

PF v2.0 Compatibility Checklist (v1.0)

Fast pass for expression-in-context, compatibility, responsibility, reversibility, and next-step orientation.

Use posture: Use this when a fast pass is more realistic than a full protocol. It can support a quick scan, team discussion, or a brief trace. If stakes are high, harms may be severe, dignity of awareness is at risk, reversibility is low, or disagreement is meaningful, use the fuller protocol.

CASE BOUNDARY

Expression / decision under review: _____	Date / context: _____
Role(s) present (optional): _____	

1. NAME THE EXPRESSION-IN-CONTEXT

Prompt checks

- What is the specific expression being considered or already happening?
- What is the decision boundary right now (what can still change)?
- What context features matter most here (power/impact, incentives, constraints, urgency, norms/instructions, awareness gaps)?

2. FAST THREE-LENS SCAN (COMPATIBILITY)

A) Avoidable suffering/harm

- What avoidable suffering/harm might be foreseeable given our role, information access, and time—especially where impact is high?
- Who is most likely to bear the cost?
- What harms could be reduced by changing scope, timing, intensity, or safeguards?

B) Dignity of awareness (ceiling principle)

- Is there a plausible risk of humiliation or destruction of awareness beyond limits (ceiling principle)?
- If awareness is present—or plausibly in play—are we risking treating it as mere instrument under coercion, captivity, forced dependence, or severe asymmetry?
- Is a less dignity-threatening path being seriously considered?

C) Freedom-to-regulate (within real constraints)

- Whose freedom to regulate their potentials within real constraints is being reduced (to a reasonable degree)?
- Which limits look fixed for now, and which look more like defaults, incentives, or design choices that could be changed?
- Are we narrowing options temporarily and revisably, or locking them in?

3. RESPONSIBILITY SCAN (AWARENESS × POWER)

Prompt checks

- Where do awareness and power/impact concentrate?
- Where do formal authority and practical power/impact differ?
- Who can still change course (pause, narrow scope, reroute, refuse, escalate)?
- Where might responsibility diffuse or drift toward low-power parties?
- If this later needs explanation, who will likely have to answer for effects?

4. REVERSIBILITY AND POSTURE SHIFT

Prompt checks

- If we are wrong, how hard is this to undo?
- Is this setting a precedent, locking in a path, or reducing future contestability?
- Is there a reason to slow down, narrow scope, or escalate/widen review?

5. OPTIONS (LESS HARMFUL / MORE REVISABLE)

Prompt checks

- What variants could reduce harm while still serving the core purpose?
- What pause/delay option would buy learning, consent, or coordination?
- What smaller-scope or more reversible option is available?
- Are we treating the first available path as the only path?

6. NEXT-STEP ORIENTATION (NON-BINDING)

Which of these, if any, seems warranted for now?

- Proceed as framed
- Proceed with changes / safeguards
- Pause / slow down
- Escalate / widen review
- Do not proceed via this channel (for now)
- Other: _____

Why (1–3 lines):

Brief notes (optional): tradeoffs, uncertainties, or revisit triggers
