One industrial decision across two architecture patterns

Matched scenario: supplier in Japan, laboratory in the Republic of Korea, manufacturer in Germany; all actors and evidence are synthetic

DECISION JOURNEY	P1 PLATFORM-GOVERNED ONTOLOGY	P2 FEDERATED EVIDENCE AND ONTOLOGY
1 Discover	Find configured objects, data and tools in the platform or its connected services.	Find a permitted endpoint through the participant gateway and protected catalog.
2 Request	An application or agent requests the component record and relevant test evidence.	Present organizational identity and task-scoped delegation to the provider.
3 Authorize	Configured platform controls govern the user or agent, resource and operation.	Evaluate provider policy, compatible obligations and permitted result disclosure.
4 Verify	Inspect lineage and evidence; portable proof checks depend on selected implementation.	Check protected payload, subject, issuer scope, status, time and source binding.
5 Interpret	Map source data to the adopted object model, units, links and executable logic.	Apply an approved exchange profile and mappings; retain attributed disagreement.
6 Decide	Run the agreed rule over the authorized snapshot; expose missing premises.	Run the same rule over admitted evidence; distinguish eligible, ineligible and deferred.
7 Act	An authorized action requests the ERP change; external effects need reconciliation.	The receiving participant rechecks preconditions; request and receipt bind the decision.
8 Update	Index changed instances and observed effects; trace dependent workflow state.	Refresh evidence and status; reevaluate dependencies without silently changing history.

Comparison rule Same task, actors, permissions, evidence and failures. Record native support, adapters and untested requirements separately.

P1 is a documentary abstraction; P2 is a proposed composition. Neither column reports an executed benchmark or jurisdictional recognition.