Reuse the evidence; reassess its applicability

One source-linked evidence base can serve several permitted assessments. It does not produce one universal compliance verdict.

Reusable evidence: R3 configuration | TA42 assertion | TR42 source | SB04 software inventory | events and status

Retain subject, issuer, scope, method, time, version and access conditions. Select only the records relevant to each assessment.

ESPR / DPP	Functional safety	EU AI Act	MDR	Machinery Regulation	CRA	Export controls
Product obligations	Risk + assurance	AI role + use context	Only if medical scope	Machine + use context	Digital-product scope	Item + destination

SEVEN SEPARATE ASSESSMENT VIEWS

Applicability, required evidence, accepted authority and the responsible decision-maker must be established for each view.

For each applicable view, repeat the controlled workflow:

1 ASK

Name the task, subject, operating conditions and accountable owner.

People define purpose.

2 RETRIEVE

Follow permitted links. Reveal only the evidence allowed for this task.

Gateways enforce access.

3 VERIFY

Check source integrity, issuer scope, freshness and current status.

Software tests premises.

4 INTERPRET

Resolve units and versions. Apply the selected, explicit decision rule.

Rules run; gaps stay visible.

5 EXPLAIN

AI cites accepted evidence. A reviewer examines gaps and conflicts.

AI assists; humans assess.

6 AUTHORIZE

The responsible participant approves any action and records its outcome.

Local authority decides.

Example: TR42 withdrawn

Recheck every view that actually used TA42. Under AR1, RC3 is HOLD; WO9 cannot rely on that release claim.

Different outcomes remain possible

A view may be unaffected, require new evidence, or reach a different decision under its own rule. Preserve the reason.

VALUE TO TEST **Less repeated preparation | faster impact review | supported explanations | easier provider substitution**

Measure correct decisions, unsupported claims, disclosure failures, tokens, throughput, p95 response time and total lifecycle cost.

These are hypotheses for a complete controlled workflow. A graph, signature or open standard alone guarantees none of them.

Synthetic demonstration. No safety approval, legal certification, autonomous physical action or measured AI-performance improvement is reported.