
Pair assessment	114ab694f024489a155b83d0cbb4d78453119ee8f4df3dc7cc8d6e66045de996

Hashes identify the exact retained objects used by the reporting process. Evidential verification also requires the associated registered identities, lineage and controlled records; a hash alone does not establish meaning or provenance.

Document control and review

This is a first substantive public draft prepared for structured review. Before release, Codance will verify technical identities and claims against the controlled evidence, resolve reviewer comments, assign the approved publication version, regenerate the PDF and record the final file SHA-256.

Review question	Required disposition
Is every statement clearly classed as demonstrated fact, engineering proposition or programme intent?	Confirm, narrow, source or remove.
Can a competent reader identify the controlled boundary and prohibited over-claims?	Make the boundary explicit.
Do technical identities and results match retained evidence?	Verify against controlled records.
Does the document disclose material limitations and credible contrary interpretations?	Add or strengthen limitations.
Is the document useful without access to confidential implementation detail?	Improve explanation or supporting public evidence.