
Agent accountability, composed

A verifiable record needs separate CAN, WHO, WHAT, and AUDIT verdicts



One digest aligns the evidence without collapsing verifier responsibilities



Show the seam with one passing binding row and one refusing verifier row

Captured CCF evidence

Public vector `valid-ccf-vds2`: a pyscitt did:x509 Signed Statement (ES256) plus a real CCF ccf.v1 receipt (vds=2, ES384).

The scitt-cose Python runner and clean-room Go verifier both passed it; the committed negative vectors refused. This is current implementation evidence, not complete interop coverage.

Do not infer

A passing capsule binding does not prove authorization, provenance truth, physical completion, independent observation, or relying-party policy acceptance.

Ask: implementers and reviewers who can test the seams across SCITT, RATS, authorization, and agent-gateway work.

A four-minute demo: one passing row, one refusal

Each row has its own verifier and claim boundary; a shared digest provides alignment rather than a new root of trust.

Verifier row	Concrete evidence	Visible outcome	Boundary retained
Valid CCF vector	valid-ccf-vds2: pyscitt statement plus CCF ccf.v1 receipt	**pass in Python + Go**	Does not prove authorization or effect truth
Tampered path	fail-tampered-path preserves the signed statement but corrupts inclusion	**refuse in Python + Go**	No acceptance of a tampered receipt
Bad statement signature	fail-bad-statement-sig retains a receipt but alters statement bytes	**refuse**	The refusal is the trust-boundary demonstration

draft-mih-sato-agent-accountability-composition · action-state-group/scitt-cose · Songbo Bu · Iman Schrock · Steven Mih · Tom Sato