



AF-FAQ-9600-001

Interpretation Questions and Boundary Cases

Space / Aviation / Defense

FIRST EDITION

AF 9600 SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

Document identity and use

FIRST EDITION MANUSCRIPT - Prepared for Aerospace Federation review

Field	Controlled identity
Document	AF-FAQ-9600-001 - Interpretation Questions and Boundary Cases
Parent standard	AF 9600 - Artificial Intelligence, Autonomous Systems & Interoperability
Edition / language	FIRST EDITION / English master text
Family	Companions
Primary source anchors	0-40; informative Annex S
Suggested local owner	Technical authority
Authority	Publisher approval and effective date are not assigned. Local use requires authorized adoption and completed parameters.

Use with the main standard

This document implements the identified AF 9600 clauses and annexes. Read the complete applicable requirements in the main standard. The source anchors are navigation references; a template does not replace technical judgement, evidence, permission or eligible approval.

AF-ML-9600-001 lists the complete supporting set. AF-CM-9600-001 maps the main clauses and annexes to working documents. AF-TP-9600-001 establishes the common local parameter baseline; add the relevant discipline profiles.

Record control

Identify the object, configuration, record owner and dates. Reference attachments by stable identifier and version. Keep superseded evidence and decisions traceable. Use the approved local retention, access and authentication arrangements. No technical limit, numerical limit, interval or acceptance value is assigned by a blank template.

Implementation model: Translate the stated responsibilities and controls into the actual organization. Informative examples remain explanatory; use approved programme-specific values for operational decisions.

1 Use of this companion

This companion explains recurrent interpretation questions. Answers do not waive applicable requirements or supply missing programme parameters. Read the exact source clause before making a decision.

2 Questions and decision boundaries

Status: Informative. Answers clarify recurring distinctions; they do not waive requirements or assign missing local parameters.

1 Does high accuracy establish safe autonomy?

No. Accuracy is one property for a declared population. Authority, domain, timing, failures, protection, human roles and physical effects require separate evidence.

2 Is model confidence the probability that an action is safe?

No. Its meaning depends on the model and calibration event. A safety probability requires a justified system-level model and evidence; a confidence score cannot supply that relationship by itself.

3 Does a human-in-the-loop label provide adequate oversight?

Only demonstrated information, competence, workload capacity, intervention time and actual control can support that claim. A nominal approval step or alert is insufficient.

4 Can a monitor make any controller acceptable?

No. The monitor, observation, timing, authority and fallback must be valid for the specific state and consequences. Common failures and unsupported conditions remain relevant.

5 Can a model learn continuously after release?

Only within an explicitly justified adaptation envelope with protected constraints, evidence continuity and controlled active state. Improved recent performance does not independently authorize promotion.

6 Does a shared protocol mean systems interoperate?

No. Data meaning, units, time, behavior, trust, optional features and organizational duties must also agree for the exact participants and configuration.

7 Does reliable transport ensure a command happens exactly once?

No. Retries, crashes and lost acknowledgments can leave business effects uncertain. Persistent execution identity and actual-state reconciliation must support the claim.

8 Can simulation replace all operational evidence?

Only evidence justified for the intended property and validated model scope can be credited. Unrepresented conditions and real-world interactions require additional support or restrictions.

9 Is absence of drift proof of continued validity?

No. A detector has limited observations and sensitivity. Delayed outcomes, hidden subgroups and changing relationships can remain undetected.

10 Can an agent create its own approval authority?

No. Authority comes from the approved workflow and eligible delegation. Generated content, retrieved instructions or repeated retries cannot expand permissions.

11 Does a model rollback restore the system?

Not necessarily. Persistent memory, data schemas, transactions, physical effects, trust and partner states may also need reconciliation and verification.

12 Does completing this set confer recognition or operating permission?

No. Publication, local adoption, technical acceptance, recognition and permission to operate are separate decisions by their eligible authorities on the required evidence.