ITUPublications
Recommendations

International Telecommunication Union
Standardization Sector

Proposed work item

AAR-REQ

FG-TIDA proposal for a new work item

Accountability and Attribution After an Agent Has Acted

Record-side requirements, draft 0.3

Record-side requirements (AAR-REQ). Proposal for a new work item

ABSTRACT

When an act by an agent is questioned later, the party asking was usually not present, and establishing what happened can require “an investigation rather than a lookup” (FG-TIDA/themes#1). This contribution proposes a work item that states what an action-time record must be able to carry, and what properties every claim it carries needs, so that such a party can establish the execution that performed the act and, where one exists, its supported relation to a logical agent; under whose delegated authority; within what declared scope; and that the record is unaltered. It consolidates requirements R1–R8, the lineage requirements and the absence states developed in the open thread on themes#1 since August 2026, each clause under its author’s name, and maps them to cases. It states requirements only and prescribes no encodings, schemas, protocols or identifiers.

HISTORY

Version	Document	Approval	Focus Group	Working Group
0.1	AAR-REQ: proposal for a new work item	—	TIDA	Incubation (proposed)
0.2	Co-author added; status and copyright wording corrected	—	TIDA	Incubation (proposed)
0.3	Two co-authors and a contributor added; a linked contribution record listed	—	TIDA	Incubation (proposed)

To access this Document as a PDF, open the published documentation site in your web browser and click the PDF download link, or navigate directly to https://tyche-dev.github.io/tida-aar-req/specification.pdf.

AUTHORS

Name	Affiliation	Contact
Anton Sokolov (editor)	Tyche Institute MTÜ, Estonia	anton.sokolov@tyche.institute; GitHub @tyche-dev
Syed Amir Hamza	Forkit AI	GitHub @syedofc
Nika Novak	ICAM Research Programme	GitHub @danyka-icam
Xinghua Zhao	Independent expert	GitHub @zhaoxinghua09-cell

Contributors. The requirements come from the open thread on FG-TIDA/themes#1. Its originating proposer is Oleh Vasylenko (@OlehVasylenko2000), Management Company Elixir LLC (Ukraine), who takes part as proposer and reviewer. Co-author Nika Novak (@danyka-icam) co-drafted the lineage requirements and cases and contributed use case #12. Co-author Syed Amir Hamza (@syedofc) co-drafted the identity and state continuity requirements (R8) and contributed use case #7. Co-author Xinghua Zhao (@zhaoxinghua09-cell) is named for the null-case refinement on R5 and for the linked contribution record on the verifier side (*Relation to other work*). @Abracadabrastartup (DEUSPROOF) raised the point recorded under open question 12, an asserted or witnessed moment (a possible R7.2a). Every clause in *Requirements* names its author.

KEYWORDS

Agentic AI; accountability; attribution; action-time record; carried claim; rejection class; delegated authority; lineage; tamper-evidence.

FOREWORD

Agentic AI systems now act as autonomous entities capable of reasoning, planning, and executing tasks across services, infrastructures, and organizational boundaries. This fundamentally changes the nature of identity in digital systems: identity is no longer limited to human users and static machine instances but must also encompass autonomous, dynamic, and goal-oriented agents. And identity alone is insufficient — the core question extends beyond "what an entity is" to "whether, and under what conditions, that entity should be trusted to act".

The Focus Group on Trust and Identity for humans and agentic AI (FG-TIDA) addresses trust management and interoperable digital identity infrastructure for humans and for agentic AI, supporting the development of secure, trustworthy digital ecosystems in which humans and agentic AI can safely interact and collaborate.

FG-TIDA was established under Recommendation ITU-T A.7 (Focus groups: Establishment and working procedures), with ITU-T Study Group 17 as its parent group. Further details are available in the group's terms of reference.

For more news and updates about the TIDA Community, including its supporter organizations, please refer to the community's published resources.

NOTE

This document is a proposal for a new work item, submitted to FG-TIDA Incubation on 15 November 2026 as an input to the first FG-TIDA meeting (Paris, 30 November – 1 December 2026). The TIDA DataTracker records it as contribution FG-TIDA-INCUBATION-003, state Submitted. It is not adopted Focus Group text. The requirement text it summarises stands in the posted comments listed in *Annex: source record*.

CONTENTS

Scope . . . 1
0.0.1 Problem . . . 1
0.0.2 What the work item covers . . . 1
0.0.3 Out of scope . . . 1
Requirements . . . 1
0.0.4 Questions carried open . . . 2
Relation to other work . . . 2
Programme of work . . . 3
0.0.5 Deliverables . . . 3
0.0.6 Placement . . . 3
0.0.7 Editor . . . 4
0.0.8 Proposed timetable . . . 4
0.0.9 Attribution . . . 4
Annex: source record . . . 4
References . . . 4

Scope

0.0.1 Problem

Agents act across services and organizational boundaries. When an act is questioned afterwards, the party asking was usually not there, and what that party can establish depends on what was recorded at the moment of the act and on the properties of that record. FG-TIDA/themes#1 cites evaluation work by the UK AI Security Institute in which, where agents took unsanctioned actions, establishing what had happened "required an investigation rather than a lookup" (@OlehVasylenko2000, 10 August 2026). That evaluation ran with safeguards disabled, so the point is reconstruction, not the level of risk. The question is asked afterwards, but the requirement binds when the act happens (@OlehVasylenko2000, 15 August 2026). No persistent logical-agent identity is assumed.

0.0.2 What the work item covers

Requirements on the record, and on what a relying party reports from it: what an action-time record must be able to carry about the act (the execution that performed it and, where one exists, its supported relation to a logical agent; the delegated authority and declared scope; observed content, and a conformance verdict where one exists; a reference to the provenance of authority); the rejection classes a relying party reports (R1–R4); the properties of carried claims (R5–R7); absence and silence; lineage from representation to action; and identity continuity and effective state (R8).

0.0.3 Out of scope

Protocol specification: encodings, schemas, field names, media types, test vectors and expected-outcome files. How a relying party reaches a class, and how an execution, an identity, a state or a derivation relation is named. Model internals, and how any value in a record is computed. Replacing logging and audit practice. Legal liability. What a conformance verdict asserts and how it is checked (FG-TIDA/themes#6, task 3). Where authority originates and what may be conferred (FG-TIDA/themes#5).

Requirements

The clause text stands in 2 comments posted on FG-TIDA/themes#1: R1–R6 of 24 August 2026, and R4.4, R7 and R8 of 12 October 2026 (see *Annex: source record*). This table summarises them; where it differs, the posted comments govern. Each row names who proposed the clause and, in brackets, who refined it.

Table 1: Record-side requirements and their authors

Clause	Requirement, in one line	Proposed (refined) by
R1 Separability	A relying party that rejects reports the class of the rejection; a bare accept or reject is not enough.	@tyche-dev; asked for as a requirement by @OlehVasylenko2000
R2 The reported reason must be true	A correct rejection with a misattributed cause does not conform.	@tyche-dev
R3 Tier 1 classes	Replayed, expired, malformed, out of mandate: each decidable from the record and the relying party's own state, and distinguishable from the others.	@tyche-dev (@AntoBud, @OlehVasylenko2000)
R4 Tier 2: standing withdrawn	Every tier 1 check passes, but the grantor would not confer the mandate at the moment of the act. The record declares whether the grantor's continued standing is checkable (R4.1); a relying party records which moment it used (R4.2); neither moment is mandated, and the choice is visible (R4.3).	the class @AntoBud; the 2 tiers @tyche-dev

continues on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Clause	Requirement, in one line	Proposed (refined) by
R4.4	A carried standing answer is a claim, and it carries what R7 requires.	@AntoBud
R5	Negative and null assertions are claims, subject to R1–R4 as a positive claim is.	@cgorlla; the null case @OlehVasylenko2000 (@zhaoxinghua09-cell)
R6	Freshness is a relation, not a property: the record carries the moment its assertion was true and the means, if any, of rechecking it.	@AntoBud
R7	Any carried claim needs attribution (R7.1), a stated moment (R7.2) and tamper-evidence that a party with no relationship to the producer can check (R7.3). R7 does not make a claim true.	the recursion @OlehVasylenko2000; the names follow @OlehVasylenko2000 and @danyka-icam
Absence and silence	The record keeps 3 states apart: a reference was established; a bounded search, with its scope and author, returned nothing; nothing was recorded.	@pdixon-wpf and @OlehVasylenko2000, on FG-TIDA/themes#9
LR1–LR5 Lineage	Descent, transformed descent, independent reconstruction, examined-but-unresolved and record silence stay distinguishable; similarity and conformance never stand in for lineage, and missing evidence never yields NO.	@danyka-icam (@OlehVasylenko2000)
R8	A later relying party can establish the act, the execution that performed it, that execution's supported relation to a logical agent where one exists, and the effective state that governed the act at that time, not a later state (R8.1–R8.5).	@syedofc; R8.3 @OlehVasylenko2000; R8.5 @pdixon-wpf
3 relations	The execution, its supported relation to a logical agent, and the principal or harness context that instantiated it stay distinguishable; instantiation alone establishes no authorization.	@syedofc; supported by @OlehVasylenko2000

0.0.4 Questions carried open

The work item carries the open questions of the theme 1 charter (PR #46, version 0.5), with the positions recorded under them: the evidence basis of a carried claim (1); whether the record states which checks were in the path (2); what attribution binds to (3); "and if so where" in R4.1 (5); a third UNCLEAR lineage state (6); multi-step delegation, the boundary with law and policy, and record-keeping obligations (7); inputs from FG-TIDA/themes#5, #36 and PR #28 (9); reconstructable or re-computable (10); whether a deployment can meet R8 (11); and an asserted or witnessed moment (12). On the last: R7.3 lets a party check that a record is unaltered, but not when it was written (@Abracadabrastartup, 10 November 2026). @OlehVasylenko2000 suggested that D1 first keep 3 moments apart: the moment of the act; the moment a producer states for a claim; and an independently bounded moment, which shows only that a record existed no later than a given time and is not the freshness relation of R6 (12 November 2026). If the proposed R7.2a becomes text, it is a sub-clause of R7.2, and R7 keeps 3 properties.

Relation to other work

- **WG2, Identity, Behaviour and Enforcement for AI Agents (IBEA).** The WG2 charter places "the record that carries a decision, and the properties any carried claim needs" under FG-TIDA/themes#1 (Out of Scope). For the texts that describe this boundary, @OlehVasylenko2000 proposed one line (PR #46, 12 November 2026), which this work item takes: "WG2 specifies what a decision is and what its outcome means, including what the decision record states; #1 specifies the record-side requirements that record must meet and the properties of the claims it carries (R1–R8)."
- **WG1, Continuous and Dynamic Remote Attestation for Agentic AI (CDRA).** WG2 examines with WG1 whether a third party can later check an enforcement decision. That check also rests on R7.3: tamper-evidence that a party with no relationship to the producer can check.

- **FG-TIDA/themes#5, Provenance of Authority: mutual, not sequential.** Provenance determines what a record can truthfully say about authority; the properties of the record determine whether it survives a party who was not there.
- **FG-TIDA/themes#6, task 3.** What a conformance verdict asserts and how a verifier checks it. Task 3 takes its tier 1 and tier 2 rejection classes from R3 and R4 unchanged, and #6 "will reference" R7 rather than restate it (@cgorlla, 14 October 2026).
- **FG-TIDA/themes#27 and PR #28 (verifier-side requirements in regulated workflows).** Of the change-event record it proposes, its drafter wrote that the record-side requirements in themes#1 "define where this record belongs; this item specifies what the verifier must be able to read from it" (@zhaoxinghua09-cell, PR #28, 15 October 2026).
- **Verifier-side interface to the record requirements (linked contribution record).** Four clauses, VR1 to VR4, on the report a verifier makes: each check as a pair of who performed it and against what; the moment evaluated against; what a pass claims and within what boundary; and the report as a claim the next party assesses. The record "adds nothing to R1–R8 and alters nothing in them", and it stands beside this document, under its author's name (@zhaoxinghua09-cell, PR #46, 16 November 2026): https://github.com/LGD-Eval/evaluation-protocol/blob/f66c4658fd1c99b1e6fef99b99eed3865dc8e45f/FG-TIDA-AAR-VERIFIER-SIDE-INTERFACE.md. Whether the four clauses move into this work item is for the group to decide.
- **WG0, Use Cases and Terminology.** Use cases #7 (@syedofc) and #12 (@danyka-icam) supply the cases for D2.
- **Format work.** Encodings and profiles for carried claims belong to the bodies that specify formats. The thread named the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Remote Attestation Procedures (RATS) architecture and the Entity Attestation Token (EAT) as relevant adjacent work; this assigns no standards body exclusive responsibility for future formats (@OlehVasylenko2000, PR #46, 26 October 2026).
- **ITU-T Study Group 17 (SG17).** "Work under this theme complements ongoing SG17 work without duplicating it. Questions of possible overlap are resolved by the FG Chair and the SG17 Chair on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with clause 2 of the Terms of Reference." (wording by @OlehVasylenko2000, 16 September 2026)

Programme of work

0.0.5 Deliverables

- **D1 Record-side requirements.** One consolidated text of R1–R8, the lineage requirements, the absence states and the 3 relations, each clause under its author's name. Requirements only: no encodings, schemas, protocols, identifiers, identity-binding mechanisms or conformance vectors.
- **D2 Cases.** A short mapping of the lineage cases LR1–LR5 and use cases #7 and #12 to the requirements they test. D2 fixes no conformance vectors.

0.0.6 Placement

If the Focus Group places the work in an existing working group, or in one formed in Paris, D1 and D2 move into that group's deliverables, and no competing charter is opened: "the requirements travel, and the drafting responsibility travels with them" (@OlehVasylenko2000, 1 September 2026).

0.0.7 Editor

Anton Sokolov offers to serve as editor, as offered on FG-TIDA/themes#1 on 31 August 2026 ("willing to serve as editor or co-editor, subject to the drafting timetable it adopts"), and asks for at least 1 co-editor for D1. Who co-edits, and the cadence, are for the group to set.

0.0.8 Proposed timetable

Paris, 30 November – 1 December 2026: decision on the work item and its placement. Before the 2nd meeting (Geneva, 26–27 January 2027): a consolidated D1 draft for review. The editor attends in Paris on 30 November and can present the item that day.

0.0.9 Attribution

Clause-level attribution stays traceable in D1, where every clause stands under its author's name, and in the linked contribution record (see *Annex: source record*): the theme 1 charter, which records who proposed and refined each clause and keeps the open questions, and the 2 requirement comments on themes#1, which hold the clause text.

Annex: source record

- FG-TIDA/themes#1: https://github.com/FG-TIDA/themes/issues/1
- Requirement text R1–R6, 24 August 2026: https://github.com/FG-TIDA/themes/issues/1#issuecomment-5399524599
- Requirement text R4.4, R7 and R8, 12 October 2026: https://github.com/FG-TIDA/themes/issues/1#issuecomment-6127433298
- Theme 1 charter, version 0.5 (PR #46): https://github.com/FG-TIDA/themes/pull/46

References

[ITU-T A.7]
Recommendation ITU-T A.7, *Focus groups: Establishment and working procedures*.

[FG-TIDA ToR]
FG-TIDA Terms of Reference,

https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/focusgroups/tida/Pages/ToR.aspx

[WG2 charter]
FG-TIDA WG2, Identity, Behaviour and Enforcement for AI Agents (IBEA), charter,

https://github.com/fg-tida-wg2/wg2-ibea-charter

[Use cases]
FG-TIDA WG0, use cases #7 and #12,

https://github.com/fg-tida-wg0/use-cases/issues/7

https://github.com/fg-tida-wg0/use-cases/issues/12

LIST OF TABLES

1 Record-side requirements and their authors 1

LIST OF FIGURES