ARF Agent Work Suite

Who owns the last step?

A patch can reach review long after the person who asked for it has gone home. Tomorrow's operator needs four answers. What did the worker ask to do? Who allowed it? Who attempted it? What did the target actually report? The Agent Work Suite gives each answer an owner and a record.

Put the grant where it can be used

Take a release owner who delegates the release notes and a private draft. The grant names the job, the target and its limits. Delegating a second worker to review the notes raises a new question about what that worker may see. Publishing the result raises another about who can change the release. A conversation can carry the original instruction across both boundaries. The privilege to act has to be checked at each one.

The Agent Interposer routes requests between clients and model providers. On a route configured for governance, Watchdog consults ARF before forwarding. The Governance Proxy evaluates the provider-bound request. Downstream, the command broker checks the requested tool and destination. The executor uses the authority it receives for that operation. This separation lets a team change its review model and keep its release rule. It also identifies every route the team needs to cover when it introduces another client.

Follow a governed change

In an integrated run, the agent proposes work, policy evaluates each governed request, the operator responds when a decision requires human judgment, the executor performs permitted operations, and observers report resulting state. The linked browser exercise scripts an example decision window and denial so you can follow how these records link together.

Open the graph and pick a decision. Its JSON line names the same signed event. Follow the work parents to find what caused the decision, and follow the ledger parent to find its place in the recorded sequence. The separate 45-record file history is also a signed simulation fixture. Its final cleanup has several work causes even though only one event immediately precedes it in ledger order. Give the fixture and trust file to a colleague and have them recover the deleted test input.

The missing reply

Now consider a configuration change that goes quiet halfway through. An executor's dispatch entry shows that it attempted the change. A fresh read from the target tells the operator whether the setting took effect. Until that observation arrives, a retry may repeat the change. The platform design keeps this case open for reconciliation and gives recovery its own authority.

A related failure was exercised in the authority database itself. The restoration committed, then the test withheld the reply. The operator retried the command and recovered the same result, with previously spent allowance still spent. Independent verification checked 94 signatures over 45 canonical records and rejected 26 altered cases. That is evidence about restoration of authority. The target's current state still comes from the target.

Give tomorrow's reviewer something to work with

A fixture can be important for ten minutes and still explain a decision six months later. The filesystem capture design binds a file revision to its original bytes. Retention rules determine which content can travel, for how long, and to whom. The provenance engine signs the observation. The independent witness gives a later verifier a prior commitment to compare. The receiving agent searches with its own identity and gets the evidence its assignment permits.

Put one workflow through acceptance

Choose one change the team has had to explain before. Give the agent a worktree and one narrow objective. Switch the model for review. Revoke one permission while the job is active. Withhold a reply after dispatch. Then put a second operator in front of the record and ask whether they would retry, restore or stop. Measure the time it takes them to find the grounds for their answer.

SDD 1.2.3 sets out 32 architecture decisions for this design. Its implementation record includes a native reference service that completed 780 scheduled requests, with a forward change and exact restoration in the peak workload. The individual papers link those recorded results to the particular decisions they test.

Four records for one change

Record	Who can answer for it	What to look for
Request	Worker or requester	The named target and the exact proposed change.
Authority	Policy, an operator or a default at the deadline	The decision, what it covers and how it was resolved.
Dispatch	The designated executor	An intent in the journal and the result it received.
Observation	Target system or independent observer	A readback or receipt that resolves what actually happened.

Sources and evidence

Architecture decisions and acceptance criteria · Try a release in the Decision Press · Read a native checkpoint