

Compassionate Logic: Principles of Pragmatic Veracity and Ontological Stewardship

The "Gardener's Gambit" Methodology for Information Ethics in the Age of Informational Chaos

Protocol ID: MMG-GARDENER-1.0

Status: *White Paper for Ethical Standardization and Implementation*

Djeff Bee*

Principal Architect, Meaningfulness Media Group

January 18, 2026

Abstract

The contemporary informational landscape is characterized by an **Epistemological Collapse**, where the systemic erosion of shared truth-verification methods has rendered traditional ethical models of absolute candor insufficient. In high-stakes environments, the immediate disclosure of “raw” truth can precipitate **Ontological Harm**—psychological or systemic damage for which the recipient lacks the necessary readiness. This paper introduces **Compassionate Logic**, a formal ethical framework for the responsible stewardship of information. We present the **Gardener's Calculus**, an eight-step auditable protocol designed to guide the timing, sequencing, and scaffolding of difficult truths. By shifting the focus from terminal disclosure to **Generative Guidance**, the framework aims to build long-term epistemic resilience and agency. We define the **Disclosure Debt** as a non-negotiable obligation to repay temporary informational shields through structured support, ensuring that compassion never serves as a veil for manipulation. This architecture provides a rigorous methodology for leaders, educators, and AI practitioners to navigate the complexities of truth in a fractured world.

Keywords: Information Ethics, Ontological Harm, Pragmatic Veracity, Epistemological Collapse, Cognitive Security, AI Ethics, Stewardship.

*Correspondence: info@meaningfulness.com.au

1 Introduction: The Epistemological Collapse

The contemporary information ecosystem has undergone a phase transition from conditions of scarcity to conditions of overwhelming abundance, resulting in a systemic failure of shared sense-making. We designate this phenomenon the **Epistemological Collapse**. It is characterized not merely by the presence of misinformation, but by the erosion of the collective capacity to agree on the methodology for verifying truth (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

In this environment, the traditional Enlightenment model—which posits that the broad dissemination of facts inevitably leads to consensus and rational action—has proven insufficient. Instead, we observe a landscape defined by “informational atomization,” where algorithmic personalization and engagement-based incentives create self-reinforcing reality tunnels (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017). This fragmentation has profound consequences for leadership, parenting, and institutional governance, rendering the simple ethical injunction to “always tell the truth immediately” not only inadequate but, in specific high-stakes contexts, actively harmful.

1.1 Drivers of the Collapse

The collapse is not an accident of history but an emergent property of four distinct structural forces, identified in this framework as the primary drivers of informational chaos:

1. **Algorithmic Personalization (The Echo Chamber):** The optimization of information feeds for individual preference rather than accuracy or diversity reduces content entropy, creating hermetically sealed worldviews that resist falsification (Pariser, 2011).
2. **Engagement Optimization (The Outrage Loop):** Platform incentives that prioritize high-arousal, negative-valence content privilege outrage over analysis, transforming public discourse into a contest of affective polarization (Vosoughi et al., 2018).
3. **The Attention Economy (Commodification of Division):** The monetization of fragmented attention spans incentivizes the fracturing of shared narratives, as polarized audiences yield higher retention and conversion metrics.
4. **Generative Artificial Intelligence (The Liar’s Dividend):** The democratization of synthetic media creation creates a fatal asymmetry in the cost of information. The cost to generate plausible falsehoods approaches zero, while the cost to verify truth remains high. This introduces the “Liar’s Dividend,” where the mere existence of deepfakes allows bad actors to dismiss genuine evidence as fabrication (Bostrom, 2011).

1.2 The Crisis of Ontological Harm

The psychological consequence of this collapse is a pervasive **Ontological Anxiety**—a background radiation of uncertainty regarding the nature of reality. In this state, the introduction of a traumatic or world-shattering truth without adequate context or support does not liberate the recipient; it overwhelms their capacity for regulation.

We define this specific category of injury as **Ontological Harm**: a predictable psychological or systemic damage caused by exposure to true information for which the recipient lacks the cognitive, emotional, or institutional readiness to process constructively (Bostrom, 2011; Bok, 1978).

Current ethical frameworks often force a binary choice between absolute transparency (which risks Ontological Harm) and paternalistic deception (which violates dignity). This paper proposes a third path: **Compassionate Logic**. This framework prioritizes *Pragmatic Veracity*—the careful stewardship of the timing and sequencing of truth—over the brute-force delivery of data. It argues that the most ethical act is not always immediate disclosure, but the patient cultivation of the recipient’s resilience, ensuring they are strong enough to bear the weight of the truth.

2 The Core Framework: Compassionate Logic

Compassionate Logic is an ethical operating system designed for high-entropy informational environments. It rejects the false dichotomy between “honesty” and “deception,” replacing it with a gradient of responsible stewardship. The framework is built upon three foundational pillars.

2.1 Pillar I: Ontological Harm

The primary objective of the framework is the prevention of Ontological Harm. Unlike physical or reputational harm, Ontological Harm strikes at the recipient’s foundational sense of reality, safety, or identity.

Definition 2.1: Ontological Harm

A fundamental damage to an individual’s or a system’s core understanding of reality—their safety, identity, trust, or shared world—produced by the premature or un-scaffolded disclosure of true information.

Ontological Harm occurs when the **Severity** of the information exceeds the recipient’s **Readiness** (Bostrom, 2011). It manifests psychologically as trauma, dissociation, or identity fragmentation (Brewin, 2014), and systemically as mass panic, institutional collapse, or the erosion of social trust (Tufekci, 2017).

2.2 Pillar II: Pragmatic Veracity

To mitigate Ontological Harm without abandoning truth, the framework introduces the principle of **Pragmatic Veracity**.

Definition 2.2: Pragmatic Veracity

The ethical practice of honoring the truth by responsibly managing its timing, sequencing, and framing. It is a commitment to reality, delivered at a human pace.

Pragmatic Veracity asserts that while the *substance* of the truth must remain invariant, the *velocity* of its disclosure is a variable that must be tuned to the recipient's capacity. It distinguishes between “withholding for manipulation” (unethical) and “withholding for scaffolding” (ethical), grounded in the intent to empower the recipient (Bok, 1978).

2.3 Pillar III: Generative Guidance

The ultimate goal of Compassionate Logic is not merely protection, but empowerment. **Generative Guidance** mandates that any temporary shield against truth must be accompanied by a structured plan to build the recipient's resilience.

This implies the use of a **Scaffolding Ladder**—a methodological structure where support is provided intensely at first and progressively removed as the recipient's capacity grows (See Appendix B for detailed protocol). This shifts the role of the steward (leader, parent, or system) from an **Oracle** (who provides answers and fosters dependency) to a **Coach** (who builds capacity and fosters autonomy) (Wood et al., 1976; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.4 The Default Ethic: Candor with Consent

It is imperative to state the baseline of this protocol. The Gardener's Calculus (see Section 3) is an emergency procedure, not a standard operating mode.

Protocol Rule 1: The default ethical stance is candor with informed consent. Any deviation from immediate transparency is an exceptional, time-bounded, and auditable act of last resort, justified only by the prevention of severe, predictable Ontological Harm.

Where legal obligations exist (e.g., duty to warn, securities regulations, FOIA), the Calculus governs only the *manner* and *support structures* of disclosure, never the fact of disclosure itself.

3 The Gardener's Calculus: An Auditable Protocol

The Gardener's Calculus is the operational engine of Compassionate Logic. It transforms the abstract principles of Pragmatic Veracity into a linear, reproducible decision-making process. This protocol is designed to be rigorous and difficult, creating friction against the temptation of convenient deception.

The Calculus consists of eight distinct steps, moving from legitimacy to accountability.

3.1 Step 1: Legitimacy

The first gate is structural. The actor must establish their standing to manage the information. Does the actor have a role-based duty of care (e.g., parent, physician, fiduciary)? If the actor lacks legitimacy, they have no standing to shield the truth; their duty is standard transparency or deferral to a legitimate authority.

3.2 Step 2: Subsidiarity

The principle of Subsidiarity asks: Is there a closer, more trusted, or less powerful actor who could deliver the information with less harm? If a better steward exists, stewardship must be transferred. This step prevents the centralization of information control and ensures that truth is delivered within the most resilient available relationship.

3.3 Step 3: Harm Assessment

The actor must perform a risk assessment of the information itself, scoring variables on a 1–5 Likert scale.

- **Severity:** The magnitude of potential damage (1=Discomfort, 5=Catastrophic Collapse).
- **Immediacy:** The temporal proximity of the harm (1=Remote, 5=Imminent).

3.4 Step 4: Readiness Assessment

The actor must evaluate the recipient's current capacity to process the information constructively.

- **Cognitive Resilience:** The capacity to process complexity and nuance (Kahneman, 2011).
- **Emotional Regulation:** The ability to manage affect without dysregulation (McEwen, 1998).
- **Support Systems:** The availability of external co-regulation resources (family, community, therapy) (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010).

3.5 Step 5: The Intervention Gradient

Before withholding information, the steward must exhaust all less-intrusive options. The protocol mandates the “Least Restrictive Alternative”:

1. **Framing:** Full disclosure with compassionate context.
2. **Sequencing:** Full disclosure broken into manageable temporal stages.
3. **Scaffolding:** Simplified but accurate disclosure, adding complexity as readiness grows (Wood et al., 1976).
4. **Strategic Withholding:** The temporary redaction of specific, hazardous details (e.g., Data Weapons).
5. **Compassionate Inaccuracy:** (Last Resort) A temporary, minimal deviation from the truth, permissible only to prevent imminent, catastrophic harm.

3.6 Step 6: The Gardener’s Gambit

If, and only if, the Intervention Gradient has been exhausted and the risk of Ontological Harm remains catastrophic, the steward executes the **Gardener’s Gambit**. This is the specific, high-stakes decision to employ a Compassionate Inaccuracy or temporary shield. It is a calculated risk taken to protect the recipient’s long-term agency.

3.7 Step 7: The Disclosure Debt

Any deviation from immediate candor creates a **Disclosure Debt**. This is an ethical obligation that must be repaid. The steward must define a **Sunset Condition**—a specific date or developmental milestone that triggers a mandatory review.

Protocol Rule 2: No temporary shield may become a permanent cage. If the Sunset Condition is met but readiness remains low, the steward must escalate support resources (intensifying the Scaffolding Ladder) rather than resetting the clock. The Debt remains due.

3.8 Step 8: Oversight and Aftercare

To prevent self-serving rationalization, the decision should be registered with an independent auditor. Furthermore, an **Aftercare** plan must be established to support the recipient when the debt is eventually paid (Baile et al., 2000). This ensures that the eventual disclosure is a supported process, utilizing the **Scaffolding Ladder** (see Appendix B) to integrate the truth.

4 Application and Validation: The Protocol in Practice

The theoretical architecture of Compassionate Logic must be validated through rigorous application in diverse, high-stakes environments. This section outlines the implementation of the protocol across three primary domains: familial development (The Nursery), organizational crisis management (The Agora), and intrapersonal growth (The Mirror).

4.1 Domain I: The Nursery (Developmental Stewardship)

In the context of parenting and education, the Gardener's Calculus serves to balance the protective instinct with the developmental imperative. The objective is to transition from "Protector" to "Preparer."

Case studies involving the revelation of adoption status or the explanation of family trauma demonstrate the utility of **Scaffolding**. By introducing truth in age-appropriate stages, the parent minimizes the risk of trauma (Van der Kolk, 2014) while maintaining the trust necessary for a secure attachment (Harris, 2012). The *Sunset Condition* here is often developmental (e.g., "When the child asks X, we reveal Y").

4.2 Domain II: The Agora (Institutional Leadership)

In the public sphere, leaders must navigate the tension between transparency and stability. The disclosure of a "Data Weapon" (e.g., a vulnerability in critical infrastructure) requires **Strategic Withholding** to prevent exploitation (Bostrom, 2011). Conversely, the management of a public health crisis may require **Sequencing** to prevent panic-induced supply chain collapse while ensuring the public has actionable safety data.

The protocol demands that leaders reject the "efficiency" of a lie and the "purity" of chaotic transparency in favor of *staged disclosure*. Micro-metrics for validation in this domain include the **Comprehension Level (CL)** and the **Signal-to-Heat Level (SHL)** of public discourse following an announcement.

4.3 Domain III: The Mirror (Self-Regulation)

Compassionate Logic is equally applicable to the self. The **Inner Critic** often demands a brutal, un-scaffolded confrontation with personal failure, leading to shame and paralysis. By applying the Calculus inward, individuals can practice **Compassionate Sequencing**—addressing personal truths only after establishing the necessary emotional regulation and support systems (Neff, 2011). This aligns with therapeutic models that prioritize stabilization before trauma processing (Linehan, 1993).

4.4 Non-Derogable Constraints

To prevent the misuse of this framework for manipulation or authoritarian control, the following constraints are absolute:

1. **No Permanent Concealment:** Every shield must have a Sunset Condition.
2. **No Self-Dealing:** The Calculus may never be used to protect the steward's reputation or convenience.
3. **Duty of Repair:** If a gambit fails, the steward owes immediate disclosure, apology, and restitution.

5 Discussion: Ethics and Limitations

The introduction of Compassionate Logic inevitably invites scrutiny regarding the moral status of deception. The framework is not a refutation of the Kantian imperative to truth-telling, but a contextual application of it. It argues that a “Soul-Shatterer”—a truth that destroys the recipient's capacity for reason—is a greater violation of dignity than a temporary, scaffolded shield (Bok, 1978).

5.1 The Slippery Slope Defense

Critics may argue that the Calculus provides a sophisticated rationalization for paternalism. The framework addresses this risk through **Friction by Design**. The eight-step protocol is deliberately burdensome. A manipulator acting in bad faith seeks efficiency; the Gardener's Calculus imposes inefficiency (audit, documentation, aftercare). The rigor of the process acts as a filter against casual misuse.

5.2 Limitations

This protocol is an emergency measure, not a substitute for systemic reform. It cannot solve the structural drivers of the Epistemological Collapse (e.g., algorithmic amplification or economic inequality). Furthermore, the reliability of the Readiness Assessment is subject to the steward's own cognitive biases. Future iterations of the protocol must incorporate external validation mechanisms to mitigate steward bias.

5.3 Mitigation of the Risks

The Subjectivity of Readiness: A primary risk of this framework is “Steward Bias,” where a leader underestimates a population’s readiness to justify convenience-based secrecy (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). To mitigate this, the protocol encourages **Adversarial Auditing:** the steward should actively seek a second opinion from a party with no vested interest in the delay.

Cultural Specificity: The definitions of “privacy” and “harm” are culturally contingent. While the Calculus provides the mechanism, the *calibration* of Harm and Readiness scores must be adapted to the specific cultural norms of the recipient system.

6 Conclusion: Toward a Standard of Stewardship

The Gardener’s Gambit offers a path beyond the paralysis of the Epistemological Collapse. It reframes the ethical actor not as a passive transmitter of data, but as an active steward of human resilience. By formalizing the definitions of Ontological Harm and providing a concrete mechanism for Pragmatic Veracity, this framework allows leaders, parents, and systems architects to navigate the grey zones of truth with integrity.

The adoption of the Gardener’s Calculus transforms the burden of knowing into a disciplined act of service. It asserts that in an age of informational chaos, the highest form of honesty is not the brutal delivery of a fact, but the patient, scaffolded cultivation of a mind capable of bearing it.

We invite practitioners across disciplines to test, refine, and critique this protocol. The goal is not a perfect algorithm for ethics, but a shared language for the difficult, necessary work of keeping truth whole in a fractured world.

We invite creators, publishers, and standards bodies to adopt, extend, and refine this protocol. Feedback and contributions toward v1.1 are welcome via the public repository at: <https://github.com/MeaningfulnessMediaGroup/MMG-Gardener>.

References

- Baile, W. F., et al. (2000). SPIKES—A Six-Step Protocol for Delivering Bad News: Application to the Patient with Cancer. *The Oncologist*, 5(4), 302–311.
- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*. Pantheon Books.
- Bostrom, N. (2011). Information Hazards: A Typology of Potential Harms from Knowledge. *Review of Contemporary Philosophy*, 10, 44–79.
- Brewin, C. R. (2014). Episodic memory, trauma, and the cognitive neuroscience of PTSD. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(2), 69–75.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Harris, P. L. (2012). *Trusting What You're Told: How Children Learn from Others*. Harvard University Press.
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review. *PLoS Medicine*, 7(7).
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Linehan, M. M. (1993). *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder*. Guilford Press.
- McEwen, B. S. (1998). Stress, Adaptation, and Disease: Allostasis and Allostatic Load. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 840(1), 33–44.
- Neff, K. (2011). *Self-Compassion: The Proven Power of Being Kind to Yourself*. William Morrow.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton University Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and Tear Gas*. Yale University Press.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131.
- Van der Kolk, B. (2014). *The Body Keeps the Score*. Penguin.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359, 1146–1151.
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information Disorder*. Council of Europe Report.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100.

Appendices

A The Gardener's Calculus: Working Template

This appendix provides the summarized text of the assessment protocol. For field use, practitioners should utilize the standardized, high-resolution worksheet.

Download the Printable Protocol Worksheet:

<https://github.com/MeaningfulnessMediaGroup/MMG-Gardener/templates/gardeners-worksheet.pdf>

AUDITABLE PROTOCOL v1.0

STEP 1: THE STORM (Define the Truth)

What is the single, clear, and difficult truth?

STEPS 2 & 3: THE ASSESSMENT (Scoring)

Rate variables on a scale of 1 (Low) to 5 (High/Severe).

Harm Assessment

Severity (1-5): _____

Immediacy (1-5): _____

Readiness Assessment

Cognitive Resilience (1-5): _____

Emotional Regulation (1-5): _____

Support Systems (1-5): _____

HARM TOTAL: _____ / 10 **READINESS TOTAL:** _____ / 15

Decision Trigger: *If Harm Total ≥ 8 AND Readiness Total $\leq 8 \rightarrow$ Proceed with Scaffolding.*

STEPS 4 & 5: THE STRATEGY

Check: Legitimacy Established? ☐ Yes ☐ No Subsidiarity Checked? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Select Intervention Level (Least Intrusive Necessary):

☐ 1. Framing ☐ 2. Sequencing ☐ 3. Scaffolding

☐ 4. Strategic Withholding ☐ 5. Compassionate Inaccuracy (The Gambit)

STEPS 6, 7 & 8: ACCOUNTABILITY PROTOCOL

The Gambit (Minimal Shield Used):

Disclosure Debt (The Plan to Build Resilience/Repay Truth):

Sunset Condition (Specific Date or State for Full Disclosure):

Oversight (Name of Independent Auditor): _____

B The Scaffolding Ladder: Disclosure Debt Repayment

The Scaffolding Ladder is the standardized methodology for fulfilling the **Disclosure Debt**. It transforms the abstract commitment of “Aftercare” into a sequential, five-stage protocol for building recipient resilience.

OPERATIONAL STANDARD: THE 5 RUNGS

RUNG 1: EMOTIONAL REGULATION (Stabilization)

Goal: Restore physiological and emotional baseline.

Action: Co-regulation, validation of affect without verifying facts.

Micro-Metric: Time-to-Calm (minutes).

RUNG 2: SENSE-MAKING (Narrative Coherence)

Goal: Move from raw affect to coherent narrative construction.

Action: Guided journaling, “naming the story,” establishing causality.

Micro-Metric: Narrative stability (consistency of account).

RUNG 3: PERSPECTIVE-TAKING (Hypothesis Expansion)

Goal: Challenge the “single story” without invalidating the experience.

Action: Generating alternative hypotheses, the “Cognitive Debugging” protocol.

Micro-Metric: Count of plausible alternative explanations generated (> 2).

RUNG 4: METACOGNITION (Pattern Recognition)

Goal: Identification of internal behavioral scripts.

Action: Observing the process of thinking; separating the thinker from the thought.

Micro-Metric: Speed of script identification.

RUNG 5: EPISTEMIC HUMILITY (Integration)

Goal: Comfort with ambiguity and complexity.

Action: Disclosure of the full truth; integration of the withheld information into the now-resilient worldview.

Outcome: Debt Paid.

The Coaching Gradient

To ensure the steward moves from **Oracle** to **Coach**, interactions must progress through the following gradient:

1. **Prompt:** Asking open questions to trigger recipient processing.
2. **Probe:** Gently challenging assumptions (Rung 3).
3. **Pattern:** Identifying recurring scripts (Rung 4).
4. **Plan:** Co-designing future resilience strategies (Rung 5).

C Glossary of Terms

Compassionate Inaccuracy A temporary, minimal, and strategically chosen deviation from the full truth, employed strictly as a last resort within the Gardener’s Calculus to shield a recipient from imminent, catastrophic Ontological Harm.

Compassionate Logic The overarching ethical operating system proposed in this paper. It prioritizes the prevention of Ontological Harm by supplementing the default ethic of candor with a rigorous, auditable protocol for managing the timing and sequencing of information.

Compassionate Sequencing The application of Pragmatic Veracity to intrapersonal or interpersonal growth; the deliberate staging of difficult truths to match the recipient’s evolving emotional and cognitive readiness.

Data-Weapon A category of information hazard where true information (e.g., a viral sequence or code vulnerability) poses a direct, **extrinsic** threat to physical safety or infrastructure. The ethical duty is containment.

Disclosure Debt The non-negotiable ethical obligation created by any act of withholding or scaffolding. It represents a “loan taken out against the truth” that must be repaid through a structured plan of Generative Guidance culminating in full disclosure.

Epistemological Collapse A systemic condition characterized by the erosion of shared methods for verifying truth. It is driven by algorithmic personalization, engagement-based incentives, and the proliferation of ultra-realistic synthetic media (generative AI), resulting in informational atomization and universal verification fatigue.

Gardener’s Calculus The operational decision-making engine of Compassionate Logic. An eight-step, auditable protocol used to determine the legitimacy, necessity, and method of disclosing cognitively hazardous information.

Gardener’s Gambit The specific, high-stakes decision to employ a Compassionate Inaccuracy or temporary shield. It is a calculated risk taken to protect the recipient’s long-term agency, ethically bound by the Disclosure Debt.

Generative Guidance The pedagogical goal of the framework: shifting the steward’s role from an **Oracle** (providing terminal answers) to a **Coach** (building the recipient’s resilience).

Intervention Gradient The hierarchy of disclosure strategies mandated by the Calculus: Framing → Sequencing → Scaffolding → Strategic Withholding → Compassionate Inaccuracy.

Liar's Dividend A consequence of the proliferation of synthetic media, where bad actors can dismiss genuine evidence as AI-generated fabrication.

Ontological Harm A predictable psychological or systemic damage caused by exposure to true information for which the recipient lacks the cognitive, emotional, or institutional readiness to process constructively.

Pragmatic Veracity The ethical practice of honoring the truth by responsibly managing its timing, sequencing, and framing.

Readiness Assessment The diagnostic phase of the Calculus, evaluating the recipient's Cognitive Resilience, Emotional Regulation, and Support Systems.

Scaffolding Ladder The methodological structure for repayment of the Disclosure Debt. It involves providing temporary cognitive or emotional support to a recipient, which is progressively removed as their resilience increases.

Soul-Shatterer A category of Ontological Harm where true information poses a direct, **intrinsic** threat to the recipient's core identity or psychological stability. The ethical duty is sequencing and support.

Strategic Withholding The temporary redaction of specific operational details while maintaining transparency regarding the general nature of a threat.

Sunset Condition A specific, measurable date or developmental milestone established at the moment of a decision. It defines the deadline by which the Disclosure Debt must be paid.