

PUBLIC SELF-ASSESSMENT GUIDE

Public self-assessment guide for AI project execution readiness

Technical feasibility does not equal execution readiness.

What the Gate evaluates—and why it exists

01. System Definition

Normora AI Pre-Execution Gate v1.0 is a project-level structural assessment and decision framework. It examines whether the business context, intent, judgment, authority, responsibility, control and evidence conditions needed for an AI project are sufficiently defined before build, deployment or operation.

Technical feasibility answers whether a system can be built. Execution readiness asks whether it should be allowed to act—and under which conditions.

02. Why Pre-Execution Readiness Matters

- AI increasingly recommends, prioritizes, decides and acts across real operating processes.
- A working model can still operate against an unclear purpose or outside an approved boundary.
- Undefined authority, responsibility or intervention conditions create business and governance risk before technical failure occurs.
- Readiness must be demonstrated with evidence, not assumed from prototype performance.

This public guide supports preliminary self-screening. It is not an official Gate Decision, certification, legal opinion or model benchmark.

From business structure to governed implementation

01	BEOO	Business and operating diagnosis
02	A-WBS	Scope, responsibility, decision gates and unresolved conditions
03	AI Pre-Execution Gate	Execution-readiness assessment and Gate Decision
04	Decision Record	Attributable record of scope, evidence, conditions and decision
05	Governed Implementation Brief	Controlled handoff to builders, delivery and operations

DHEX Architecture is acknowledged as the internal judgment-structuring layer. Its detailed logic remains protected.

The public architecture shows the role and relationship of each layer. It does not disclose the transformation contracts, encoding, decision derivation or integration mechanics between layers.

The structure assessed before AI is allowed to act

No.	Assessment Domain	Public Purpose
01	Business & Operating Context	Confirms the business need, operating environment, system boundary and accountable operating ownership.
02	Intent & Outcome	Locks the approved intent, expected outcomes, unacceptable outcomes and non-automation boundary.
03	Judgment	Defines the judgment type, criteria, priority rules, uncertainty treatment and human judgment points.
04	Authority	Defines what AI may propose, recommend, approve or execute, and what it must never do.
05	Responsibility	Assigns accountable owners for business outcomes, decisions, approvals, systems and exceptions.
06	Control & Intervention	Verifies approval, intervention, stop, recovery, reversal and fallback controls before execution.
07	Evidence & Traceability	Requires attributable evidence for judgments, actions, non-actions, approvals, changes and review.

The seven domains are publicly disclosed. Internal domain weights, severity treatment and aggregation logic are not disclosed.

Criterion names are public. Operating logic is protected.

No.	Domain	Structural Criterion
01	Business & Operating Context	Approved Business Need and Value Case
02	Business & Operating Context	Operating Context and Process Fit
03	Business & Operating Context	Scope, System and Data Boundary
04	Business & Operating Context	Deployment Model and Operating Ownership
05	Intent & Outcome	Approved AI Intent
06	Intent & Outcome	Expected Outcomes and Success Measures
07	Intent & Outcome	Failure and Unacceptable Outcome Definition
08	Intent & Outcome	Non-Automation Boundary
09	Judgment	Judgment Type and Consequence Classification
10	Judgment	Judgment Criteria and Priority Rules
11	Judgment	Uncertainty and Confidence Treatment
12	Judgment	Human Judgment and Escalation Points
13	Authority	Human-AI Authority Map
14	Authority	Action Permission Tiers and Limits

This index discloses criterion names only. The internal questions, evidence requirements, severity, weights, decision effects and remediation rules are not included.

Public criterion inventory – continued

No.	Domain	Structural Criterion
15	Authority	Prohibited Actions and Non-Execution Conditions
16	Authority	Delegation, Revocation and Expiry
17	Responsibility	Accountable Executive and Business Owner
18	Responsibility	Decision and Approval Accountability
19	Responsibility	Technical and System Accountability
20	Responsibility	Incident, Error and Exception Responsibility Path
21	Control & Intervention	Human Approval Gates
22	Control & Intervention	Intervention, Suspension and Stop Controls
23	Control & Intervention	Recovery, Reversal and Fallback
24	Control & Intervention	Control Validation and Operating Readiness
25	Evidence & Traceability	Decision Rationale and Input Provenance
26	Evidence & Traceability	Action, Non-Action and Approval Logging
27	Evidence & Traceability	Change, Version and Exception History
28	Evidence & Traceability	Auditability, Retention, Access and Review

The 28-criterion inventory is visible by design. The controlled assessment matrix remains a protected Normora asset.

Public Self-Assessment Instructions and Response Mode

o6. Public Self-Assessment Instructions

o1	Set one project boundary	Assess one AI project, use case or materially distinct operating scope.
o2	Use current evidence	Answer from documents and observable operating facts, not future intent alone.
o3	Include responsible roles	Complete the review with business, product, operations, risk and technical owners where relevant.
o4	Record uncertainty	Use UNKNOWN when the answer cannot be verified; do not convert uncertainty into YES.
o5	Review by domain	Look for concentration of gaps within a domain instead of relying on a total count.

o8. Response Mode

YES	Clearly defined and supported by current evidence.
PARTIAL	Some structure exists, but scope, approval, ownership or evidence is incomplete.
NO	The condition is absent, materially undefined or not operating.
UNKNOWN	The reviewer cannot verify the condition from available evidence.

Do not convert responses into an official score. The public guide contains no internal weights, threshold or Gate calculation.

Questions 01–09: Context, Intent and Judgment

01 Business & Operating Context

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Is the business problem and expected value of using AI clearly stated and approved?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Is the current operating process, including affected people and dependencies, sufficiently understood?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Are the project, system, user and data boundaries documented?	☐	☐	☐	☐

02 Intent & Outcome

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Is there one approved statement of why the AI system should exist?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are expected outcomes and unacceptable outcomes both explicit?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Are activities that must remain human-led or non-automated identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐

03 Judgment

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Is the type of recommendation, classification or decision expected from AI defined?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are the factors and priorities that should guide judgment documented?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Are uncertainty, ambiguity and required human review points recognized?	☐	☐	☐	☐

These are public screening prompts, not the internal 28-criterion evaluator questions.

Questions 10–15: Authority and Responsibility

04 Authority

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Are the actions AI may propose, recommend or execute clearly separated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are prohibited actions and non-delegable decisions explicitly identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Are authority limits defined by scope, role, time, data or transaction?	☐	☐	☐	☐

05 Responsibility

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Is there a named business owner accountable for the project outcome?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are approval, escalation and exception responsibilities assigned?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Are incident, change and ongoing operating owners identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
If authority or accountability cannot be named, execution permission should not be assumed.					

Questions 16–21: Control and Evidence

06 Control & Intervention

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Can an authorized person review, intervene in or stop AI-supported activity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are recovery, reversal and correction methods available for material errors?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Is a workable fallback available when the AI system is unavailable or unsafe?	☐	☐	☐	☐

07 Evidence & Traceability

#	Public Screening Question	Y	P	N	U
1	Can material AI actions and non-actions be reconstructed from records?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	Are approvals, overrides, changes and exceptions attributable to named roles?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Can the evidence needed for review be retained, retrieved and understood?	☐	☐	☐	☐
A system is not structurally ready if material activity cannot be controlled or reconstructed.					

A preliminary signal—not an official Gate Decision

Record the response count for each domain. Use the pattern to locate visible strengths, partial structures, material gaps and unknowns. Do not combine the counts into a weighted score.

Domain	YES	PARTIAL	NO	UNKNOWN
Business & Operating Context				
Intent & Outcome				
Judgment				
Authority				
Responsibility				
Control & Intervention				
Evidence & Traceability				
FOUNDATION VISIBLE – The required structures are broadly visible and supported, but formal review may still identify conditions or evidence gaps.				

PARTIAL FOUNDATION – Important structures exist, but one or more domains require clarification, approval or operationalization.

MATERIAL GAPS – One or more conditions are absent or materially undefined and should be addressed before execution entry.

INSUFFICIENT VISIBILITY – Available information is not enough to make a reliable readiness claim.

No public indicator maps automatically to READY, CONDITIONAL, HOLD or NOT READY.

Signals that require deeper clarification

Signal	Risk Pattern	What It Indicates
R-01	Purpose conflict	Different teams describe different reasons for the same AI system.
R-02	Boundary uncertainty	Users, data, systems or actions inside the project scope cannot be clearly named.
R-03	Authority ambiguity	It is unclear what AI may recommend, approve or execute.
R-04	Missing accountability	No named role owns the outcome, exception or incident response.
R-05	Uncontrolled intervention	Authorized people cannot reliably pause, stop, reverse or correct activity.
R-06	No viable fallback	Operations depend on AI without a workable non-AI or degraded-mode process.
R-07	Evidence discontinuity	Important actions, non-actions, approvals or changes cannot be reconstructed.
R-08	Unresolved conditions	Known assumptions, conflicts or risks remain open while execution continues.

A risk signal is not itself an official Critical Condition. Official trigger definitions and impacts remain protected.

The official outcome structure

READY – Core conditions are satisfied. Execution may proceed only within approved scope and authority.

CONDITIONAL – Execution is permitted only under explicit restrictions, actions, owners and validity conditions.

HOLD – Evidence, responsibility or a required decision is insufficient to determine permission.

NOT READY – A blocking condition or material structural defect prohibits execution entry.

The official Gate Decision is not produced by the public response count. It integrates the controlled assessment matrix, evidence sufficiency, Critical Conditions, unresolved conditions and evaluator review.

How formal assessment is conducted

12. Assessment Process

o1	Scope Lock	Confirm project, system, user, data and operating boundary.
o2	Evidence Intake	Collect controlled documents, approvals, records and operating evidence.
o3	Structured Review	Review the 28 internal criteria and relevant conditions.
o4	Clarification	Resolve conflicts, gaps, unknowns and responsibility questions.
o5	Gate Decision	Issue an attributable decision with scope and conditions.
o6	Governed Handoff	Translate approved conditions into implementation controls.

13. Evidence Requirements Overview

Formal assessment may review approved briefs, operating procedures, authority and responsibility records, system and data boundaries, control specifications, risk records, decision logs, change records, interviews and demonstrated operating behavior.

Authority	Is the evidence issued or approved by an appropriate role?
Currency	Does it reflect the current project and operating state?
Attribution	Can the source, owner and decision be identified?
Completeness	Does it cover the material scope and exceptions?
Consistency	Does it agree with other evidence and observable behavior?

Evidence factors, multipliers, sufficiency calculations and conflict treatment are protected.

The protected operating core is disclosed by name

Protected Item	Publicly Disclosed	Protected Detail
Internal Weighting & Calculation Model	Its existence and role in controlled consistency are public.	Values, formulas, aggregation and conflict order.
Official READY Decision Thresholds	The four official Gate outcomes and their general meaning are public.	Eligibility thresholds, override hierarchy and exception logic.
Critical Condition Trigger Definitions	The registry and its direct role in constraining the Gate are public.	Trigger definitions, default impacts, exceptions and closure tests.
Evidence Sufficiency Calculation	Evidence-backed judgment principles and quality dimensions are public.	Factors, multipliers, sufficiency calculation and conflict treatment.
Evaluator Protocol	A controlled review and attributable Decision Record are required.	Review sequence, mandatory fields, reviewer controls and validity rules.
DHEX Internal Judgment Logic	Its role as an internal judgment-structuring layer is public.	Encoding, state translation, criteria derivation, schema and integration logic.
These protected items are not omitted because they are undefined. Their existence, purpose and system role are public; their operating logic remains proprietary and confidential.		

From public screening to an attributable Gate Decision

15. Expected Outputs

Public Self-Assessment Record	Preliminary domain-level visibility and gap record.
Controlled Assessment Record	Internal criterion, evidence and condition review.
Decision Record	Attributable Gate Decision with scope, conditions and validity.
Governed Implementation Brief	Approved operating conditions translated for implementation teams.

Application Scenarios

- Before committing to AI build or procurement
- Before deployment, release or expansion of authority
- After a material scope, data, model or operating change
- After an incident or when governance evidence becomes unreliable

16. Normora Formal Assessment

Organizations that identify material gaps, uncertainty or cross-domain conflict can proceed to a controlled Normora assessment. The formal engagement confirms scope, reviews evidence, applies the protected evaluator protocol and issues an attributable Gate Decision.

Before AI acts, the structure must be ready.

Normora Systems
Operating Architecture for AI-Era Projects
Public Self-Assessment Guide · Version 1.0 · 3 August 2026