

Verification and Documentation of Machine- Assisted Work in Architectural Practice

Implementation Appendices A through G

DANIEL HUTCHINS, AIA, NCARB

First Public Edition · Version 1.0 · September 4, 2026

Status and Reading Note. *These implementation appendices accompany the author-developed voluntary professional-practice framework Verification and Documentation of Machine-Assisted Work in Architectural Practice. Section 0 of the Guide governs their scope, source taxonomy, limitations, and meaning of shall. They provide model provisions, forms, and illustrative language for voluntary adoption. Publication alone creates no legal obligation and does not define the standard of care.*

How to Use the Appendices

These appendices convert Parts II through VI of the Guide into firm procedures and project records. They may be maintained as one manual or integrated into an existing policy, quality-control system, project-management platform, or document-management system. The platform is not prescribed. The substance, timing, links, status, access controls, and retrievability of the required records are.

What a Firm Produces

- **Firm methodology.** The policy or addendum, use classification, protocols, tool register, competence process, retention and legal-hold rules, and review cycle.
- **Project verification record.** Project and instrument context linked to contemporaneous verification entries, evidence, status, exceptions, corrections, and reverification.
- **Release decision.** The completed pre-sealing checklist for the instrument to be issued.
- **Assessment and communications.** The assessment findings memorandum and, when supported, optional conformance, proposal, and renewal language.

A firm need not create a separate bound manual if its existing systems contain these elements. A claim of conformance, however, is made only by Guide version and only after a documented assessment supports the statement for its stated scope, date, limitations, and exceptions. Conformance is the firm's self-attestation. It is not author certification, assurance, or a warranty of error-free work.

Appendix Map

App.	Function	Result
A	Adopt or graft the firm policy and maintain the tool register	Firm policy and approved-tool record
B	Classify recurring and proposed uses	Firm task classification
C	Select the test for each gated failure surface	Verification protocol

App.	Function	Result
D	Open and maintain the two-layer project record	Context record, verification entries, and log
E	Confirm the record and controls before sealing	Release decision and signoff
F	Assess and accurately describe the firm's practice	Findings memorandum, Conformance Statement, and optional external language
G	Apply defined terms consistently	Reference glossary

Implementation Sequence

- **Adopt and configure.** Complete Appendix A, assign responsibility, approve tools and data classes, and establish competence, retention, legal-hold, and review processes.
- **Classify.** Use Appendix B to classify the output, destination, consequence, and role in professional judgment. An unclassified use remains gated.
- **Open the record.** At the first gated use, create the Appendix D context and identify the applicable Appendix C protocol.
- **Verify before reliance.** Apply the protocol using a stated pass criterion, an authoritative source, and a recorded result.
- **Resolve and release.** Link corrections and reverification, keep exceptions visible, and complete Appendix E before sealing.
- **Assess and represent.** Review documentary and project evidence under § 6.5 before using Appendix F language.

Firms With Existing Policies

A firm with an existing artificial-intelligence policy may adopt §§ A.4 through A.9 as an addendum. Reconcile definitions, the responsible-person designation, retention, and legal holds rather than create competing provisions.

If the existing policy destroys working drafts at closeout, it shall exclude the verification record governed by §§ A.6 and A.7. The definitions in § A.2 govern the addendum. An existing responsible person may serve as the § A.3 designee.

Appendix A Model Firm Policy for Verification and Records

This appendix supplies a complete, adoptable policy for a firm that has none. A firm with an existing policy may use the guidance above to adopt the operative provisions as an addendum. The policy is written in the firm's voice and shall be completed, reviewed, and executed under the firm's own name. Bracketed values are firm-specific and shall be completed before adoption.

This policy implements the conditions of conformance stated in Parts II through IV. It states what the firm does and does not substitute for installing, following, and documenting the practices it describes.

A.1 Purpose and Scope

This policy governs machine assistance whose output may materially enter instruments of service that a licensed professional of [FIRM] will seal, and material professional communications outside the sealed set as defined in § A.4. It applies from the moment such content is a candidate for professional reliance.

Routine internal drafting, formatting, indexing, administrative work, and minor confirming correspondence that neither enters sealed work nor materially affects the consequence categories in § A.4 are permitted. They are not subject to §§ A.5 through A.7, although ordinary professional review, confidentiality, contract, and quality-control duties remain.

This policy takes no position on which tools [FIRM] adopts. It governs how the output of an approved use is treated before professional reliance.

A.2 Definitions

Terms used in this policy carry the meanings assigned in § 0.3 of the Guide. Four are restated because they are operative throughout this policy:

Machine assistance. The contribution of content, analysis, or disposition to professional work product by an artificial-intelligence system whose output is generated rather than retrieved or deterministically computed, whether the system stands alone or is embedded in ordinary production software. Deterministic computation is not machine assistance. Content propagated deterministically from a governing change is governed by § A.5.4 alone.

Verification. A test with a stated pass criterion, performed against an authoritative source, yielding a recorded result.

Authoritative source. The primary document that governs an assertion, such as the code edition adopted by the authority having jurisdiction as locally amended, the current published standard, the manufacturer's current data, or the governing contract document. An AI's restatement is not a source.

The record. The contemporaneous, two-layer documentation specified in Part IV and § A.6: project and instrument context recorded once, with an entry for each verification or documented verification population.

A.3 Designation of Responsibility

[DESIGNATED PROFESSIONAL] is accountable for maintaining this policy, assigning qualified professional and specialist reviews, maintaining the tool register at § A.8.2, and ensuring the competence process at § A.9. The designee shall be a licensed professional but need not personally perform legal, security, privacy, procurement, insurance, or provider review where qualified advice is used and documented.

Responsibility for an individual verification is not transferred to the designee. Each verification is performed by a professional qualified to evaluate the content, and the professional who seals an instrument remains in responsible control of every material machine-assisted contribution to it.

[FOR A MULTI-OFFICE FIRM: Name a designated professional for each office and one firm-level designee responsible for the whole. State any jurisdiction-specific supplements.]

A.4 Classification of Uses

[FIRM] maintains a written classification of its recurring uses of machine assistance, organized as permitted, gated, or prohibited. The classification includes assistance embedded in ordinary production software and is reviewed on the cycle at § A.10. Appendix B supplies the classification method and register.

Permitted. Uses producing no material contribution to sealed work and no material professional communication outside the sealed set. Routine internal drafting, formatting, indexing, administrative work, and minor confirming correspondence are ordinarily permitted. No verification record under this policy is required.

Gated. Uses whose output may materially enter sealed work, or constitutes a professional communication outside the sealed set that could materially affect life safety, code compliance, building performance, construction cost or time, contractual rights, or a professional determination. Gated uses require the applicable § A.5 verification and § A.6 record.

Prohibited. Uses closed to machine assistance under § 2.7. A machine shall not be the sole or primary basis of a compliance determination, shall not originate a professional review action issued under a seal, and shall not supply sealed content without qualified professional review, integration, and verification.

An unclassified use is treated as gated until it is classified.

A.5 Verification

A.5.1 General Requirement

Every material machine-assisted contribution that will be relied upon in sealed work, and every material professional communication outside the sealed set identified in § A.4, shall be verified before reliance. The test states its pass criterion, uses an authoritative source, and yields a recorded result under § A.6. Verification addresses the proposition relied upon and, where material, its applicability, completeness, exceptions, and coordination. Its depth is proportionate to consequence and use, but no material assertion entering sealed work is left unverified.

A.5.2 Code, Zoning, and Regulatory Analysis

Every material regulatory proposition supplied by a machine and relied upon in gated work shall be verified against the governing-source stack: jurisdiction and adopting authority; adopted edition and effective date; applicable local amendments and administrative criteria; incorporated standards; and the material project facts, definitions, exceptions, and dependencies that determine applicability. The verifier shall read each cited provision and material cross-reference. Appendix C.2 supplies the working protocol.

Where a compliance conclusion depends on interpretation rather than text, the interpretation is professional judgment. Machine output may assist but shall not supply the sole or primary basis for that conclusion.

A.5.3 Specifications

A machine-assisted specification section shall receive section-level professional review before incorporation. Part 1 references shall be verified against the issuing body's current

record; Part 2 products and manufacturers against current manufacturer data; and material Part 3 installation and system-performance requirements against the applicable listed, tested, evaluated, or otherwise accepted assembly and its conditions. Product data alone does not verify performance that belongs to an assembly. The review shall address material compatibility, drawing coordination, related sections, availability or current status, and conditions of performance. Appendix C.3 supplies the working protocol.

A designation, product, assembly, performance claim, or coordination premise that cannot be verified against an appropriate current source shall not remain in sealed work.

A.5.4 Drawing Production, Coordination, and QA/QC

For a machine-generated or machine-propagated change, verification shall identify the governing input, intended dependent outputs, and interfaces not governed by the automation. The test shall confirm both lineage within the dependency chain and coordination at its boundaries. Quantities, dimensions, classifications, keyed references, and schedules shall be verified against the governing project source before issuance. Agreement among outputs generated from the same source is evidence of propagation, not by itself evidence that the source or resulting construction is correct. Appendix C.4 supplies the working protocol.

Verification shall be paced to the rate and reach of generated change and not limited to milestone review.

A.5.5 Submittal and Shop Drawing Review

Machine assistance may inventory specified criteria, compare submitted data, track responses to prior comments, and flag apparent changes. Before taking action, the architect shall confirm the contractor's required review, the package's sufficiency for the action sought, specifically disclosed deviations, revisions outside prior comments, the scope and limits of the machine comparison, and required consultant review. The architect shall select the disposition through independent professional judgment. A machine may draft disposition language only after that selection; it shall not select or issue the disposition. Appendix C.5 supplies the working protocol.

A.5.6 Construction-Phase Correspondence

A machine-assisted RFI response, field directive, or other project correspondence is gated outside the sealed set only when it could materially affect the consequence categories in § A.4. Before issuance, the architect shall verify material factual premises, implicated Contract Documents, contractual authority, affected disciplines, and known effects on related work.

The architect shall determine whether the response is an interpretation or requires a Supplemental Instruction, minor change, Change Order, Construction Change Directive, proposal request, or other instrument authorized by the governing Contract Documents. Required consultant review shall be obtained. Routine minor confirming correspondence remains permitted. Appendix C.6 supplies the working protocol.

A.6 The Record

A.6.1 What the Record Establishes

For each gated use, the record shall be sufficient to establish which content or defined population was machine-assisted; the project, instrument, version, and tool context; what test was performed before reliance; who performed and approved it; and the result, status, exceptions, corrections, and reverification where applicable.

A.6.2 Project and Instrument Context

The following context is recorded once for each bounded project, instrument, issuance, or material professional communication:

- project identifier; deliverable or instrument title; revision or version; and issue date or status;
- task classification and governing verification protocol, for example, gated code analysis under Appendix C.2;
- tool and provider; product, model, and version to the extent known; and any configuration material to the output or review; and
- a durable input and output reference where appropriate, such as a controlled-repository identifier, file reference, hash, or sufficient description.

Protected data is minimized. Full prompts, privileged communications, confidential project data, personal information, and proprietary material are not retained indiscriminately. A controlled reference or description may identify the content without unnecessarily duplicating protected material.

A.6.3 Verification Entries

Each verification entry states:

- the content, assertion, item, or defined population verified, with its location in the instrument or communication;

- the pass criterion;
- the authoritative source or governing evidence, with jurisdiction where applicable, edition or version, date, and pinpoint;
- the verification method and evidence sufficient to show how the criterion was tested;
- the verifier's identity, role, relevant qualification, and verification date or timestamp;
- the disposition: confirmed, corrected, removed, escalated, or unresolved; and
- any correction and reverification, approval or status, and linked exception or unresolved item.

A.6.4 Aggregation Sampling and Reverification

[FIRM] aggregates entries only for a defined population sharing the same task type, criterion, source and version, method, required verifier qualification, and disposition. The entry identifies the population and whether review was complete or sampled.

Sampling follows a documented, risk-based plan and does not bypass verification of a unique material assertion affecting life safety, code compliance, building performance, contractual rights, or another professional determination. A failed sample triggers an expanded review appropriate to the failure and a record of correction or escalation.

A change to the content, authoritative source or edition, material project facts, or a dependent instrument triggers reverification when it could affect the prior result. The original entry is preserved and linked to the superseding entry. Exceptions and unresolved items remain visible until closed by an identified person or carried expressly into the release decision.

A.6.5 Contemporaneity

The record shall be made at or near the time of the verification it documents, in the ordinary course of practice. It is created as part of the work and not assembled after a claim has been asserted or once the work is questioned.

A.6.6 Location and Status

[FIRM] maintains the linked context and verification entries at [NAMED LOCATION OR SYSTEM]. The record owner is [ROLE]. Status values are [STATUS VALUES, such as open, corrected, reverified, approved, unresolved, superseded, and closed]. Access controls and links shall permit retrieval for a named instrument or material professional

communication without reconstruction from staff memory or file metadata. The record is a distinct project-record category governed by § A.7.

A.7 Retention

The record is retained under a written schedule approved for [FIRM]'s work and jurisdictions. The schedule addresses applicable licensing requirements, contracts, limitation and repose periods and their triggering events, insurer guidance, privacy and data-minimization duties, and legal holds. The selection is reviewed with qualified counsel and the firm's broker or insurer as appropriate. This policy states no universal period, trigger, longest-period rule, or safe harbor.

[FIRM] retains the record under [RETENTION PERIOD OR SCHEDULE], on the following documented basis: [JURISDICTIONS, SERVICES, CONTRACTS, CLAIMS PERIODS AND TRIGGERS, INSURER GUIDANCE, AND PRIVACY BASIS]. [FIRM] uses [PROJECT-SPECIFIC, JURISDICTION-SPECIFIC, OR DOCUMENTED UNIFORM] rules and reviews them on the cycle at § A.10.

A legal hold suspends routine destruction for affected records. [FIRM] identifies who may issue and release a hold; the repositories, backups, and provider-held copies in scope; notice and acknowledgment procedures; and secure disposition after release and expiration of the applicable schedule.

A.8 Confidentiality and Tool Vetting

A.8.1 The Rule

No confidential, privileged, proprietary, personal, or security-sensitive information shall become accessible to a machine-assisted system unless the data class is authorized and the specific provider, tool, account, tenancy, interface, integration, and configuration are approved for it. Approval shall account for client restrictions, privilege, contract, applicable law, the full accessible data path, access controls, storage and processing, retention and deletion, provider model development, incident terms, and intellectual-property and output-use rights.

A.8.2 The Tool Register

[FIRM] maintains one entry for each approved account, tenancy, or integration. A vendor or product name alone is not an approval. The register is reviewed on the cycle at § A.10 and upon material change.

Field	Firm or project entry
Accountable owner	[NAME OR ROLE]
Approved system	[PROVIDER, TOOL, ACCOUNT OR TENANCY, INTERFACE, INTEGRATION]
Approved uses	[TASKS AND PURPOSES]
Approved data classes	[AUTHORIZED DATA CLASSES AND EXPRESS EXCLUSIONS]
Accessible data scope	[FILES, MODELS, METADATA, LOGS, EXTENSIONS, CONNECTED SOURCES]
Provider and subprocessors	[NAMES OR CONTROLLED REVIEW REFERENCE]
Required configuration	[IDENTITY, ACCESS, ENCRYPTION, TENANCY, LOGGING, AND OTHER CONTROLS]
Storage and processing	[KNOWN LOCATIONS AND MATERIAL TERMS]
Retention and deletion	[TERMS AND FIRM SETTINGS]
Provider model development	[TRAINING OR OTHER USE OF SUBMITTED INFORMATION]
Incident provisions	[NOTICE, RESPONSE, AND ESCALATION]
Intellectual property and output	[MATERIAL TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS]
Review and approval	[PROFESSIONAL, LEGAL, SECURITY, PRIVACY, PROCUREMENT, INSURANCE, PROVIDER REVIEWERS]
Dates and status	[APPROVAL DATE, NEXT REVIEW DATE, CURRENT STATUS]

A.8.3 The Boundary

[FIRM] defines the boundary between each approved account, tenancy, or integration and any open or unapproved interface, and enforces it through access control, configuration, training, and monitoring. Approval of one instance does not approve every interface bearing the same product name.

A.8.4 Qualified Review and Approval

The designated professional ensures that professional, legal, security, privacy, procurement, insurance, and provider reviews are assigned to persons qualified for the question. Specialist review may be internal or external and shall be documented. The licensed professional remains accountable for professional reliance on the output but is not presumed to be the sole expert in every review discipline.

A.8.5 Change and Incident Response

A material change to provider terms, configuration, sub-processors, data scope or location, retention, provider model development, deletion, incident handling, intellectual-property terms, or integration triggers review before continued protected-data use. A suspected unauthorized disclosure or material incident triggers [INCIDENT PROCESS], preservation of relevant records, and suspension or narrowing of use as appropriate.

A.9 Competence

A professional shall not employ a machine tool in producing an instrument of service without practical competence in that tool: knowledge of its capabilities, limitations, and characteristic failure modes sufficient to evaluate its output. This does not require knowledge of the system's internal construction. It requires knowledge of what the tool does reliably, where it fails, and how its failures present.

[FIRM] maintains that knowledge through [TRAINING, TESTING, SUPERVISION, OR OTHER PROCESS] on the cycle at § A.10 and when a material new tool, configuration, or failure mode is introduced. The firm retains [LOCATION OR EVIDENCE] sufficient for an assessment under § 6.5 to examine competence maintenance.

A.10 Review and Amendment

This policy, the classification at § A.4, the record design at § A.6, the retention and legal-hold schedule at § A.7, the tool register at § A.8.2, and the competence process at § A.9 are reviewed not less than [FREQUENCY, recommended annually], and upon a material new tool or configuration; a provider-term, subprocessor, data-scope, location, retention, provider-development, deletion, incident, or intellectual-property change; a new Guide edition; a material change in jurisdictional, contractual, privacy, or licensing requirements; or an insurance change addressed to machine assistance.

Amendments are made to this document and reissued with an incremented version number. [FIRM] retains superseded versions under § A.7.

Adopted [DATE]. Version [N]. [DESIGNATED PROFESSIONAL].

Appendix B Task Classification

This appendix implements § 3.G. Sealed work supplies the primary destination gate. Outside the sealed set, only a professional communication that could materially affect life safety, code compliance, building performance, construction cost or time, contractual rights, or a professional determination is gated. The role of professional judgment may close a use to machine assistance. For a gated use, the characteristic failure selects the protocol.

B.1 How to Classify

Classify the exact use by answering four questions:

- What exact output will the machine produce?
- Where can that output go or be relied upon?
- What material consequence can it have?
- Would reliance on it supply or displace professional judgment reserved by § 2.7?

If material machine-assisted content will enter or become a candidate to enter a sealed instrument, the use is at least gated. Outside the sealed set, it is gated only when it is a material professional communication within the defined categories. If the use would assign reserved professional judgment to the machine, it is prohibited. An unclassified use remains gated until classified. Reclassify permitted draft material when its destination or use changes.

Field	Firm or project entry
Use and exact output	[DESCRIBE THE RECURRING OR PROPOSED USE]
Destination	[SEALED INSTRUMENT, MATERIAL PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION, OR OTHER]
Material consequence	[CATEGORY OR NONE]
Professional judgment	[ROLE OF THE MACHINE AND RESERVED DETERMINATION, IF ANY]
Characteristic failure	[PRIMARY FAILURE MODE]
Tier	[PERMITTED, GATED, OR PROHIBITED]
Protocol and record	[APPENDIX C SECTION AND APPENDIX D LOCATION, IF GATED]
Owner and review	[OWNER, APPROVAL DATE, NEXT REVIEW DATE, STATUS]

B.2 Model Classification

Task	Destination	Characteristic failure	Tier	Controls
Formatting, indexing, file organization	No sealed instrument	Recoverable omission	Permitted	§ 3.G
Internal drafting scaffolds; research summaries for professional use	No sealed instrument	Confabulated content caught before reliance	Permitted	§ 3.G
Administrative and minor confirming correspondence	Outside sealed set; no material determination	Tone or minor fact error	Permitted	§ 3.G; B.1
Meeting transcription or internal notes before approval	Internal working record; not issued or relied upon	Omission or misattribution	Permitted until issued or relied upon	§ 3.G; B.1
Massing studies, renderings, early design exploration	Not yet an instrument	Plausible but wrong geometry	Permitted until incorporated	§ 3.G; B.1
Existing-conditions indexing for an internal survey log	Internal working record	Omission or mislabeling	Permitted until incorporated	§ 3.G
Code and regulatory research	Sealed instrument or gated representation	Fabricated citation or inapplicable authority	Gated	§ 3.A; C.2
Zoning analysis	Sealed or submitted instrument	Wrong jurisdiction, overlay, definition, or edition	Gated	§ 3.A; C.2
Specification drafting and revision	Sealed instrument	Unverified standard, product, assembly, or performance	Gated	§ 3.B; C.3
Product and manufacturer research	Sealed instrument	Discontinued product or superseded data	Gated	§ 3.B; C.3
Drawing, quantity, schedule, or existing-condition generation	Sealed instrument	Wrong governing premise or quantity	Gated	§ 3.D; C.4
Machine propagation of changes across a set	Sealed instrument	Unmanaged dependent output or interface	Gated	§ 3.D; C.4
Submittal and shop-drawing review support	Professional review workflow	Missed deviation or incomplete comparison scope	Gated	§ 3.C; C.5
Material RFI response or field directive	Material professional communication	Wrong premise, instrument, authority, or effect	Gated	§ 3.E; C.6

Task	Destination	Characteristic failure	Tier	Controls
Design narratives and basis-of-design statements	Sealed or submitted instrument	Confabulated performance claim	Gated	§ 2.2; C.1
Compliance determination based solely or primarily on machine output	Reserved professional act	Professional determination displaced	Prohibited	§ 2.7; § 3.A
Machine selection or issuance of a submittal disposition	Reserved professional review action	Judgment no professional made	Prohibited	§ 2.7; § 3.C
Resolution of ambiguous or concealed existing conditions without required professional judgment	Professional determination	Unsupported inference represented as fact	Prohibited	§ 2.7; § 3.G
Machine-assisted content proposed for sealing without qualified review, integration, and verification	Sealed instrument	Responsible-control boundary not satisfied	Prohibited	§ 2.1; § 2.7

The table states ordinary cases. A firm's completed classification governs its practice and shall preserve the sealed-work gate, limited material-communication gate, and reserved-judgment boundaries.

B.3 Boundary Cases

Three boundary cases recur. An internal draft becomes gated when it is a candidate for incorporation into sealed work. Generated content from an embedded feature is classified like the same task performed in a stand-alone tool. An unsealed communication is not gated merely because an architect sends it; it becomes gated only when the machine-assisted content is a material professional communication within the defined consequence categories.

Appendix C Verification Protocols

This appendix supplies the working protocols for the gated tier. Each protocol implements the test in § 2.2 at the moment of reliance and adds the task-specific controls in Part III. These are conditions of conformance proposed by the Guide; a cited source imposes an external duty only where independently applicable.

C.1 General Protocol

For any material machine-assisted contribution within the gated tier:

- Identify the proposition relied upon, the content or defined population under test, and its location in the instrument or communication.
- State a pass criterion that can pass or fail. An impression of reasonableness is not a criterion.
- Open the authoritative source in the applicable edition or version as of a stated date. An AI restatement or a second AI's agreement is not the source.
- Test the proposition actually relied upon. Where material, address project applicability, completeness, exceptions, and coordination with dependent information.
- Scale the depth and granularity of the test to consequence and use without leaving a material assertion entering sealed work unverified.
- Reach a disposition: confirmed, corrected, removed, escalated, or unresolved. Record corrections, approvals, exceptions, and reverification where applicable.
- Create the linked Appendix D context and verification entry as the test is performed.
- A contribution that cannot be located, tied to an authoritative source, or tested against a stated criterion shall not remain in the instrument.

C.2 Code, Zoning, and Regulatory Analysis

Criterion. The proposition uses the correct jurisdiction, adopting authority, adopted edition, effective date, local amendments, administrative criteria, incorporated standards, and material project facts. Each cited and dependent provision exists and supports the proposition relied upon.

Source. The adopted code, ordinance, regulation, administrative criterion, and incorporated standard identified by jurisdiction, edition, adoption or effective date where material, and amendment status.

Test. Trace each machine-supplied citation to the governing text. Read the provision and material cross-references, amendments, exceptions, definitions, and project facts that determine applicability. Identify affected downstream calculations, drawings, and decisions.

Reserved judgment. Where the conclusion depends on interpretation rather than text, the interpretation is made by a qualified professional and does not rest solely or primarily on machine output.

Task-specific record additions. Jurisdiction, adopting authority, edition and dates, amendment status, provisions read, applicability facts and exceptions tested, and affected downstream work. All Appendix D.2 fields also apply.

C.3 Specifications

Criterion for Part 1. Each standard designation is current or intentionally specified to an identified edition, and its status and material requirements match the section as of issuance.

Criterion for Part 2. Each named product and manufacturer is current as specified, and material performance, compatibility, availability or status, and coordination premises agree with current manufacturer data and related Contract Documents.

Criterion for Part 3 and system performance. The applicable listed, tested, evaluated, or otherwise accepted assembly and its installation conditions support the stated performance. Product data alone does not verify performance that belongs to an assembly.

Source. The issuing body's current record, current manufacturer data, the applicable assembly listing or evaluation, and related Contract Documents.

Test. Review the complete machine-assisted section. Trace Part 1 references and Part 2 names to current sources; test material assembly and installation conditions; and check compatibility, drawing coordination, and related sections.

Task-specific record additions. Section and item, designation or product, assembly or performance condition, current-status date, related documents, and coordination result. All Appendix D.2 fields also apply.

Fail state. A designation, product, assembly, performance claim, or coordination premise that cannot be verified against an appropriate current source shall not remain in the sealed instrument.

C.4 Drawing Production, Coordination, and QA/QC

Criterion. Each generated or propagated value agrees with its governing source; each intended dependent output reflects the governing change; and material interfaces outside the automation have been coordinated.

Source. The governing model, calculation, document, or approved project input from which the value or change derives, together with the information governing affected interfaces.

Test. Identify the governing input, intended dependent outputs, and excluded or unmanaged interfaces. Confirm lineage through the dependency chain and coordination at its boundaries. Perform the check at a rate appropriate to the reach and frequency of generated change.

Task-specific record additions. Governing input, affected outputs, excluded or unmanaged interfaces, propagation result, boundary-coordination result, and corrections. All Appendix D.2 fields also apply.

C.5 Submittal and Shop Drawing Review

Boundary. Machine assistance may inventory, organize, compare, track, and flag. The architect selects the review action through independent professional judgment. The machine may draft disposition language only after that selection and shall not select or issue the disposition.

Criterion. The contractor's required review occurred; the package is sufficient for the action sought; machine-flagged comparisons trace to specified requirements; stated deviations are isolated; revisions outside prior comments are identified; the machine-comparison scope and omissions are understood; and required consultant review is obtained.

Source. The governing Contract Documents, specified requirements, prior reviewed version and comments, current submittal, disclosed deviations, and affected consultant documents.

Test. Establish the pages, fields, criteria, prior versions, and related submittals included and omitted from machine comparison. Independently review every item within the architect's contractual scope, not only machine-flagged items, and decide the final action.

Task-specific record additions. Version reviewed, comparison scope and omissions, prior comments tested, disclosed deviations, material additional revisions, affected consultants, named professional, and final disposition. All Appendix D.2 fields also apply.

C.6 Construction-Phase Correspondence

Criterion. Material factual premises are accurate; the architect has authority for the response; implicated Contract Documents support it; affected disciplines have been addressed; and known material effects on cost, time, rights, performance, safety, code, and related work have been evaluated.

Source. The governing project record and Contract Documents identified by document and section, together with affected consultant information.

Test. Trace each material premise and interpreted requirement to the governing record or provision. Determine whether the response is an interpretation or requires a Supplemental Instruction, minor change, Change Order, Construction Change Directive, proposal request, or other authorized instrument. Obtain required consultant review and evaluate known effects before issuance.

Task-specific record additions. Question, correspondence item, sources and provisions, affected work and disciplines, contractual classification, consultant review, known effects, and final disposition. All Appendix D.2 fields also apply.

Boundary. Routine minor confirming correspondence remains permitted. A machine shall not issue correspondence under the architect's authority without the required professional review.

Appendix D Verification Record Specification and Forms

This appendix implements Part IV through two linked layers: project and instrument context recorded once, and a verification entry for each test, documented population, or approved sample. A firm may use the forms below or map every field to an existing controlled system. The platform is not prescribed; completeness, contemporaneity, status, access control, links, and retrieval are.

D.1 Project and Instrument Context

Open this record when machine assistance is first used for a gated purpose. Update it whenever the scope, tool, source set, or intended use materially changes.

Field	Firm or project entry
Project identifier	[PROJECT NUMBER OR CONTROLLED IDENTIFIER]
Deliverable or instrument	[TITLE AND TYPE]
Revision and issue	[REVISION OR VERSION; ISSUE DATE OR STATUS]
Classification	[PERMITTED, GATED, OR PROHIBITED; GATED USES CONTINUE]
Task and protocol	[TASK TYPE AND APPENDIX C SECTION]
Tool context	[PROVIDER, TOOL, PRODUCT, MODEL, VERSION, MATERIAL CONFIGURATION]
Durable input reference	[CONTROLLED REPOSITORY IDENTIFIER, FILE REFERENCE, HASH, OR DESCRIPTION]
Durable output reference	[CONTROLLED REPOSITORY IDENTIFIER, FILE REFERENCE, HASH, OR DESCRIPTION]
Record system and owner	[NAMED LOCATION OR SYSTEM; RESPONSIBLE ROLE]
Access and status	[ACCESS CLASSIFICATION; CURRENT STATUS]

D.2 Verification Entry

D.2.1 Detailed Entry Form

Complete one entry for each verification, documented population, or approved sample as the test is performed.

Field	Firm or project entry
Entry identifier	[UNIQUE ID AND LINK TO PROJECT CONTEXT]
Content or population	[ASSERTION, ITEM, OR DEFINED POPULATION]
Location	[SHEET, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ITEM, OR COMMUNICATION]
Pass criterion	[PROPOSITION THAT CAN PASS OR FAIL]
Authority or evidence	[SOURCE, JURISDICTION IF APPLICABLE, EDITION OR VERSION, DATE, PINPOINT]
Method and evidence	[TEST PERFORMED AND DURABLE EVIDENCE REFERENCE]
Verifier	[IDENTITY, ROLE, RELEVANT QUALIFICATION]
Verification time	[DATE OR TIMESTAMP]
Disposition	[CONFIRMED, CORRECTED, REMOVED, ESCALATED, OR UNRESOLVED]
Correction and reverification	[ACTION, LINKED SUPERSEDING ENTRY, OR NOT APPLICABLE]
Approval and status	[APPROVER IF REQUIRED; OPEN, APPROVED, SUPERSEDED, OR CLOSED]
Exception or unresolved item	[LINK, RESPONSIBLE PERSON, RELEASE TREATMENT, OR NONE]

D.2.2 Summary Log

The summary log is an index to the detailed entries. It does not replace the fields or evidence above.

ID	Item and location	Protocol	Source	Verifier and date	Disposition and status	Evidence or link
[ID]	[ITEM; LOCATION]	[C.#]	[SOURCE; PINPOINT]	[NAME; DATE]	[DISPOSITION; STATUS]	[ENTRY OR EVIDENCE LINK]
V-014	Egress width; Sheet A-101	C.2	Adopted code and local amendments; controlled pinpoint	Project architect; 2026-09-04	Corrected; superseded by V-014R1	Controlled calculation and comparison

ID	Item and location	Protocol	Source	Verifier and date	Disposition and status	Evidence or link
V-014R1	Egress width; Sheet A-101	C.2	Same governing source; current issue	Project architect; 2026-09-04	Confirmed; approved	Corrected drawing and reverification entry

D.2.3 Worked Example

This fictional example shows the level of specificity expected. It does not state the code requirement for any actual jurisdiction or project.

Field	Firm or project entry
Context	Project 24-017; Permit Set v6; issue date 2026-09-04
Classification	Gated code analysis; Appendix C.2
Tool context	Firm-approved assistant; provider, model, version, and material configuration recorded in the project context and tool register
Item and location	Required egress width shown on Sheet A-101
Criterion	The stated width complies for the project's documented occupant load and egress component under the governing adopted code and local amendments
Authority	Adopted code edition and local amendments for the project jurisdiction; applicable section and table recorded in the controlled entry
Method and evidence	Recalculated the occupant load and required width; read the governing provision, definitions, exceptions, and dependent references; compared the result with the drawing dimension; retained controlled calculation and comparison
Initial result	Corrected. The first entry is preserved as V-014 and linked to the corrected drawing
Reverification	V-014R1 repeated the test against the same governing source after correction; disposition confirmed; project architect approved; no open exception

D.3 Aggregation Sampling and Reverification

Aggregate only a population sharing the same task type, pass criterion, authoritative source and version, verification method, required verifier qualification, and disposition. Identify the population and state whether review was complete or sampled. Sampling follows a

documented, risk-based plan and does not bypass a unique material assertion affecting life safety, code compliance, building performance, contractual rights, or another professional determination. A failed sample expands review. Reverify when content, source or edition, material project facts, or a dependent instrument changes in a way that could affect the result; preserve and link the original and superseding entries.

D.4 The Production Test

For a named instrument or material professional communication, the firm can retrieve the linked context and entries, including population or sample status, method, evidence, approvals, exceptions, corrections, and reverification, without reconstructing them from staff memory or file metadata. A need for reconstruction indicates that the system did not preserve the retrievable record required for conformance. It does not by itself establish the legal timing, admissibility, or weight of an underlying note.

D.5 Retention

Classify the verification record as a distinct project-record category and apply the written schedule adopted under § A.7. The project context identifies the applicable schedule or rule and the controlled storage location. Legal holds override routine destruction. This Guide states no universal period, trigger, longest-period rule, or safe harbor.

D.6 What the Record Is Not

The record is not an ordinary draft, client disclosure instrument, warranty, certification, or proof of perfection. A prompt history, model output, or provider activity log may support the record but does not establish that a qualified professional tested the content against governing authority. Protected material need not be duplicated when a controlled reference sufficiently identifies it. A record should preserve corrections, removals, escalations, and unresolved items, not confirmations alone.

Appendix E Pre-Sealing Checklist

Complete this checklist before sealing an instrument that contains or relies on a gated machine-assisted contribution. Each answer is supported by the Appendix D record. If the record does not support an item, answer No. A No answer blocks release until the issue is resolved and the record is updated.

Project and instrument	Revision and issue	Record location	Sealing architect
[PROJECT; INSTRUMENT]	[REVISION; DATE OR STATUS]	[SYSTEM; CONTEXT ID]	[NAME; JURISDICTION]
Control	Status	Record reference	Exception or disposition
Identification. Machine-assisted content or populations are identified from the record (§ 4.1).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[ENTRY OR EVIDENCE]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]
Classification and boundaries. Each use was classified; no prohibited use or unreviewed sealed content remains (§ 2.7; App. B).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[CLASSIFICATION]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]
Verification. Every material gated contribution was tested before reliance under the applicable protocol (§ 2.2; App. C).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[ENTRIES]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]
Provenance. Each material assertion traces to its governing source and pinpoint (§ 2.3).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[ENTRIES]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]
Responsible control. The sealing architect reviewed, integrated, and verified each material contribution and has the knowledge required by the jurisdiction (§§ 2.1, 5.2).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[REVIEW RECORD]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]
Confidentiality. Protected data used an approved system and configuration; changes and incidents were addressed (§ 3.F; § A.8).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	[TOOL REGISTER]	[NONE OR RESOLUTION]

Release decision. I reviewed the items above and the linked record. ☐ Ready for sealing and issue ☐ Not ready. Sealing architect: _____ Date: _____ Unresolved items carried into the decision: [NONE OR IDENTIFY].

Appendix F Conformance and Communications

This appendix supplies illustrative language for a firm to adapt in its own voice and under its own signature. It is not executable without fact-specific completion, documentary assessment, and appropriate legal and insurance review.

F.1 Use and Limits

The Conformance Statement is the firm's self-attestation that, as of a stated assessment date and within a defined scope, limitations, and exceptions, its documented practice supports the statement. The firm shall state conformance only by Guide version and only after an assessment under § 6.5 supports the statement.

- The author maintains no registry of conforming firms and does not countersign, acknowledge, approve, audit, or certify a firm's statement.
- No mark, seal, logo, badge, or certificate accompanies conformance, and none may be represented as available from the author.
- A statement shall not represent that conformance warrants error-free work, satisfies the legal standard of care, or proves project-level implementation outside its evidence and scope.
- A firm shall not state conformance for an unidentified version, unsupported scope, or assessment date, and shall state known limitations, exceptions, and unresolved items accurately.

F.2 Assessment Evidence

Before using a Conformance Statement, the firm shall prepare the assessment product specified in § 6.5: a findings memorandum with an executive statement of scope and limitations, detailed findings, exceptions, and a corrective-action record. The assessment shall identify the Guide version and date; organizational and service scope; assessor and qualifications; independence and conflicts; privilege, confidentiality, recipients, and distribution; population and sampling method; evidence threshold; and known limitations.

The assessment examines the written methodology, actual recurring and embedded uses, classification, tool register, verification protocols as performed, record completeness and retrievability, retention and legal holds, and competence maintenance. Interviews may orient the work but do not replace documentary and project evidence. Failed samples, missing

records, and unexplained exceptions are expanded, corrected, limited, or disclosed as § 6.5 requires.

F.3 Model Conformance Statement

Statement of Conformance

[FIRM OR ENTITY], covering [OFFICES OR ORGANIZATIONAL SCOPE], states that it operates to [GUIDE TITLE], [VERSION], effective [GUIDE EFFECTIVE DATE], in producing instruments of service sealed by its licensed professionals.

[FIRM OR ENTITY] states that, within the assessed scope and exceptions, it maintains the elements that version specifies: a written methodology; classification of uses; applicable verification protocols; confidentiality governance and a tool register; competence maintenance; a two-layer contemporaneous record; and retention and legal-hold controls.

Assessment scope, basis, and exceptions. Assessed as of [ASSESSMENT DATE] for [SERVICES, PROJECT TYPES, OFFICES, SYSTEMS, AND TIME PERIOD], using [ASSESSMENT METHOD AND SAMPLE]. Assessor and qualifications: [IDENTIFY]. Independence and conflicts: [STATE]. Limitations, exceptions, and unresolved items: [NONE OR LIST].

This statement attests to the stated methodology and scope. It is not a warranty that any instrument of service is free of error and does not cover any project, service, system, or office outside the scope above.

[NAME], [LICENSE], [TITLE AND AUTHORITY TO SIGN]

For [FIRM OR ENTITY] Date signed [DATE] Next review or renewal [DATE]

F.4 Proposal Language

Short form for a qualifications statement or cover letter:

[FIRM] states that, as of [ASSESSMENT DATE] and within [SCOPE, LIMITATIONS, AND EXCEPTIONS], its practice was assessed against [GUIDE TITLE], version [N] ([YEAR]). Our current Statement of Conformance is available on request.

Long form where a proposal requests the firm's quality-control procedure:

Machine assistance and verification. [FIRM] uses machine assistance in defined production tasks under a written methodology assessed against [GUIDE TITLE], version [N] ([YEAR]), within the scope and exceptions stated in our Conformance Statement. Material machine-assisted content

that may enter sealed work, and material professional communications gated outside the sealed set, are verified before reliance by a qualified professional against the governing authority. Uses reserved by § 2.7 remain prohibited.

[FIRM] maintains contemporaneous project records under Part IV and uses protected project information only through accounts, integrations, and configurations approved for the applicable data class. Retention follows [FIRM]'s written schedule and legal-hold process.

F.5 Renewal and Underwriting Language

The responses below describe the Guide's methodology. Adapt them to the firm's actual practice, current policy, services, coverage, assessment scope, and known exceptions. They are addressed to no carrier and are not statements by the author.

Who reviews machine-assisted output

Material machine-assisted content within the gated tier is verified before reliance by a professional qualified for the subject under the applicable task protocol. Routine permitted uses are not represented as receiving the same protocol.

What documentation exists

[FIRM] maintains linked project and instrument context and contemporaneous verification entries under Part IV, including the criterion, governing source and pinpoint, method and evidence, verifier and qualification, timestamp, disposition, approval or status, exceptions, corrections, and reverification. The applicable record can be retrieved without reconstruction and is retained under [RETENTION PERIOD OR SCHEDULE] and the firm's legal-hold process.

Whether use is disclosed

[FIRM] discloses machine assistance where the governing agreement, applicable law, or rule requires disclosure. [IF APPLICABLE: The firm additionally discloses in its professional-services agreements that machine assistance may be used in defined production tasks under a written verification methodology.]

Ask the firm's broker in writing how its policy treats AI, automated systems, and machine assistance embedded in ordinary production software.

Appendix G Glossary

Terms defined at § 0.3 govern. This glossary collects those terms and operative terms introduced elsewhere for reference.

Authoritative source. The primary document that governs an assertion: the code edition adopted by the authority having jurisdiction as locally amended; the current published standard; the manufacturer's current data; or the governing contract document. An AI's restatement is not a source (§§ 0.3, 2.2).

Automation bias. The tendency to accept an automated aid's output in place of adequate independent evaluation, including changing a correct judgment to an incorrect one after receiving erroneous automated advice (§ 2.8).

Confabulation. Confidently stated erroneous or false generated content. The Guide adopts this federal vocabulary from NIST AI 600-1 (§ 0.3).

Conformance Statement. The firm's version-specific written self-attestation that a documented assessment supports the statement for its identified scope, date, limitations, and exceptions. It is not author certification or a warranty (§ 6.4; App. F).

Contemporaneous record. A record made at or near the time of the verification it documents as part of the firm's regular project workflow (§ 4.2).

Data provenance. The origin and history of the information supporting an assertion. The record reconnects each material machine-assisted assertion to governing authority (§§ 0.3, 2.3).

Destination. The place where machine-assisted output will go or be relied upon. A sealed instrument is the primary classification gate; a narrower gate applies to material professional communications outside the sealed set (§ 3.G).

Gated task. A task producing material output that may enter sealed work, or a material professional communication outside the sealed set within the consequence categories in § 3.G. It requires the applicable verification and Part IV record.

Human-AI configuration. The arrangement in which people interact with and review a machine-assisted system. The Guide adopts this federal vocabulary from NIST AI 600-1 (§ 0.3).

Inapplicable authority. A real source that does not govern the matter because it comes from the wrong jurisdiction, edition, date, or factual context. A source can be authentic and still be inapplicable (§§ 2.4, 3.A).

Instrument of service. As defined in the governing agreement; presumptively, the drawings, specifications, and other documents prepared by the architect for the project (§ 0.3).

Machine assistance. The contribution of content, analysis, or disposition to professional work product by an AI system whose output is generated rather than retrieved or deterministically computed, whether the system stands alone or is embedded in ordinary production software. Deterministic computation is not machine assistance; deterministic propagation is governed by § 3.D alone (§ 0.3).

Material and materiality. Capable, in context, of materially affecting life safety, code compliance, building performance, construction cost or time, contractual rights, or a professional determination. Materiality depends on consequence and intended use (§ 0.3).

Permitted task. A task producing no material contribution to sealed work and no material professional communication outside the sealed set. The Guide's verification record is not required, although other professional, contractual, confidentiality, and quality-control duties remain (§ 3.G).

Pinpoint. The section, article, table, page, or other specific location within an authority at which another person can repeat the verification (§ 4.3).

Professional representation. A communication issued under the architect's authority that states or interprets a professional or contractual determination. Outside the sealed set, only a material professional representation is gated (§§ 0.3, 3.G).

Prohibited task. A task or use that falls within a boundary in § 2.7 and is therefore closed to machine assistance under the Guide's classification (§§ 2.7, 3.G).

The record. The contemporaneous documentation specified in Part IV. It has two linked layers: project and instrument context recorded once, and an entry for each verification or documented verification population. Together the layers show what was tested, against what source, how, by whom, when, and with what disposition and status (§§ 0.3, 4.3).

Responsible control and responsible charge. Related professional duties requiring the knowledge and authority to direct, evaluate, approve or reject, and take responsibility for the work. The governing definition and legal effect remain profession- and jurisdiction-specific (§§ 0.3, 2.1).

Seal. A licensed individual's attestation of the professional responsibility required by the governing jurisdiction for the instrument being sealed (§§ 1.3, 5.2).

Statute of repose. A jurisdiction-specific time limit that may bar a claim after a legislatively defined period and triggering event. Duration, trigger, scope, and interaction with other rules require jurisdiction-specific analysis (§ 4.4).

Tool register. The firm's written record of each approved account, tenancy, or integration, including owner, approved uses and data classes, provider and material subprocessors, required configuration, accessible data scope, data handling and location terms, retention and provider-development terms, deletion and incident provisions, intellectual-property and output terms, reviewers, dates, and status (§§ 2.5, 3.F; § A.8.2).

Verification. A test with a stated pass criterion, performed against an authoritative source, yielding a recorded result (§§ 0.3, 2.2).

Verification complexity. The difficulty of independently confirming automated output. The Guide uses it as a risk factor, not as a threshold below which automation bias is absent (§ 2.8).