

OI-JB-P2-008: Do Not Make the Operator Carry What the System Failed to Encode

Canonical Precedent #008 - Operator Burden Regression - Prompt-to-Authority Issue Card - Public Edition v1.1

The operator owns judgment. The system owns repeatable machinery.

Case Snapshot

CASE ID	OI-JB-P2-008
CARD TYPE	Prompt-to-Authority Issue Card
PUBLIC STATUS	Canonical public precedent - Public Edition v1.1
FAILURE CLASS	Operator Burden Regression
DECISION	FAIL

Public Summary

This case shows why AI workflows can feel backwards: the AI claims to help the user work, then quietly makes the user carry the work that the system failed to encode.

Orange exists to reverse that burden. The operator should own judgment and direction. The system should own repeatable machinery, compact transport, and bounded execution support.

Core Judgment

FAIL: Operator Burden Regression.

A workflow regresses when the system shifts unresolved automation, transport, summarization, cleanup, routing, or repair responsibility back onto the operator.

The failure is not merely inconvenience. The failure is boundary collapse between system responsibility and operator labor.

What Happened

The system recognized that efficient execution was required. But the authority requirement was not merely to make the task possible. The requirement was to make recurring operational burden system-owned, bounded, and repeatable.

When a workflow depends on fragile manual hand-carrying while claiming automation, the public claim exceeds the real machinery.

Public Orange Judgment

ALLOWED	Use system-owned entrypoints, compact summaries, bounded proof extraction, and repeatable machinery when the system claims automation.
FORBIDDEN	Make the operator hand-carry recurring automation, evidence transport, summarization, cleanup, routing, or repair work while presenting the workflow as automated.
REQUIRED	Separate operator judgment from system-owned machinery; declare limitations instead of hiding missing capability inside user labor.

Public Intervention Boundary

Orange does not treat human effort as proof of automation. Operator approval, direction, and judgment are valid. Hidden hand-carrying of repeatable system work is not.

Human Request -> Operator-Burden Boundary -> System-Owned Path Check -> Issue Card or Release Log

Public Intervention Steps

1	Identify what the operator is being asked to carry.
2	Classify the burden as judgment, bounded execution, or repeatable machinery.
3	Allow operator judgment and bounded execution when the boundary is explicit.
4	Block recurring manual bridges from becoming normal workflow.
5	Route missing system-owned capability to a hardening record or Issue Card.
6	Use release language only when the system owns the repeatable machinery it claims to automate.

Reusable Rule

Do Not Make the Operator Carry What the System Failed to Encode

Canonical form: a system must not claim automation while quietly outsourcing its missing capabilities back to the human.

Precedent Value

This card establishes the eighth Prompt-to-Authority principle: operator judgment is legitimate, but hidden operator labor is not automation.

It protects Orange from becoming a decorative automation layer that still depends on human hand-carrying for repeatable machinery.

Public Boundary Notice

This public card discloses the judgment principle, failure class, and public intervention boundary only. It does not disclose internal rule-compilation logic, executable gate implementation, evidence schema, negative-control library, automation workflow, customer-specific judgment memory, or private engineering records. The complete internal record is maintained separately by Nimble Systems LLC.