

FOUNDER-GOVERNED

Internal Constitutional Scrutiny Record

The Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework

Record ID	RC-GOV-HX-CSR-2026-08-09
Record Version	1.0 Authorized Internal Governance Record
Responsible Human	Mazhar UI Haq Founder, Re Culture™
Decision Date	9 August 2026 Asia/Riyadh
Controlled Source	Human Experience Framework v1.2 CC BY 4.0
Source DOI	10.5281/zenodo.21792507
Visibility	Private Controlled Record Until Separately Authorized For Publication

CONTROLLED OUTCOME: The Foundational Definition And All Six Constitutional Principles Were Reaffirmed Without Amendment Through Explicit Founder Approval.

Closure Boundary: This Record Closes Only The Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny Of The Foundational Definition And Six Constitutional Principles. It Does Not Constitute Independent Review, Peer Review, Accreditation, Certification, Empirical Validation, Legal Review, Or Institution-Wide Forensic Closure.

Technology And Human Responsibility: Re Culture™ Is Founder-Conceived, Human-Governed And AI-Assisted. Artificial Intelligence Assisted Bounded Organization, Drafting And Quality Control. AI Was Not An Evidence Source, Approval Authority Or Closure Signer. Mazhar UI Haq Retains Final Responsibility For Meaning, Accuracy And Institutional Decisions.

Source And Rights: The Controlled Source Is Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework Version 1.2, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21792507, Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International. This Record Does Not Alter That Licence Or Imply Endorsement, Accreditation, Certification Or Empirical Validation.

CONTROL NOTE

Scope, Method And Governance Boundary

What Was Examined, How It Was Decided And What Remains Open

Scope: The Controlled Source Text Examined Was The Foundational Definition And Six Constitutional Principles In The Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework Version 1.2, Authorized Controlled Correction, Published Under CC BY 4.0 At DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21792507.

Method: Each Constitutional Item Was Examined For Purpose, Conceptual Coherence, Possible Overclaiming, Misuse Risk, Ethical Boundary, Operational Interpretation And Institutional Decision.

Decision Rule: The Constitutional Text Could Be Reaffirmed, Reaffirmed With A Controlled Interpretive Boundary, Or Referred For Amendment. No Item Required Amendment.

Authority: Mazhar Ul Haq Provided Explicit Item-Level Founder Approval On 9 August 2026. The Approvals Are Recorded As Human Governance Decisions, Not As Independent Review Findings.

Controlled Outcome

Item	Decision	Amendment
Foundational Definition	Founder Approved	None
1. Human Experience Before Management Interpretation	Founder Approved	None
2. Context Without The Loss Of Accountability	Founder Approved	None
3. Dignity As An Institutional Condition	Founder Approved	None
4. Leadership As A Daily Human Experience	Founder Approved	None
5. Capability As A Human-System Outcome	Founder Approved	None
6. Measurement With Meaning	Founder Approved	None

What Remains Open

Independent Critique: External Review Remains Welcome And Must Be Recorded Separately If Received.

Evidence Development: The Framework Remains Conceptual And Practice-Oriented. Empirical Testing And Bounded Practice Pilots Remain Open.

Arabic Semantic Equality: The Official Arabic Identity Is Preserved In Its Controlled Form Below. A Named Human Semantic Review Is Still Required Before Arabic Constitutional Equivalence Can Be Closed.

ري كلتشر™

Corpus-Level Review: The Wider Re Culture™ Forensic Review Remains Active. This Record Does Not Close Unrelated Evidence, Citation, Visual Provenance, Repository Or Public-Copy Controls.

CONSTITUTIONAL ITEM 00

Foundational Definition

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Human Experience Is The Lived And Interpreted Reality Created Where A Person's Context, Relationships, Cultural Conditions, And Institutional Systems Meet.

Constitutional Purpose: This Definition Establishes Human Experience As Neither An Isolated Personal Feeling Nor A Programme Administered By An Organization. It Locates Experience Where Personal Context, Relationships, Cultural Conditions And Institutional Systems Meet.

Scrutiny Finding: The Definition Is Conceptually Coherent And Provides A Clear Foundation For The Six Constitutional Principles. Its Strongest Distinction Is That Experience Is Both Lived And Interpreted.

Four Foundational Commitments

Lived: Experience Occurs Through Real Moments And Consequences.

Interpreted: The Same Institutional Action May Carry Different Meanings Across Different Histories And Circumstances.

Relational: Leadership And Colleague Interactions Influence How Institutional Systems Are Experienced.

Institutional: Policies, Structures, Measures, Technologies And Resource Decisions Shape Everyday Human Conditions.

Authorized Interpretation

Institutions Do Not Create The Entire Human Reality Of A Person. They Create And Shape Conditions That Meet The Person's Existing Context, Relationships And Interpretive Reality.

Scope Note: This Is A Conceptual And Practice Definition Of Human Experience Within Institutional And Workplace Contexts. It Is Not A Clinical Definition, Psychological Diagnosis Or Universal Explanation Of Individual Experience.

Privacy Boundary: A Person's Context Means Context That Is Relevant And Proportionate To The Institutional Matter. It Does Not Authorize Unrestricted Access To Private Life.

Judgement Boundary: Individual Interpretation Is Essential Evidence But Is Not The Sole Determinant Of Institutional Fact. Human Experience Does Not Replace Strategy, Standards, Accountability, Legal Obligations Or Specialist Judgement.

Institutional Questions

Q1. What Relevant Personal Or Situational Context Is Present?

Q2. What Relationships Shaped How The Situation Was Encountered?

Q3. What Cultural Conditions Influenced Voice, Trust Or Silence?

Q4. What Institutional System Or Decision Contributed To The Experience?

Q5. What Remains Outside The Institution's Legitimate Authority Or Competence?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar UI Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: The Definition Applies Within Institutional And Workplace Contexts And Does Not Claim That Institutions Create The Entire Human Reality Of A Person.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 01

Human Experience Before Management Interpretation

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Before A Person Is Reduced To A Category, Score, Case, Or Outcome, The Institution Must Recognize That A Human Reality Exists Behind The Available Data.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Establishes The Correct Order Of Institutional Judgement: Recognize The Person And Relevant Human Reality; Examine The Available Evidence; Apply Managerial Interpretation; Reach A Proportionate And Accountable Decision.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Is Constitutionally Sound. It Does Not Reject Management Data, Categories Or Performance Measures. It Prevents Them From Becoming The Complete Explanation Of A Person Or Situation.

Authorized Interpretation

Data May Describe Part Of The Reality. It Must Not Be Treated As The Whole Of The Person Or The Complete Explanation Of The Outcome.

Accountability Boundary: Recognition Of Human Reality Does Not Excuse Misconduct, Disregard Reliable Evidence, Delay Necessary Decisions Indefinitely Or Replace One Assumption With Another Supposedly Empathetic Assumption.

Privacy Boundary: The Principle Does Not Authorize Intrusion Into Private Life Or Require Personal Disclosure As The Price Of Fair Treatment.

Institutional Questions

- Q1.** What Does The Available Evidence Establish?
- Q2.** What Relevant Human Or Systemic Context May Still Be Missing?
- Q3.** Has An Administrative Label Been Mistaken For A Complete Explanation?
- Q4.** Has The Affected Person Had A Fair Opportunity To Be Heard?
- Q5.** Can The Final Decision Protect Dignity Without Weakening Standards?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar Ul Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Human Recognition Must Precede Reduction To An Administrative Label, While Evidence And Legitimate Accountability Remain Intact.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 02

Context Without The Loss Of Accountability

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Context Does Not Cancel Standards. It Improves The Quality Of Judgment By Distinguishing Constraint, Capability, Conduct, Intention, And Temporary Disruption.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Prevents Context-Blind Enforcement And The Opposite Error Of Using Context To Remove Legitimate Accountability. Context Refines Judgement; It Does Not Replace Standards.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Provides A Necessary Balance Between Humanity And Institutional Responsibility. Similar Outcomes May Arise From Materially Different Causes And Therefore Require Disciplined Interpretation.

Authorized Interpretations

Intention Must Be Examined Cautiously And Never Presumed.

Temporary Disruption Is One Contextual Category. It Does Not Exclude Enduring Disability, Structural Constraint Or Continuing Human Circumstances.

Standards Boundary: Standards Must Be Lawful, Known, Relevant, Consistently Applied And Reasonably Achievable.

Fairness Boundary: Context May Influence Interpretation And Proportionality, But It Must Not Become Favoritism, Inconsistency Or Protection From Serious Misconduct.

Institutional Questions

Q1. Was The Standard Clear, Legitimate And Communicated?

Q2. Did The Person Possess The Necessary Capability, Authority And Resources?

Q3. Was The Outcome Shaped By Constraint, Conduct Or Systemic Failure?

Q4. What Evidence Supports Any Conclusion About Intention?

Q5. Would The Same Contextual Consideration Be Available In A Comparable Case?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar Ul Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Context Improves Accountability Only When Intention Is Not Presumed And Enduring Or Structural Context Is Not Excluded.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 03

Dignity As An Institutional Condition

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Dignity Must Not Depend On Rank, Performance Continuity, Agreement, Or Personal Similarity. It Is Expressed Through Fair Process, Respectful Interaction, Proportionate Response, And The Protection Of Human Worth.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Establishes Dignity As A Condition The Institution Must Protect, Not A Reward Granted For Seniority, Performance, Agreement Or Personal Affinity.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Is Ethically Coherent And Institutionally Necessary. It Protects Against Rank-Based Treatment, Withdrawal Of Respect During Performance Difficulty, Punishment For Respectful Disagreement, Affinity Bias And Humiliation Disguised As Accountability.

Authorized Interpretation

Protecting Human Worth Does Not Remove Legitimate Institutional Consequences.

Accountability Boundary: Dignity Does Not Mean Agreement, Praise, Avoidance Of Difficult Feedback, Identical Outcomes Or Immunity From Proportionate Correction, Discipline Or Removal.

Process Boundary: Respectful Interaction Must Not Conceal An Unfair Process. Fair Process Must Protect Voice, Privacy, Consistency And The Right To Understand Decisions.

Performance Continuity: Human Worth Does Not Disappear When Previously Reliable Performance Becomes Disrupted Or Declines.

Institutional Questions

Q1. Would This Person Receive The Same Procedural Respect Regardless Of Rank?

Q2. Is Disagreement Being Treated As Misconduct Merely Because It Challenges Authority?

Q3. Is The Response Corrective And Proportionate, Or Unnecessarily Humiliating?

Q4. Has The Person Been Heard And Given A Comprehensible Explanation?

Q5. Would The Process Remain Defensible If Applied To Someone Personally Closer To The Decision-Maker?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar Ul Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Dignity Governs Process And Treatment Without Removing Legitimate, Explainable And Proportionate Consequences.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 04

Leadership As A Daily Human Experience

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Leadership Is Experienced Less Through Statements Than Through Listening, Explanation, Consistency, Decisions, Corrections, Recognition, And The Use Of Power In Ordinary Moments.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Moves Leadership From Declared Intention To Lived Institutional Experience. Leadership Is Encountered Through Repeated Interaction, Especially When Authority Is Exercised, Performance Is Corrected, Disagreement Emerges Or Difficult Decisions Are Explained.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Is Central To The Re Culture™ Distinction. It Prevents Values Statements, Leadership Messaging And Public Commitments From Being Treated As Sufficient Evidence Of Humane Leadership.

Authorized Interpretation

Human Experience Is Essential Evidence Of Leadership, But It Must Be Interpreted Alongside Conduct, Context, Institutional Responsibility And Consequence.

Communication Boundary: Statements Remain Important Because Clarity And Explanation Are Part Of Responsible Leadership. The Principle Establishes Priority, Not Irrelevance.

Consistency Boundary: Listening Does Not Require Automatic Agreement. Explanation Does Not Require Disclosure Of Protected Information. Consistency Does Not Require Identical Treatment Where Circumstances Materially Differ.

Power Boundary: The Use Of Power Must Be Examined Through Voice, Credibility, Correction, Recognition, Accountability And The Cultural Cost Of Disagreement.

Institutional Questions

Q1. Do Ordinary Actions Align With Formal Statements?

Q2. Can People Raise Difficult Information Without Unreasonable Personal Cost?

Q3. Are Decisions Explained Sufficiently To Those Affected?

Q4. Is Correction Directed Toward Conduct And Standards Rather Than Human Worth?

Q5. Does The Use Of Authority Create Clarity, Dependency, Fear, Trust Or Responsible Contribution?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar Ul Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Leadership Must Be Examined Through Repeated Behaviour And The Responsible Use Of Power, While Human Experience Remains Evidence Rather Than The Sole Determinant Of Fact.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 05

Capability As A Human-System Outcome

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Knowledge And Skill Become Reliable Capability Only When People Can Ask, Practise, Reflect, Report, Learn, And Contribute Within Conditions That Support Psychological And Operational Safety.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Distinguishes Possessing Knowledge From Being Able To Convert Knowledge Into Dependable Contribution. Capability Emerges Through The Interaction Between Individual Responsibility And Conditions Created By Leadership, Culture, Systems And Work Design.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Is Central To Re Culture™'s People Capability Re-Imagined Position. It Challenges The Assumption That Course Completion, Certification Or Technical Knowledge Automatically Produces Sustainable Workplace Capability.

Authorized Interpretation

Individuals May Demonstrate Knowledge Or Perform Successfully Under Poor Conditions. However, Capability Cannot Become Reliably Sustainable At Institutional Level When People Cannot Ask, Practise, Reflect, Report, Learn Or Contribute Safely.

Reliable Capability: Reliable Means Consistent, Transferable, Responsible, Sustainable Beyond A Single Successful Moment, Open To Feedback And Able To Surface Error, Uncertainty Or Risk.

Individual Agency: Human-System Conditions Do Not Remove Individual Responsibility To Learn, Practise, Contribute And Meet Legitimate Standards.

Safety Boundary: Psychological Safety Does Not Mean Comfort Or Protection From Feedback. Operational Safety Includes Appropriate Clarity, Resources, Authority, Procedures, Workload And Escalation Channels.

Institutional Questions

Q1. Was The Required Knowledge Clearly Established?

Q2. Was Meaningful And Appropriately Controlled Practice Available?

Q3. Could Questions And Relevant Risks Be Raised Without Unreasonable Personal Cost?

Q4. Did The Person Possess The Necessary Authority, Resources And Operational Conditions?

Q5. Is The Institution Diagnosing An Individual Deficiency Where The Stronger Cause May Be Systemic?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar UI Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Reliable Capability Preserves Both Institutional Responsibility And Individual Agency.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE 06

Measurement With Meaning

Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny And Reaffirmation

Metrics Are Signals, Not Complete Explanations. Institutions Must Interpret Quantitative Evidence Alongside Context, Pattern, Voice, Experience, And Consequence.

Constitutional Purpose: This Principle Protects Institutions From Confusing Numerical Visibility With Complete Understanding. Metrics May Reveal What Occurred, How Often It Occurred And Where A Pattern May Exist. They Do Not Automatically Explain Why It Occurred Or What Conditions Produced It.

Scrutiny Finding: The Principle Does Not Weaken Quantitative Evidence. It Requires Responsible Interpretation Before Data Is Used To Define People, Diagnose Causes Or Justify Consequential Decisions.

Authorized Interpretation

A Metric May Establish What Was Recorded. It Does Not, By Itself, Establish The Complete Human Or Institutional Explanation Behind The Result.

Evidence Boundary: Metrics Must Not Be Dismissed Because They Are Uncomfortable. Context Must Be Relevant And Evidenced. Human Voice Must Be Gathered Safely And Interpreted With Attention To Representation, Silence And Unequal Exposure.

Interpretation Boundary: Qualitative Interpretation Must Not Become Selective Storytelling. Individual Accounts Must Not Automatically Be Generalized To An Entire Institution.

Proportionality Boundary: Additional Inquiry Must Be Proportionate. It Must Not Create Endless Analysis Or Prevent Necessary Action.

Institutional Questions

Q1. What Exactly Does This Measure Establish?

Q2. What Does It Remain Unable To Explain?

Q3. Is The Result Isolated Or Part Of A Recurring Pattern?

Q4. Whose Voice Is Represented, Missing Or Unsafe To Express?

Q5. What Intended And Unintended Consequences May Follow From The Decision?

Founder Decision

REAFFIRMED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Approval Authority: Mazhar UI Haq, Founder

Approval Date: 9 August 2026 (Asia/Riyadh)

Interpretive Boundary: Measurement Must Inform Institutional Judgement Without Replacing It.
CLOSURE RECORD

Consolidated Founder Decision

Authorized Internal Scrutiny Outcome And Continuing Institutional Obligations

The Foundational Definition And All Six Constitutional Principles Are Reaffirmed Without Amendment.

Founder: Mazhar UI Haq

Institution: Re Culture™ | Human Experience Review | People Capability Re-Imagined

Approval Form: Explicit Item-Level Founder Decisions Recorded During The Controlled Working Session

Decision Date: 9 August 2026 | Asia/Riyadh

Constitutional Change: None

Superseded Constitutional Wording: None Created

Interpretive Notes: Authorized As Application Guidance. They Do Not Replace Or Silently Amend The Constitutional Text.

Institutional Meaning Of This Closure

Re Culture™ Has Completed A Founder-Governed Internal Scrutiny Of Its Foundational Definition And Six Constitutional Principles. The Record Strengthens Internal Coherence, Makes Application Boundaries Explicit And Preserves Transparent Human Responsibility. It Does Not Convert Founder Approval Into Independent Validation.

Continuing Obligations

Evidence: Continue Claim-Level Evidence Traceability And Avoid Representing Conceptual Propositions As Empirical Findings.

Practice: Apply The Framework To Bounded Institutional Questions And Preserve Consequences, Limitations And Learning.

Language: Complete Named Human Arabic Semantic Review Before Closing English-Arabic Constitutional Equality.

External Challenge: Record Any Future Independent Critique Separately And Publish Material Revisions Or Limitations Where Appropriate.

Version Control: Preserve This Record, The Source Framework And Any Future Amendments Through Dated, Explainable Version History.

A Framework Becomes Institutionally Responsible Not When It Claims Perfection, But When It Preserves The Discipline To Examine, Limit And Correct Its Own Meaning.

| A Re Culture™ Controlled Institutional Record |