

# Deterministic State Stabilization in RTGS Systems

Vol. 3. — Architectural Instantiation of the Perceptual Stabilization  
Transition Architecture

---

Samuel V. Passberg

March 20, 2026

---

## Abstract

This document presents a direct architectural derivation and applied extension of the Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture, demonstrating its structural instantiation within Real-Time Gross Settlement systems. The objective is to show how deterministic representational stabilization can be introduced into financial infrastructures without modifying the internal operation of settlement cores.

The analysis defines the structural domain of informational state systems in which authoritative states are produced internally while externally observable representations are generated through separate representational mechanisms. RTGS systems provide a suitable instantiation environment due to the clear separation between settlement processing and representational communication.

The architectural model is defined through the authoritative state domain  $\mathcal{A}$ , the domain of representational state candidates  $\mathcal{R}$ , the deterministic equivalence verification function  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the stabilized verification condition *State V*, and the representational exposure boundary. Together, these elements establish the structural conditions under which representational exposure becomes a conditionally governed transition rather than an automatic consequence of authoritative state production.

A deterministic transition pipeline governs the sequence through which authoritative settlement states are received, verified through  $\Delta(a, r)$ , stabilized, and conditionally projected to external interfaces. The structural consequences include the elimination of representational indeterminacy, the prevention of Perceptive Vacuum instances, and the behavioral distinction between representational absence and provisional exposure.

## Keywords:

*Deterministic Representational Validity; Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture; PSTA Instantiation in RTGS Systems; Deterministic Settlement Stabilization; Authoritative Settlement State; Deterministic State Verification; Deterministic Transition Pipeline; Stabilization Boundary; Deterministic Representational Exposure.*

---

## Technical Specifications:

---

**Program Lineage:** Deterministic Representational Validity Framework

**Structural Basis:** Transition Stabilization Axiom (*TSA*)

**Formal Paradigm:** Deterministic Representational State Conditioning

**Core Formal Object:** Verification Operation  $\Delta(a, r)$

**Structural Configuration:** *PSTA* Instantiation in RTGS Systems

**Architectural Domain:** Real-Time Gross Settlement Infrastructure

**Evaluation Principle:** Deterministic Equivalence Verification

**Encoding:** L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X

**Version:** v1.0

**Framework Reference:** Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture

(DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18918056)

**ORCID:** 0009-0002-4609-552X

---

---

Passberg, Samuel V. (2026). *Deterministic State Stabilization in RTGS Systems*. Vol. 3.

©  
2026 Samuel V. Passberg.  
All Rights Reserved.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Instantiation Domain</b>	<b>3</b>			
1.1	Informational State Systems . . . . .	3		4.3	Stabilization Boundary in RTGS Archi- tecture . . . . . 9
1.2	Authoritative and Representational State Domains . . . . .	3		4.4	Deterministic Settlement State Projection 9
1.3	RTGS Systems as an Instantiation En- vironment . . . . .	4	<b>5</b>	<b>Architectural Variations Within the PSTA Framework</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Architectural Model</b>	<b>4</b>	5.1	Inline Verification Architecture . . . . .	10
2.1	Authoritative State Domain ( $\mathcal{A}$ ) . . . . .	4	5.2	Intermediary Stabilization Layer . . . . .	10
2.2	Representational State Candidates ( $\mathcal{R}$ ) . . . . .	5	5.3	Event-Driven Stabilization Model . . . . .	10
2.3	Deterministic Equivalence Verification Function $\Delta(a, r)$ . . . . .	5	<b>6</b>	<b>Structural Consequences of Determinis- tic Stabilization</b>	<b>10</b>
2.4	Stabilized Verification State ( <i>State V</i> ) . . . . .	6	6.1	Elimination of Representational Inde- terminacy . . . . .	11
2.5	Representational Exposure Boundary . . . . .	6	6.2	Elimination of Perceptive Vacuum Ins- tances . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Deterministic Transition Pipeline</b>	<b>6</b>	6.3	Deterministic Representational Expo- sure Condition . . . . .	11
3.1	Authoritative State Reception from the Settlement Core . . . . .	7	6.4	Representational Absence as a Structu- ral Condition . . . . .	11
3.2	Representational Candidate Derivation . . . . .	7	6.5	Illustrative Divergence Scenario . . . . .	12
3.3	Deterministic Equivalence Verification . . . . .	7	<b>7</b>	<b>Structural Properties of the Architec- ture</b>	<b>12</b>
3.4	Stabilization Gate . . . . .	7	7.1	Structural Non-Bypassability . . . . .	12
3.5	Representational Projection . . . . .	8	7.2	Protocol Independence . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Instantiation of the PSTA in RTGS Sys- tems</b>	<b>8</b>	7.3	Architectural Universality . . . . .	13
4.1	Authoritative Settlement State . . . . .	8	<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
4.2	Representational Settlement Interfaces . . . . .	9			

# 1 Instantiation Domain

This section defines the computational domain within which the architectural instantiation of the Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture is examined. The objective is to establish the structural characteristics of informational state systems in which authoritative states are internally produced while externally observable representations are generated through distinct representational mechanisms. Within such environments, the transition between authoritative state production and representational exposure constitutes a critical structural boundary where conditions governing representational validity become relevant. Real-Time Gross Settlement systems provide a suitable instantiation environment for this analysis, as they naturally exhibit a clear separation between the settlement core responsible for producing definitive transaction states and the representational interfaces that communicate settlement outcomes to external observers. In RTGS infrastructures, such separation is operationally observable in settlement reporting interfaces, liquidity dashboards, and transaction monitoring consoles. This separation allows the deterministic stabilization principles defined by the *PSTA* to be examined in a concrete operational context without altering the internal functioning of the settlement infrastructure.

## 1.1 Informational State Systems

Informational state systems are computational environments in which internal system conditions are produced, maintained, and transitioned through structured processing operations. Within such systems, authoritative states emerge as the result of validated internal processes that determine the definitive condition of a given operation or transaction. These states exist independently of how the system communicates or represents them externally.

In many computational infrastructures, particularly in financial and transactional environments, the internal production of an authoritative state and its external representation are handled by distinct system layers. The authoritative domain is responsible for generating the final system condition, while representational layers translate this condition into observable outputs delivered through interfaces, notifications, or system messaging channels. In RTGS infrastructures, this distinction is operationally observable across settlement reporting interfaces, liquidity dashboards, and transaction monitoring consoles, where representational states are continuously derived from authoritative settlement conditions and exposed to participants and supervisory systems.

The separation between authoritative state production and representational exposure introduces a structural transition point within informational state systems. It is within this transition space that mechanisms governing representational validity become relevant, as the external visibility of system states must remain consistent with the internally produced authoritative condition.

## 1.2 Authoritative and Representational State Domains

Informational state systems commonly operate through two structurally distinct domains: the authoritative state domain and the representational state domain. The authoritative domain corresponds to the internal computational environment in which definitive system states are produced through validated processing operations. Within this domain, the system establishes the final condition of transactions or operations that constitute the authoritative system state.

The representational domain, in contrast, corresponds to the set of mechanisms responsible for exposing system states to external observers. This domain includes user interfaces, notification systems, reporting layers, and inter-system communication channels that translate internal states into observable representations. These representations function as the external manifestation of the system's internal condition.

Although representational states are derived from authoritative states, the two domains remain structurally distinct. The representational domain does not generate system truth; rather, it reflects the outcome of authoritative processes. Maintaining consistency between these domains is therefore a central structural requirement in informational state systems where externally observable representations must accurately reflect internally defined authoritative conditions. In the absence of a deterministic conditioning mechanism governing the transition between these domains, representational states may be exposed before equivalence with the authoritative condition has been established.

### 1.3 RTGS Systems as an Instantiation Environment

Real-Time Gross Settlement systems constitute a class of financial infrastructures in which transactions are processed and settled individually and with finality in real time. Within these systems, the settlement core produces authoritative states that define the definitive completion of each transaction, establishing the internal source of truth for the settlement process.

Alongside the settlement core, RTGS environments include multiple representational layers responsible for communicating settlement outcomes to participating institutions, operational interfaces, and notification channels. These representational mechanisms translate the authoritative settlement state into externally observable confirmations, reports, and system messages that allow participants to perceive the outcome of settlement events. Components such as settlement ledgers, liquidity management interfaces, transaction monitoring dashboards, and participant reporting systems collectively constitute the representational layer through which authoritative settlement states are externally projected.

Because RTGS systems structurally separate settlement processing from representational communication, they provide a suitable environment for demonstrating the instantiation of the *PSTA* architecture. The transition between authoritative settlement states and their external representations offers a clear architectural boundary in which deterministic stabilization mechanisms can be introduced without modifying the internal operation of the settlement core.

## 2 Architectural Model

This section presents the structural components of the Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture and the logical relationships that govern deterministic representational stabilization. The model defines the authoritative state domain  $\mathcal{A}$ , the domain of representational state candidates  $\mathcal{R}$ , the deterministic equivalence verification function  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the resulting stabilized verification condition *State V*, and the representational exposure boundary through which externally observable system states are projected. Together, these components establish the formal structure through which representational exposure becomes conditionally governed rather than an automatic consequence of authoritative state production.

### 2.1 Authoritative State Domain ( $\mathcal{A}$ )

The Authoritative State Domain denotes the set of informational states produced and maintained by the authoritative computational core of a system. Within the context of RTGS infrastructures, this domain corresponds to the settlement core responsible for generating the final and irrevocable state of financial transactions. Formally,  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as the domain of states whose validity is determined exclusively by the internal rules and consensus mechanisms of the authoritative system, representing the definitive informational outcome of the underlying computational process.

In RTGS environments, elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  correspond to settlement-confirmed transaction states recorded in the authoritative ledger. These states are produced through deterministic internal processes governed by the settlement engine, ensuring that once a state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is established, it represents the definitive authoritative condition of the system at that point in time. The *PSTA* architecture does not alter or intervene in the generation of these states — the production, validation, and persistence of  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  remain entirely within the domain of the settlement core.

Consequently,  $\mathcal{A}$  serves as the reference domain for all subsequent representational validation procedures. Any representational state candidate must be evaluated against a corresponding authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  to determine whether its external exposure preserves deterministic equivalence with the authoritative condition of the system. This separation constitutes the structural foundation upon which deterministic representational stabilization is constructed.

## 2.2 Representational State Candidates ( $\mathcal{R}$ )

The Representational State Candidates denote the set of informational states derived from the authoritative domain and intended for external exposure through representational interfaces. Formally,  $\mathcal{R}$  is defined as the domain of representational projections that attempt to express, reflect, or communicate an underlying authoritative state. Each representational candidate  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  is therefore a derived informational structure produced from internal system processes, data transformations, or interface-level representations of the authoritative condition.

Within RTGS infrastructures, elements of  $\mathcal{R}$  typically include notification messages, API responses, transaction status displays, and settlement confirmations intended for operational visibility. However, representational candidates are not inherently guaranteed to preserve informational equivalence with the authoritative state from which they are derived. Due to asynchronous processing, caching mechanisms, or message propagation delays, a representational candidate  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  may diverge from the authoritative condition  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  at the moment of exposure. Representational candidates must therefore be considered provisional informational projections whose validity cannot be assumed without prior verification.

The role of the stabilization architecture is to evaluate representational candidates before their external exposure, ensuring that any representational projection released to external observers preserves deterministic equivalence with the corresponding authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ .

## 2.3 Deterministic Equivalence Verification Function $\Delta(a, r)$

The Deterministic Equivalence Verification Function constitutes the formal mechanism responsible for evaluating whether a representational state candidate preserves informational equivalence with its corresponding authoritative state. Formally,  $\Delta(a, r)$  is defined as a deterministic verification function that evaluates a pair  $(a, r)$ , where  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  represents an authoritative state and  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  represents a representational candidate. The function determines whether the informational content expressed by  $r$  preserves structural equivalence with the authoritative condition represented by  $a$ , without attempting to reproduce or recompute the authoritative state itself.

The verification outcome is strictly binary: if  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$ , the equivalence condition is satisfied and the representation becomes eligible for external exposure; if  $\Delta(a, r) = 0$ , the candidate is withheld from exposure. Given the same pair  $(a, r)$ , the function always produces the same outcome, guaranteeing consistent stabilization behavior across system executions. The equivalence condition is evaluated over a set of representationally critical parameters determined by the authoritative state, whose structural role within the verification condition remains invariant, while its specific composition is defined at the implementation boundary.

Through this mechanism,  $\Delta(a, r)$  establishes the decisive condition governing the transition between representational candidate status and externally observable representation, functioning as the logical bridge between the authoritative state domain and the representational exposure process.

## 2.4 Stabilized Verification State (*State V*)

The Stabilized Verification State denotes the logical condition achieved when a representational candidate  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  has satisfied the deterministic equivalence verification with respect to its corresponding authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Formally, *State V* emerges when  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$ , indicating that the pair  $(a, r)$  is considered stabilized under the verification procedure. Only representations that reach this condition are permitted to proceed to the representational exposure stage.

It is important to emphasize that *State V* does not introduce a new authoritative state, nor does it modify the existing state within the authoritative domain. The authoritative state remains unchanged and continues to be governed by the internal rules of the settlement core. *State V* denotes exclusively that the representational candidate has satisfied the deterministic verification condition required for external projection, functioning as the transitional marker between candidate evaluation and controlled representational exposure.

## 2.5 Representational Exposure Boundary

The Representational Exposure Boundary denotes the architectural interface at which informational states transition from internal system processing to external representational visibility. Within the stabilization architecture, this boundary functions as the controlled projection interface that establishes a deterministic gate between the internal verification process and the external representational domain. Only representational states that have successfully reached *State V* are eligible to cross this boundary — any candidate that has not satisfied  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$  is structurally prevented from reaching external exposure.

The Representational Exposure Boundary does not modify the authoritative state nor intervene in the production of representational candidates. Its role is exclusively to enforce the exposure condition governing the transition from internal informational processing to externally observable system representation, thereby preventing the uncontrolled projection of informational states that may diverge from the authoritative domain.

Within this framework, state stabilization denotes the macro-level condition achieved through deterministic stabilization mechanisms, while representational stabilization refers specifically to the conditioning of representational exposure at the interface boundary.

## 3 Deterministic Transition Pipeline

The Deterministic Transition Pipeline defines the operational sequence through which authoritative states produced by the settlement core are transformed into externally observable representations. The pipeline progresses through five sequential stages: authoritative state reception, representational candidate derivation, deterministic equivalence verification through  $\Delta(a, r)$ , stabilization gate conditioning, and representational projection. By enforcing verification prior to external exposure, the pipeline ensures that all representations released across the representational boundary preserve deterministic informational equivalence with the authoritative state — making representational exposure a controlled outcome rather than an automatic consequence of state production.

### 3.1 Authoritative State Reception from the Settlement Core

The deterministic transition pipeline begins with the reception of an authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  produced by the RTGS settlement core. Once a transaction has been processed and the resulting state has been recorded within the authoritative ledger,  $a$  becomes available to downstream system components responsible for representational processing and external communication. The stabilization architecture does not interfere with the production or validation of this state — the reception stage merely captures the authoritative output and forwards it to the stabilization pipeline as the entry point of the verification process.

The architecture assumes the correctness and finality of the authoritative state produced by the settlement core. Its role is not to recompute or validate the settlement logic itself, but to ensure that any external representation derived from  $a$  remains deterministically equivalent to the canonical condition established within the settlement domain. Once received,  $a$  becomes the reference state against which all subsequent representational candidates are evaluated within the transition pipeline.

### 3.2 Representational Candidate Derivation

Following the reception of the authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the system derives one or more representational candidates  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  intended for external exposure. This derivation involves transforming  $a$  into a representational structure suitable for external consumption — a process that may involve formatting, protocol adaptation, message construction, or interface-specific representation. Within RTGS environments, such candidates typically correspond to transaction status messages, API responses, user interface updates, or notification signals emitted by components that monitor settlement outcomes.

However, the derivation process does not guarantee that the resulting candidate faithfully preserves informational equivalence with  $a$ . Intermediate transformations, asynchronous propagation, or caching mechanisms may introduce divergence between  $r$  and the authoritative condition. The representational candidate must therefore be considered provisional until the deterministic equivalence verification defined by  $\Delta(a, r)$  has been performed and the equivalence condition satisfied.

### 3.3 Deterministic Equivalence Verification

Once a representational candidate  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  has been derived from the authoritative state  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the verification function  $\Delta(a, r)$  evaluates whether  $r$  preserves informational equivalence with the authoritative condition. The process does not recompute or modify  $a$  — it verifies structural correspondence between the authoritative state and its representational projection. If  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$ , the candidate becomes eligible to proceed to the stabilization stage. If  $\Delta(a, r) = 0$ , the candidate is withheld, preventing the propagation of a representation that does not accurately correspond to the authoritative domain.

This verification stage constitutes the central control mechanism within the deterministic transition pipeline. Through the application of  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the architecture establishes a deterministic control point that governs the transition between authoritative state production and external representational projection, ensuring that externally observable states cannot diverge from the canonical condition produced by the settlement core.

### 3.4 Stabilization Gate

The Stabilization Gate represents the control point within the deterministic transition pipeline that governs whether a representational candidate is permitted to advance toward external exposure. Operating on the outcome of  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the gate admits the candidate and transitions the system into *State V* when  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$ , establishing representational eligibility for controlled external projection. When  $\Delta(a, r) = 0$ , the gate prevents

the candidate from progressing further — the representation may be discarded, regenerated, or delayed until a candidate satisfying the equivalence condition is produced.

Architecturally, the stabilization gate is the operational enforcement point that separates the verification mechanism from representational projection. While  $\Delta(a, r)$  determines validity, the gate enforces the decision — ensuring that only representations that have reached *State V* are permitted to propagate beyond the verification domain and proceed toward the representational exposure boundary.

### 3.5 Representational Projection

Representational Projection constitutes the final stage of the deterministic transition pipeline. A representational state that has successfully passed through the stabilization gate and reached *State V* is permitted to cross the Representational Exposure Boundary and become observable to external actors. This projection may take the form of transaction confirmations, API responses, notification messages, or interface updates that communicate the authoritative settlement condition to external observers.

Because the candidate has already satisfied  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$ , the projected representation preserves informational equivalence with the canonical state of the system — reflecting a stabilized and verified informational condition rather than a provisional or potentially divergent one. The projection stage therefore completes the deterministic stabilization process, ensuring that representational exposure occurs only after the informational state has been deterministically stabilized.

## 4 Instantiation of the PSTA in RTGS Systems

This section presents the architectural instantiation of the Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture (*PSTA*) within Real-Time Gross Settlement (RTGS) environments. The objective is not to modify the internal settlement mechanisms of RTGS infrastructures, but to demonstrate how the stabilization architecture can be positioned structurally between the authoritative settlement core and the external representational interfaces. In practice, this boundary corresponds to the transition point between the settlement ledger state dissemination layer and downstream participant-facing reporting interfaces, including transaction monitoring dashboards, liquidity management consoles, and institutional notification channels. Through this positioning, representational settlement confirmations become conditionally exposed only after deterministic equivalence verification with the authoritative settlement state, ensuring that externally observable system representations remain informationally consistent with the finalized settlement domain.

### 4.1 Authoritative Settlement State

Within RTGS environments, the authoritative settlement state corresponds to the definitive state produced by the core settlement infrastructure once a transaction has been processed and finalized. This state represents the single source of truth within the system and exists independently of any external representation presented to users, operators, or interfaces. In practice, this state is recorded within the authoritative settlement ledger and reflects the irrevocable completion of the transaction as determined by the settlement engine.

In the context of the *PSTA* instantiation, this authoritative state belongs exclusively to the settlement core and is treated as the reference condition against which representational candidates are evaluated. The stabilization architecture does not modify or intervene in the production of this state; rather, it operates after the authoritative state has been produced, using it as the deterministic reference for representational verification.

## 4.2 Representational Settlement Interfaces

Representational settlement interfaces correspond to the set of external channels through which settlement outcomes are communicated to users, institutions, or supervisory systems. These interfaces may include transaction confirmation displays, notification services, institutional dashboards, liquidity reporting consoles, and system-to-system messaging layers operating under protocols such as ISO 20022 that translate internal settlement states into externally observable representations.

Within the *PSTA* instantiation, such interfaces operate exclusively downstream of the stabilization boundary. Representational candidates generated for these channels must first pass through the deterministic verification process before being exposed externally. This positioning ensures that every notification or settlement representation released through these interfaces reflects a state that has been deterministically validated against the authoritative settlement state.

## 4.3 Stabilization Boundary in RTGS Architecture

Within RTGS architectures, the stabilization boundary corresponds to the structural location at which deterministic representational verification is introduced between the settlement core and the external representational interfaces. This boundary defines the point where representational candidates derived from settlement outcomes are subjected to equivalence verification against the authoritative settlement state before any external exposure occurs. In operational terms, this boundary is positioned between the state dissemination layer of the settlement ledger and the downstream interfaces responsible for participant-facing reporting, including transaction confirmation systems, liquidity dashboards, and institutional notification channels.

By positioning the stabilization mechanism at this boundary, the architecture preserves the operational independence of the settlement core while ensuring that all externally observable settlement confirmations remain deterministically consistent with the authoritative domain. The stabilization boundary therefore functions as the control point governing the transition from authoritative settlement states to externally exposed representations.

## 4.4 Deterministic Settlement State Projection

Deterministic settlement state projection corresponds to the controlled exposure of settlement outcomes after successful stabilization. Once a representational candidate has been verified through deterministic equivalence against the authoritative settlement state and the stabilization gate condition has been satisfied, the representation becomes eligible for external projection across the representational boundary. At this stage, the stabilized state may be delivered through participant notification services, transaction confirmation interfaces, and institutional reporting channels, reflecting exclusively the finalized authoritative condition recorded in the settlement ledger.

In the RTGS instantiation, this projection ensures that every externally observable settlement confirmation corresponds to a state that has been structurally validated against the authoritative domain. As a result, representational exposure occurs only after deterministic stabilization, preventing the external propagation of provisional, inconsistent, or indeterminate settlement representations.

# 5 Architectural Variations Within the PSTA Framework

The *PSTA* framework allows multiple architectural deployment configurations while preserving the same deterministic stabilization principle. Regardless of implementation form, the stabilization mechanism remains

structurally positioned prior to representational exposure and operates through the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$  between authoritative states and representational candidates. The following variations illustrate three deployment models — inline verification, intermediary stabilization, and event-driven stabilization — through which the stabilization mechanism may be integrated into existing infrastructures without altering the fundamental operational logic of the underlying settlement systems.

### 5.1 Inline Verification Architecture

In the inline verification architecture, the stabilization mechanism is positioned directly within the operational path between the authoritative state output and the representational interfaces. Representational candidates are generated and immediately subjected to the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$  before any exposure occurs. In this configuration, verification and stabilization are executed as part of the immediate transition pipeline, ensuring that every representational projection is conditionally released only after the equivalence condition has been satisfied. This configuration is particularly suited to environments where representational latency is acceptable and the stabilization boundary can be enforced synchronously within the state dissemination path.

### 5.2 Intermediary Stabilization Layer

In the intermediary stabilization layer architecture, the verification mechanism is implemented as a distinct logical layer positioned between the authoritative settlement domain and the representational interfaces. Representational candidates generated from settlement events are first routed through this intermediary stabilization layer, where the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$  is executed before any representational exposure occurs. This configuration preserves the operational separation between settlement processing and representational projection while ensuring that only states satisfying the equivalence condition are permitted to cross the representational boundary. This model is particularly suited to environments where the stabilization mechanism must operate independently of the settlement core, allowing the two layers to scale and be maintained separately.

### 5.3 Event-Driven Stabilization Model

In the event-driven stabilization model, the verification process is triggered by settlement-related system events rather than by a continuously active inline mechanism. When an authoritative settlement state is produced, an event signal initiates the derivation of representational candidates and the execution of the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$ . Representational exposure is then conditionally authorized only after the equivalence condition has been satisfied. This model allows the stabilization architecture to operate within event-based infrastructures while preserving the deterministic verification requirement prior to representational projection. It is particularly suited to environments where settlement events are asynchronous and representational exposure must be decoupled from the continuous operational flow of the settlement core.

## 6 Structural Consequences of Deterministic Stabilization

The introduction of deterministic stabilization prior to representational exposure produces structural consequences for how informational states are externally manifested within computational systems. By conditioning representational projection on the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the architecture removes structural conditions that previously allowed ambiguous or indeterminate representations to emerge. As a result, externally observable system states become deterministically aligned with the authoritative domain — establishing a stabilized informational transition between internal state production and external representation. The following subsections examine these consequences across three structural dimensions: the elimination of

representational indeterminacy, the prevention of Perceptive Vacuum instances, and the behavioral distinction between representational absence and provisional exposure.

## 6.1 Elimination of Representational Indeterminacy

By enforcing deterministic equivalence verification prior to representational exposure, the stabilization architecture eliminates conditions in which externally observable states may diverge from the authoritative settlement state. Because representational eligibility is determined exclusively by the outcome of the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$ , the architecture structurally prevents the emergence of provisional, ambiguous, or indeterminate representations within the system’s external interfaces. Representational outputs are therefore released only when structural consistency with the authoritative domain has been confirmed, establishing deterministic alignment between authoritative state production and external representational visibility.

## 6.2 Elimination of Perceptive Vacuum Instances

The stabilization mechanism prevents the emergence of Perceptive Vacuum conditions by ensuring that representational exposure occurs only after the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r)$  has confirmed deterministic equivalence with the authoritative settlement state. Because representational candidates that do not satisfy the equivalence condition are structurally prevented from crossing the exposure boundary, the architectural conditions that allow unverified states to manifest within the representational domain are eliminated. As a result, externally observable system states cannot exist in a condition where the representational layer reflects an informational state that has not yet been structurally validated against the authoritative domain.

## 6.3 Deterministic Representational Exposure Condition

Under the stabilization architecture, representational exposure becomes a conditionally permitted event rather than an automatic consequence of internal state production. External representations are projected only when the verification operation  $\Delta(a, r) = 1$  has been satisfied, confirming deterministic equivalence between the authoritative settlement state and the representational candidate. This condition establishes a controlled transition in which the existence of an externally observable state depends exclusively on the successful completion of the stabilization process, not on data availability or system throughput.

## 6.4 Representational Absence as a Structural Condition

Conventional informational architectures commonly permit representational exposure prior to deterministic verification of equivalence with the authoritative state. Under such conditions, external interfaces may present provisional representations — states that reflect an expected or anticipated authoritative condition rather than a confirmed one. This behavior is structurally permitted because such architectures do not impose a mandatory conditioning mechanism between authoritative state production and representational exposure.

The *PSTA* architecture produces a structurally distinct behavior. When the equivalence condition  $\Delta(a, r) = 0$ , no representational state is admitted through the exposure boundary. The external interface therefore presents an absence of representation rather than a provisional one.

This distinction is not merely operational. Provisional exposure introduces a representational state whose validity is uncertain at the moment of observation. Representational absence, by contrast, carries no informational content regarding the authoritative state — it signals only that verification has not yet been satisfied. The difference in observable consequence is significant: a system receiving a provisional representation may act on unverified information, whereas a system receiving no representation is structurally prevented from doing so.

## 6.5 Illustrative Divergence Scenario

The following sequence illustrates the behavioral difference between a conventional architecture and one implementing the *PSTA* stabilization pipeline.

### Without *PSTA*:

- $t_0$  Settlement committed in authoritative domain
- $t_1$  Representational layer propagates asynchronously
- $t_2$  External interface exposes provisional confirmation before equivalence is established

### With *PSTA*:

- $t_0$  Settlement committed in authoritative domain
- $t_1$  Representational candidate derived
- $t_2$   $\Delta(a, r)$  evaluated — equivalence not satisfied
- $t_3$  Exposure withheld, no representation emitted
- $t_4$  Candidate re-evaluated against updated authoritative state
- $t_5$   $\Delta(a, r) = 1$  — equivalence established
- $t_6$  Stabilized representation projected to external interface

The observable consequence in the *PSTA* case is the structural absence of representation during the interval  $[t_2, t_5]$ , rather than the presence of an unverified state. This interval defines the stabilization window within which the architecture enforces representational absence as a structural condition.

## 7 Structural Properties of the Architecture

The structural properties of the *PSTA* architecture arise from its deterministic positioning between authoritative state production and representational exposure. Because the architecture operates exclusively on the structural relation between authoritative state emission and representational exposure, the constraints it establishes govern how informational states can become externally observable independently of the underlying protocol or implementation environment. These properties ensure that the stabilization mechanism remains structurally non-bypassable, agnostic to specific communication protocols, and applicable across any computational environment in which a structural separation between authoritative state production and representational exposure exists.

### 7.1 Structural Non-Bypassability

The stabilization mechanism is structurally positioned as the unique transition pathway between the authoritative state domain and the representational exposure boundary. Because the architecture operates exclusively on the structural relation between authoritative state emission and representational exposure, any representational output must traverse the stabilization boundary prior to external projection. No alternative execution path exists through which a representational state may reach the external interface without satisfying the deterministic equivalence condition. Any architectural configuration that permits representational exposure without traversing the stabilization boundary is by definition outside the *PSTA* framework and therefore subject to the structural conditions that give rise to the Perceptive Vacuum.

## 7.2 Protocol Independence

The stabilization architecture operates independently of the specific communication protocols, messaging standards, or settlement infrastructures used by the underlying system. Because the architecture operates exclusively on the structural relation between authoritative state emission and representational exposure, it remains agnostic to the underlying transaction protocol through which settlement events are processed or transmitted. Whether the system operates under ISO 20022 messaging standards, proprietary settlement protocols, or alternative communication frameworks, the stabilization condition governing representational exposure is preserved at the architectural boundary without requiring modification of the underlying protocol layer.

## 7.3 Architectural Universality

The stabilization principle defined by the *PSTA* is not restricted to a specific class of computational systems or financial infrastructures. Any informational system that maintains a structural separation between authoritative state production and representational exposure constitutes a valid instantiation environment for the stabilization boundary defined by this architecture. This domain of applicability extends across financial settlement infrastructures, distributed transaction systems, and any computational environment in which externally observable representations must remain deterministically consistent with internally produced authoritative conditions. The architecture therefore functions as a general structural pattern for deterministic representational control, applicable wherever the transition between authoritative persistence and representational exposure requires conditioning.

# 8 Conclusion

This work presented the architectural instantiation of the Perceptual Stabilization Transition Architecture (*PSTA*) within Real-Time Gross Settlement systems, demonstrating how deterministic representational stabilization can be structurally introduced without altering the internal functioning of the settlement core. By positioning the stabilization mechanism between authoritative settlement state production and representational exposure, the architecture preserves the operational autonomy of the settlement infrastructure while establishing deterministic control — through  $\Delta(a, r)$  — over the conditions under which external representations are generated.

The RTGS instantiation illustrates that the stabilization principle does not depend on modifications to settlement protocols or transaction processing logic. Instead, the mechanism operates at the architectural boundary governing representational exposure, ensuring that externally observable settlement confirmations are conditionally released only after the equivalence condition has been satisfied. Through this positioning, the architecture eliminates representational ambiguity, prevents Perceptive Vacuum instances, and enforces representational absence over provisional exposure — making representational projection a deterministically governed transition rather than an automatic consequence of internal state production.

The RTGS environment therefore serves as a concrete instantiation demonstrating the broader applicability of the *PSTA* stabilization principle across informational state systems in which external representations must remain strictly aligned with authoritative conditions. The stabilization framework introduced here establishes the architectural foundation upon which the emergent effects of deterministically conditioned representational exposure will be examined in the subsequent volume.