

# Commitment Governance Reviews

## Decision governance before irreversible physical commitment

Sustainable Exploration provides bounded governance reviews for projects approaching irreversible physical, capital, infrastructure, or authority thresholds. These reviews identify where exposure begins, determine whether evidence is being asked to support more than it can justify, classify which governance posture remains defensible, and evaluate whether an existing commitment remains within its admissible basis.

### 1. The Commitment Problem

In physical systems including grid interconnection, subsurface wells, seabed corridors, and lunar infrastructure, uncertainty rarely disappears before action is required. A project may be technically feasible and strategically attractive while remaining premature as a commitment. Uncertainty itself is not uncertainty the main risk. Instead, the greatest risk comes from advancing site control, queue entry, drilling, injection, corridor formation, or infrastructure placement before unresolved assumptions have lost the power to change the decision.

### 2. What a Screen Produces

Every screen results in one of three determinations:

1. **Proceed-Compatible:** the proposed step remains defensible within defined bounds.
2. **Defer-Indicated:** the project must reduce decision-dominant uncertainty while preserving optionality.
3. **Refusal-Required:** the proposed action creates exposure that the evidence basis cannot justify.
4. **Maintain / Constrain / Re-evaluate / Terminate:** For commitments already underway, the review tests whether the commitment remains within its admissible basis.

### 3. The Governance Review Stack

Our framework applies anywhere physical commitment and path dependence intersect.

1. **Interconnection and Site Exposure:** queue entry, site control, upgrade exposure, or system coupling can become commitment before the project is fully understood.
2. **Subsurface Actions:** drilling, injection, excavation, or intrusive testing may reveal behavior while creating site, capital, regulatory, or disturbance exposure.
3. **Marine and Infrastructure Corridors:** routes, foundations, corridors, and support infrastructure can begin hardening before environmental, geotechnical, or access uncertainty is bounded.
4. **Frontier Systems:** lunar, orbital, and extreme-environment systems can form dependency before

resource evidence, architecture, and support infrastructure are decision-grade.

### 4. Core Outputs

1. **Commitment Exposure Review:** identifies where a project begins to become difficult to reverse.
2. **Pre-Commitment Admissibility Screen:** determines whether a proposed commitment may be considered under the current evidence and authority boundary.
3. **Governance Posture Review:** Classifies whether *Proceed-Compatible*, *Deferral-Indicated*, or *Refusal-Required* remains defensible.
4. **Minimum Evidence Determination:** defines what must be known before evidence-bearing action can proceed.
5. **Commitment Integrity Determination:** tests whether an emerging commitment remains within its admissible and defensible basis as conditions change.

### 5. The Value of Refusal

The value of this work is often found in decisions that do not proceed. Deferring a queue entry, refusing a site anchor, delaying a drilling decision, or constraining an infrastructure step can protect capital, preserve optionality, and prevent future decisions from inheriting weak assumptions. Sustainable Exploration exists for the earlier moment, while the decision can still go more than one way.

### 6. Boundary

Sustainable Exploration does not approve, optimize, design, finance, permit, or execute projects. It classifies exposure, admissibility, governance posture, and commitment integrity so the Decision Authority can act with a defensible record.