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The Structure of the Promise
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Enhanced view 2
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Enhanced view 3

action: do F on the part of the promiser = initial tendency towards realization
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= terminal tendency towards blaming and shaming in promiser and in wider society 6

blame and shame the promise in case of failure to do F

6
Different kinds of sanction

withdrawal of trust (damage to reputation)
withdrawal of permissions / credentials
on-line review
police
"ought" implies "can"


Recently, psychologists have explored moral concepts including obligation, blame, and ability. … philosophers have widely assumed such a relationship in the principle that "ought" implies "can," … The cognitive underpinnings of these concepts are tested in the three experiments reported here.
"ought" implies "can"

Experiment 1, most participants judge that an agent ought to keep a promise that he is unable to keep, but only when he is to blame for the inability.

Experiment 2 shows that such "ought" judgments correlate with judgments of blame, rather than with judgments of the agent's ability.

Experiment 3 replicates these findings for moral "ought" judgments and finds that they do not hold for nonmoral "ought" judgments, such as what someone ought to do to fulfill their desires.
"ought" implies "can"

These results together show that folk moral judgments do not conform to a widely assumed philosophical principle that "ought" implies "can." Instead, judgments of blame play a modulatory role in some judgments of obligation.
Necessary conditions for: person $x$ has a (simple promise-type) obligation

1. there is some society [object aggregate] $s$
2. $x$ member_part_of $s$
3. there is some obligation-generating practice [a social disposition like our promising] $p$
4. $p$ inheres in $s$ [$p$ instance of social practice]
5. there is some act $a$ which $x$ performs at time $t$ earlier than $t^*$
6. $a$ is an instance of $p$’s ritual obligation-generating act type [in our society: $a$ is a promise]
if $x$ promises $y$ at $t$ then

1. $x$ performs the ‘I promise’ speech act before $y$ at $t$ and $y$ registers $x$’s performance

2. there is some society $s$ and $x$ and $y$ are member-parts of $s$

3. from $t$, $x$ has a disposition $d$ to perform the content of $a$ (“do $F$”)

4. $d$ specifically depends on $a$ & $x$ knows that $d$ exists and that $d$ specifically depends on $a$

The disposition to perform the content of $a$ exists in virtue of changes in the brain of $x$
if \( x \) performs act \( a \) [e.g., \( x \) promises] at \( t \) then

5. there is a mutually specifically dependent pair of obligor and obligee roles \( r_{or} \) and \( r_{ee} \)

6. \( r_{or} \) inheres_in \( x \) & \( r_{ee} \) inheres_in \( y \)

These roles exist in virtue of the fact that

\( y \) AND/OR members of the society \( s \) associated with \( y \) believe that \( x \) performed the corresponding obligation-generating act

If all memories of the act \( a \) and its attendant obligation cease to exist, then this obligation ceases to exist
if \( x \) performs act \( a \) at \( t \) & \( x \) thereby has an obligation at \( t^+ \) then

6. at \( t^+ \)

EITHER \( y \) OR members of \( s \) associated with \( y \) have a disposition at \( t^+ \) to monitor \( a \)'s performance of this content & to blame and shame \( x \) if \( x \) fails to perform

This disposition specifically depends on the belief that \( x \) has the obligation, thus on his having the obligor role, at \( t^+ \)
obligation

$x$ is an obligation-generating-act =def. $x$ is a speech act performed by a member of a society in which ritual declarations take place of the form ‘I will do F’ which give rise to dispositions to monitoring and blame in case of failure.

$y$ has an obligation at $t^+$ =def. $y$ performed an obligation-generating act $x$ in society $s$ and members of $s$, as a result of $x$, have the disposition to blame $y$ in case of failure.
obligor role (how to define it)

x has the obligor role =def. x performed an obligation-generating act & x is believed by members of s to have performed that obligation-generating act

x has the obligor role =def. x has an obligation & x is believed by members of s to have that obligation
obligations are created by plans involving multiple agents

x is in charge of a team y (e.g. x is a conductor)

z is a plan specification (e.g. a musical score)

x commits to using y to realize z

on the basis of the GDC z, x’s plan (something in x’s brain, an intention) – call it zx – comes into being

x instructs the members of y to do their part as specified in z

all members of y become obliged to realize
Planning and Commanding

Principal investigator

will to realize goal \( g \) (sincere intention)

plan specification (GDC)
including goal (specification) \( g \)

commitment

plan

disposition: realize goal by performing specified actions

realizes

are these the same thing?

plan execution

s\_depends\_on
OBI Plan Specification
office creates obligations

to be appointed or elected to an office involves
commitment to fulfil the duties of the office
public acceptance of this commitment
obligations following therefrom
again: there are sanctions for failure to perform (= fulfil duties)
offices

is the office identical with the office holder role?

(if so, the office ceases to exist during interregna between office-holders)
duty

= def. a duty is an obligation the fulfilment of which is required by the member of an organization or by the holder of an office in the organization

are there duties outside organizations / offices?
Reinach:

Basic institutional concepts: convention, ownership, obligation, uptake, agreement, sincerity, rule, breaking a rule, authority, consent, jurisdiction

These are primitive = not capable of being defined in terms of more basic notions
Prestige vs. Dominance
This paper advances an “information goods” theory that explains prestige processes as an emergent product of psychological adaptations that evolved to improve the quality of information acquired via cultural transmission. Natural selection favored social learners who could evaluate potential models and copy the most successful among them. In order to improve the fidelity and comprehensiveness of such ranked-biased copying, social learners further evolved dispositions to sycophantically ingratiate themselves with their chosen models, so as to gain close proximity to, and prolonged interaction with, these models. Once common, these dispositions created, at the group level, distributions of deference that new entrants may adaptively exploit to decide who to begin copying. This generated a preference for models who seem generally “popular.” Building on social exchange theories, we argue that a wider range of phenomena associated with prestige processes can more plausibly be explained by this simple theory than by others, and we test its predictions with data from throughout the social sciences. In addition, we distinguish carefully between dominance (force or force threat) and prestige (freely conferred deference).
E. Francesconi, “A description logic framework for advanced accessing and reasoning over normative provisions”, *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 22, 2014
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*Fig. 3* Hohfeldian relations. a Deontic concepts and their relations, b potestative (anankastic) concepts and their relations
S. Aubert and J.-P. Müller “Incorporating institutions, norms and territories in a generic model to simulate the management of renewable resources”, *Artificial Intelligence in Law*, (2013) 21:47–78

*Fig. 3* The definition of an institution
Aubert and Müller

Fig. 5 Some institutions
The LKIF Core Ontology of Basic Legal Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>per1-tests</td>
<td>Fixes for 1.0.3, moved time-modification owl and lkieules owl to re...</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>README md</td>
<td>Added md extension</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal-action owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Rule</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal-role owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lkie-core.owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lkie-extended.owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lkie-rules owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lkie-top.owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphology.owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norm owl</td>
<td>Added counts as/imposed_on, Subjective_Entity, and redefined Role</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LRI Core Layers
Rinke Hoekstra, Joost Breuker, Marcello Di Bello, Alexander Boer. “The LKIF Core Ontology of Basic Legal Concepts”

Qualifications and Norms
E. Francesconi, “A description logic framework for advanced accessing and reasoning over normative provisions”, *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 22, 2014

**Fig. 3** Hohfeldian relations. a Deontic concepts and their relations, b potestative (anankastic) concepts and their relations
E. Francesconi, “A description logic framework for advanced accessing and reasoning over normative provisions”, *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 22, 2014

![Diagram of Hohfeldian relations]

**Fig. 3** Hohfeldian relations. a Deontic concepts and their relations
Hohfeldian legal relations

1. X has the RIGHT that Y performs A, iff in case Y does not perform A, X may react with an action R such that Y is negatively affected by R.

2. Y has the DUTY to perform A for X, iff the same condition as the one above holds (i.e., DUTY is the “opposite” of RIGHT, where the roles of the two agents are interchanged).

3. X has NO-RIGHT that Y performs A, iff in case Y does not perform A, X may not react with an action R such that Y is negatively affected by R.

4. Y has the PRIVILEGE (is allowed) to perform A with respect to X, iff in case Y does perform A, X may not react with an action R such that Y is negatively affected by R.

E. Francesconi, “A description logic framework for advanced accessing and reasoning over normative provisions”,

![Diagram showing relationships between Power, Liability, Disability, and Immunity.}]
Hohfeldian legal relations in BFO terms

1. X has the RIGHT that Y performs A = Y acquires the role of obligor wrt performing A when X requests/commands it; AND wider society has the disposition to sanction Y in case of failure to perform;

2. Y has the DUTY to perform A for X = Y acquires the role of obligor wrt performing A when X requests/commands it; AND wider society has the disposition to sanction Y in case of failure to perform;

Hohfeldian power relations

1. X has the POWER to bring about that P (where P is some Legal Relation), iff there exists an action A such that, in case X performs A, P is established.

2. X has the INABILITY to bring about that P (where P is some Legal Relation), iff there exists no action A such that in case X performs A, P is established.

3. P has the LIABILITY of being brought about by X iff there exists an action A such that in case X does perform A, P is established.

4. P has the IMMUNITY of being brought about by X iff there exists no action A such that in case X does perform A, P is established.

POWER to bring about legal relations

rests on having AUTHORITY-ROLE (commander, director, team leader …)

X has immediate AUTHORITY-ROLE =def. the (majority of members of the relevant) wider society accepts that X has AUTHORITY-ROLE

document D specifies AUTHORITY-ROLE r =def. D specifies DUTIES AND POWERS that flow from having r
POWER to bring about legal relations

X has D-mediated AUTHORITY-ROLE =def. X has AUTHORITY-ROLE defined in document D AND the members of the relevant society accept that X has AUTHORITY-ROLE

Document-ontological foundations of an Org Chart

X has D1-mediated AUTHORITY-ROLE to appoint/instruct/manage Y with D2-mediated AUTHORITY-ROLE
Hohfeldian power relations in BFO terms

1. X has the POWER to bring about that P (where P is some Legal Relation) = X has the authority-role which is such that, if X performs act A then legal relation P is established AND there is a disposition in the wider society to accept X’s authority role AND

2. iff there exists an action A such that, in case X performs A, P is established.

2. X has the INABILITY to bring about that P (where P is some Legal Relation), iff there exists no action A such that in case X performs A, P is established.

3..

Powers, immunities, liabilities and disabilities involve changes in legal relations. There are various ways in which legal relations may change, but not all of them are the result of an exercise of a power, etc. (A change in rights under a contract may, for example, result from the occurrence of a natural event.)

Powers, immunities, liabilities and disabilities, however, exist in situations in which the potential change in legal relations is dependent on the volitional act of some person. X is said to have a power over Y, if X, by doing some act, can change the legal relations of Y.
Some people can create normative relations in certain sorts of contexts

(Searle: ontological fecundity of language)

In the realization of collaborative plans, the team leader L creates obligations on the part of the team members

But how did L get to be team leader?
And how did L get the POWER (authority) to issue instructions to the team members?
Some people can create normative relations in certain sorts of contexts

We assume: L created the team
But how did L get the POWER (authority) to create the team
(follows complex story about L’s employment contract, grant funding documents, …)
Some people can create normative relations in certain sorts of contexts

1. How did L get the POWER (authority) to issue instructions to the team members?

2. Because each member M, when she joined L’s team, consented to follow L’s instructions relating to the performance of the team

3. Each team member X has the POWER to bring about that L has the POWER to issue such instructions
Hospital consent form
About Kaleida Health

Kaleida Health is the largest healthcare provider in Western New York, serving the area's eight counties with state-of-the-art technology and comprehensive healthcare services. Its expert, compassionate healthcare professionals are committed to providing the best possible outcomes and experience for patients and visitors.

More than one million sick or injured patients choose a Kaleida Health facility annually, including Buffalo General Medical Center/Gates Vascular Institute, DeGraff Memorial Hospital, Millard Fillmore Suburban Hospital, and Women & Children's Hospital of Buffalo.

Accredited by Det Norske Veritas (DNV) Healthcare, Inc., Kaleida Health also provides important services through two long-term care facilities, over 80 outpatient clinics, including school-based health centers, and home health care through the Visiting Nursing Association of WNY, Inc. In addition, Kaleida Health’s hospitals support residency training programs of the University at Buffalo School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, training more than 700 residents each year.
About Kaleida Health

Kaleida Health is the largest healthcare provider in Western New York, serving the area's eight counties with state-of-the-art technology and comprehensive healthcare services. Its expert, compassionate healthcare professionals are committed to providing the best possible outcomes and experience for patients and visitors. More than one million sick or injured patients choose a Kaleida Health facility annually, including Buffalo General Medical Center/Gates Vascular Institute, DeGraff Memorial Hospital, Millard Fillmore Suburban Hospital, and Women & Children's Hospital of Buffalo.

Accredited by Det Norske Veritas (DNV) Healthcare, Inc.

Nursing Association of WNY, Inc. In addition, Kaleida Health’s hospitals support residency training programs of the University at Buffalo School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, training more than 700 residents each year.
Selected Entity Name: KALEIDA HEALTH

Selected Entity Status Information

Current Entity Name: KALEIDA HEALTH
DOS ID #: 2090748
Initial DOS Filing Date: DECEMBER 06, 1996
County: ERIE
Jurisdiction: NEW YORK
Entity Type: DOMESTIC NOT-FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION
Current Entity Status: ACTIVE

Selected Entity Address Information

DOS Process (Address to which DOS will mail process if accepted on behalf of the entity)
KALEIDA HEALTH
GENERAL COUNSEL
726 EXCHANGE STREET
BUFFALO, NEW YORK, 14210

Registered Agent
NONE
1. Group of persons g1 submits documents d1: application for incorporation, and d2: (proposed) articles of incorporation, to the organization o1 = New York State Division of Corporations: g1 have POWERS

2. Another group of persons g2, members of o1, following specific procedures documented in d2, approves the application. g1 exercises its POWERS

3. The corporation o2 comes into existence: o2 is an aggregate (initially) of the persons in g2 in which different persons now have different, specified roles, President, Board Member, CEO, Director of Oncology … as specified in d2 (o2 = g2+roles)
4. Director of Oncology has POWER to assign doctor X to treat patient Y

5. Doctor X diagnoses patient Y, and decides patient Y needs treatment Z

6. State ethics laws (?) declare that patient consent is required for treatment Z

7. Y has P has the LIABILITY of being brought about by X iff there exists an action A such that in case X does perform A, P is established
Military Doctrine feeds into Military Planning

• Doctrine provides an authoritative body of consistent* statements on
  – how military forces conduct (joint) operations
  – how military plans are to be constructed
• provides a common lexicon
  – which must be used by military planners and leaders
  – which will be what those charged with execution of military plans will anticipate and understand
  – will allow ingestion and consistent aggregation of data concerning lessons learned

*ideally
Duties vs. specifications of duties

• Legal codes, ethics codes, corporation laws, doctrinal publications
• Contracts (of employment, ...)
• Charters (of a city, a university, a hospital, ...)
• Plan specifications, work orders, ...

—provide the frameworks within which duties are acquired by participants in complex human actions
Plan specifications are information artifacts

To understand what plans are we need to incorporate the factor of oughtness:

The commander has made a plan (selected from alternative plan specifications)

= is **committed** to the plan
  some parts of the plan are **compulsory**, other parts are **optional**
  he has authority to **command** others to realize the plan ...
  they become **obliged** to perform certain actions
  these actions can be more or less in **conformity with** the plan
  they can be **rewarded and punished** in light of their conformance
Plan specification vs. Plan

- Recipe in a book vs. Recipe in your head when you start to cook
Elements of the planning process

**Information artifact elements**

Plan development *has_output* plan specification

Commander *performs* review of alternative plan specifications

Commander *commits_to* plan specification #1

Commander’s act of commitment *has_output* plan #1

Commander *has_commitment* to realize plan #1 by following the actions specified in the plan specification

Plan *is_a* disposition

Plan *realized_in* plan execution

Plan *has_goal*: future world-state F
commander

will to realize this goal in this way (sincere intention)

plan specification

including goal, COA

commitment

plan

disposition: realize goal by performing specified actions
Language

There is a language creation and maintenance system
(schools, dictionaries, …)

The English language = competences to produce and to
process utterances + written linguistic outputs

Maintained in existence by activities of persons in writing
and speaking, by documents which serve as standards,
by mothers, teachers … with special competences and
POWERS
Compare

Price maintenance and creation system

Prices
(of 1 Euro, of a beer in a Paris bar …)

Individual acts of exchange
Compare

The law creation and maintenance system (the legislature, local courts…)

The body of law

Individual legal and police actions
Compare

The healthcare creation and maintenance system (legal bodies, standards bodies, medical schools, hospitals…)

The body of regulations, medical best practice guidelines, …

Individual actions of doctors, patients, …
Main thesis:
the meshing of complex actions of large numbers of people is made possible through

1. modularization
2. hierarchically organized authorities
both resting essentially on

3. the meshing of documents
4. the associated meshing of roles and POWERS
Orchestal score with staves
The Modularity of the Orchestral Score
The actions of the players in an orchestral performance

• are intermeshed through the sets of intermeshed documents we call orchestral scores

These documents are plan specifications (sets of instructions for playing instruments)

The conductor provides the authority

– to initiate commitment, thus to create a plan from a mere plan specification

– to resolve disputes which arise along the way, for example as to interpretation, tempo, ...
Scores bring it about that specific obligation series are distributed in coordinated fashion across large groups.
players actions are coordinated and steered through time through conductor’s actions combined with intermeshed sets of instructions
Massive shared agency presupposes modularity
Modularity of Orchestral Score
reflects modularity of orchestra
**CHAIN OF COMMAND OF THE IMPERIAL JAPANESE NAVY**  
(From 8 December 1941 to 15 August 1945)

**IMPERIAL GENERAL HEADQUARTERS**  
(Navy General Command
(Expeditionary, 25 Apr 43))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Flotilla</th>
<th>Commanding Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEAST AREA FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>24 Dec 43 - 30 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN AREA FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>24 Dec 43 - 30 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST AREA FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>24 Dec 43 - 30 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST SOUTHERN EXPEDITIONARY FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND SOUTHERN EXPEDITIONARY FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD SOUTHERN EXPEDITIONARY FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL PACIFIC AREA FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST AIR FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND AIR FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRTEENTH AIR FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEVENTH AIR FLLOTILLA</strong></td>
<td>1 Mar 44 - 1 May 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

The Navy General Command was established on 25 Apr 43 as the supreme command over the entire naval forces. It consisted of the Commander-in-Chief, Admiral Ushijima, and the Chief of Staff, Rear Admiral Tanaka. The duties of the Navy General Command included the defense of the Japanese Home Islands and the control of all naval forces in the Pacific. The Commander-in-Chief was responsible for the overall strategy and tactics of the navy, while the Chief of Staff was responsible for the operational指挥 of the fleet. The Navy General Command was replaced by the Combined Fleet in July 1944, which was under the command of Vice Admiral Soemu Toyoda. The Combined Fleet was responsible for the defense of the Japanese Home Islands and the control of all naval forces in the Pacific. The Combined Fleet was replaced by the Imperial General Headquarters in August 1945, which was under the command of Admiral Toyoda. The Imperial General Headquarters was responsible for the defense of the Japanese Home Islands and the control of all naval forces in the Pacific. The Imperial General Headquarters was eventually dissolved on 15 August 1945, with the surrender of Japan.
Authorities involved in maintaining the division of orchestral deontic labor that is involved in a symphony concert:

Conductor
Orchestral section leaders (First violin ...)
Rehearsal (drill) manager
Orchestra manager
Concert hall manager
~ Composer
   – exerts authority only as mediated through the score
Documents involved in maintaining the division of orchestral deontic labor

scores, sub-scores
contracts
between

orchestra manager and conductor
orchestra manager and players
concert hall manager and orchestra manager
concert hall manager and audience members (tickets)

laws, including

copyright law
laws governing public assembly
laws governing employment contracts
laws governing sale of tickets
documents hold together the executions of horizontally and vertically meshed subplans through *drill*
drill, too, is modularized based on individual and small group practice all the way up to full orchestra rehearsal
How to do things with scores

1. the author authors the score, thereby creates a possibility of performance, and thereby creates the work

2. conductor and orchestra use the score as the specification of a plan (with subplans) and commit themselves to its execution,

3. the orchestra members committing themselves to accept the authority of the conductor

4. they use the score in to rehearsing the execution of their plan (develop score-coordinated expertise through drill)

5. they schedule a concert, thereby making a commitment to each other, to their employer, and to a prospective audience to perform that work

6. they perform the work
Scott J. Shapiro, “Massively Shared Agency”, 2013

[Bratman, Searle …] ‘are unable to account for the existence of massively shared agency.

they ‘have largely concentrated on analyzing shared activities among highly committed participants. The working assumption has been that those who sing duets or paint houses together are all committed to the success of the activity.’
Shapiro: To adapt standard theory of collective agency to deal with massively shared actions we need to add **authority**

Authorities are ... “mesh creating” mechanisms. When disputes between participants break out with respect to the proper way to proceed, authorities can create a mesh between the subplans of the participants by demanding that both sides accept a certain solution.

Basis for Shapiro’s **theory of the nature of law**
Searle: Directions of fit

• **world-to-mind**: a plan is formulated to change the world (to make it conform to the mind of the planner ...)

• **mind-to-world**: an assertion is about something in the world

• **automatic mind-to-world-and-world-to-mind**: I say “I promise to pay you $100 dollars” and thereby make it true that *I promise to pay you $100 dollars*
planning directions of fit

- **world-to-plan**: the plan tells the world how to shape itself to create actions that are in conformance with the plan and thereby achieve the plan objective

- **plan-to-world**: the plan specification, when the execution is completed successfully, serves as a record of this execution

- **automatic plan-to-world-and-world-to-plan**: the commander commits to a given plan specification and thereby brings into being a plan that is precisely in conformance to this specification
It is a profoundly erroneous truism, repeated by all copy-books and by eminent people when they are making speeches, that we should cultivate the habit of thinking what we are doing. The precise opposite is the case. Civilization advances by extending the number of important operations which we can perform without thinking about them.
directions of fit for documents

• **world-to-mind**: a plan is formulated to change the world (to make it conform to the mind of the planner ...)

• **mind-to-world**: a report is published evaluating the success of the execution of the plan

• **automatic mind-to-world-and-world-to-mind**: Act of Parliament is published declaring that such-and-such is the law and such-and-such is the law
Living Blueprint

what begins as a plan ends as a record
• of process
• of product
Blueprint associated with multiple series of documents with deontic powers

chain of commitments
- from order
- to blueprint creation
- to acceptance of blueprint
- to process of building in accordance with blueprint
- to acceptance of finished building
Plans will be modified along the way

- physical changes to the building to meet building codes
- changes in materials/suppliers
- changes in allowed physical processes
- changes in administrative (approval) processes
Documents with different directions of fit become intermeshed through being stapled together over time
Second main thesis:
there is a division of deontic labor
effectuated through the medium of intermeshed documents, which allow the deontic effects of episodic acts to be extended through time
Drill

Planning system works only by building on routine action which those who will be charged with executing the plan can be relied on to perform automatically
Planning goes hand in hand with training
scores and subscores / plans and subplans also allow training (rehearsal = pretend realization of a plan in advance of actual realization)
it takes practice also to understand how to interpret and follow the instructions of the conductor
we need training (drill) in order to learn how to execute diagrams
How to do things with documents

• An orchestral work (as something that can be rehearsed, performed and re-performed)
  – could not exist without a score
  – could not be rehearsed without scores and subscores
  – could not be performed without (either) scores or rehearsal
Deontic Entities

Two examples from the biomedical domain

• Licenses
• Consents
Informational Entity

license
  provides information
act of granting license
  establishes rights
  establishes obligations
  establishes punishments for
    infringement of terms of license
  establishes expectations that these
    punishments will be incurred in case
    of failure to respect these terms
Open Source Licenses

Open source licenses define the privileges and restrictions a licensor must follow in order to use, modify or redistribute the open source software.

Examples include Apache License, BSD license, GNU General Public License, ...

The proliferation of open source licenses is one of the few negative aspects of the open source movement because it is often difficult to understand the legal implications of the differences between licenses. (Wikipedia)
How to create a common representation of the entities in the domain of contracts and licensing?

By following the strategy of the Gene Ontology

Examine the instances in reality – laptops, labels, actions of signing contracts – and their interrelations

For example distinguish license *template* from *license* (correctly filled-in, approved, registered, …)
Basic rule of evidence-based ontology

All terms in an ontology must have instances in reality
Ontologies must be anchored to reality through these instances
We anchor the ontology of information entities through human acts of using language, through documents, through acts of entering data into a registry...
Open Source Licenses

Open source license is a generically dependent continuant (compare: protocol in *Nature Protocols*)

The license signed by John and Jim, a specifically dependent continuant whose bearer is (say) a specific piece of paper

The signed piece of paper is a concretization of the (generically dependent) license
• Some obligations are GDCs because (writing allows) you to pass on your obligation to someone else
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurable result</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraints</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continual checking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematic approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics and beliefs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

The obligations, either in form of a standard or a code of practice, adopted or accepted by a particular organization or industry.

Documented codes of ethics, codes of conduct, good practices and organization has adopted for its operations.

A statement of recommended practice developed internally by an organization or by an international, national or industry body or other organization.

A series of activities that, when combined, are intended to achieve an expected level of compliance.

The systematic way of identifying organizational compliance obligations, how and in what order they impact on its activities, products and services, and the maintenance and prioritization of compliance obligations.

Activities planned to ensure that all employees are competent to carry out their roles in a manner that is consistent with the organization’s compliance objectives and its commitment to compliance.

The observation mechanisms set up and performed by an organization...
Definitions

Services refer to assistance provided to the regulated organisation or its controllers internally or externally in ensuring the organizational fulfill their compliance obligations. Services include compliance related services namely assurance and advisory.

Services undertaken to assess a regulated organisation’s adherence to its compliance obligations.

Services undertaken by organisational auditors to assess a regulated organisation’s adherence to its compliance obligations.

Services undertaken by third party or independent auditors to assess a regulated organisation’s adherence to its compliance obligations.

Guidance provided to facilitate an entity in deciding and implementing a compliance program (initiative). Advisory services may come from the organisation (internally acquired) or may be provided by advisory service providers.

Sets of guidelines and support provided by compliance experts in conducting proper learning and training for a compliance program.