AGCP Runtime Governance Training Program

Program Overview and Combined Course Syllabus

AGCP-101: Runtime AI Governance Foundations

AGCP-201: AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner

Foundational principle
For systems capable of consequential autonomous or programmatic action, governance becomes operationally effective only when it can determine, at runtime, whether a proposed action is permitted to become real.

Version 1.0 | July 2026

John M. Willis | Artificial Intelligence Governance Control Plane (AGCP) | Sustainable Future Tech, Inc.

agcp.ai

Contents

1. Purpose, Scope, and Status

1.1 Purpose

The AGCP Runtime Governance Training Program establishes a structured pathway for professionals who need to understand and apply runtime governance to AI-enabled, autonomous, agentic, and programmatic systems. This combined overview and syllabus defines the program context, shared competency model, course boundaries, learning objectives, instructional modules, practical exercises, Body of Knowledge coverage, and completion expectations for the first two courses in the pathway.

The document is designed for learners, instructors, organizational sponsors, and prospective participants. It provides a single public-facing reference for both the conceptual Foundations course and the applied Practitioner course.

1.2 Runtime Governance Training Purpose

Runtime governance is the execution-time discipline of determining whether a proposed AI-enabled, autonomous, agentic, or programmatic action may become operationally consequential under current conditions of authority, evidence, policy, constraints, invariants, and canonical state.

The training program prepares professionals to reason about proposed actions as candidate state transitions, identify the point at which governance must bind to execution, and analyze whether governance operates before operational consequence. It complements model governance, lifecycle governance, identity and access management, workflow approval, monitoring, audit, and risk management without replacing those disciplines.

> **Central question**
>
> Under current runtime conditions, should this proposed transition be permitted to become operationally real?

1.3 Scope

- runtime governance foundations and controlled vocabulary
- proposal and state-transition framing
- reasoning-governance-execution separation
- governance compilation and policy-to-execution translation
- governed action proposals and governance context
- canonical state, evidence continuity, and qualified runtime evidence
- admissibility, authorization, authority, binding, and commit
- commit-boundary enforcement and structural refusal
- deterministic governance, replayability, and safety properties
- runtime governance control categories
- lifecycle sequence and governance flow
- multi-agent, distributed, and cross-system governance
- basic assessment, testing, conformance, and standards alignment concepts

1.4 Out of Scope

The program does not define a general AI ethics curriculum, model-development curriculum, privacy-law curriculum, or general cybersecurity certification program. It does not replace the AGCP specification, runtime governance requirements, conformance test suite, technical papers, or other normative source materials. It organizes those materials into a training and competency framework.

Completion of either course does not by itself authorize a learner to conduct an official AGCP conformance assessment, issue a public conformance statement, or claim professional certification. Those functions require separate program governance, assessment criteria, evidence requirements, authorization, and quality controls.

1.5 Status

Version 1.0 is the first public release of this training-program overview and combined course syllabus. It supports course delivery, participant preparation, instructional alignment, practical exercises, certificates of completion, and continued development of the AGCP training pathway. It is a training document, not a certification standard, accreditation instrument, professional licensure framework, complete examination blueprint, or conformance assessor manual.

2. Program Audience and Role Profiles

2.1 Primary Audience

- AI governance and responsible AI professionals
- cybersecurity, secure-by-design, cloud security, and identity professionals
- security, enterprise, AI, platform, solution, and zero-trust architects
- IT audit, internal audit, GRC, risk, model risk, and assurance professionals
- AI system designers, AI product owners, MLOps and platform engineers, and DevSecOps professionals
- compliance, legal-adjacent, and technology consulting professionals
- control assessors and prospective AGCP conformance assessors
- executives and program sponsors responsible for enterprise AI governance and assurance

2.2 Role Profiles

Role Profile	Primary Function	Primary Emphasis
Executive / Sponsor	Understands why execution-layer governance matters and sponsors adoption.	Business case, framework alignment, secure-by-design rationale, assurance value.
Runtime Governance Practitioner	Applies AGCP concepts to representative workflows.	Governed action identification, proposal/context/evidence mapping, commit-boundary location.
Runtime Governance Assessor	Evaluates whether runtime governance controls are adequate and evidenced.	Design adequacy, operating effectiveness, evidence sufficiency, refusal, replayability, bypass paths.
Runtime Governance Architect	Designs or critiques runtime governance architectures.	Control-plane placement, PDP/PEP relationships, evidence services, canonical state, ledger/replay, multi-agent continuity.
Implementer / Operator	Builds, configures, integrates, or operates governance mechanisms.	Proposal intake, policy integration, evidence capture, commit gating, refusal handling, ledger recording.
AGCP Conformance Assessor	Applies AGCP-specific requirements, tests, and criteria.	Requirement interpretation, test applicability, evidence review, conformance classification, reporting.

2.3 Cross-Role Baseline

All AGCP-trained professionals share a common runtime governance baseline. Across roles, learners should understand the following distinctions:

- Proposed transition is not execution.
- Admissibility is not binding.
- Authorization is not authority at commitment.

- Evaluation is not enforcement.
- Policy is not runtime control unless it is made executable and enforced.
- Identity is necessary but insufficient for execution-time authority.
- Evidence must be qualified, current, attributable, and relevant.
- Canonical state determines governance reality.
- The commit boundary is the point of consequence.
- Refusal must be structural rather than merely advisory.
- Governance decisions and lifecycle state should be replayable from authoritative evidence.

2.4 Role-to-Course Alignment

Role Profile	AGCP-101 Foundations	AGCP-201 Practitioner
Executive / Sponsor	Required baseline	Optional
Practitioner	Required baseline	Required
Assessor	Required baseline	Required
Architect	Required baseline	Required
Implementer / Operator	Required baseline	Required
Conformance Assessor	Required baseline	Required

3. Competency Model and Training Pathway

3.1 Competency Progression

The AGCP training pathway uses a progressive competency model:

Competency progression

Understand -> Apply -> Assess -> Design -> Conform

Competency Stage	Professional Capability
Understand	Explain runtime governance concepts and distinctions.
Apply	Use AGCP concepts to analyze representative workflows.
Assess	Evaluate whether runtime governance controls are adequate and evidenced.
Design	Create or critique runtime governance architectures and control patterns.
Conform	Apply AGCP requirements and test criteria to determine scoped conformance.

3.2 Course Pathway

Level	Course	Competence Demonstrated	Primary Output
Level 1	AGCP-101 Runtime AI Governance Foundations	Explain concepts and distinctions.	Baseline knowledge and vocabulary.
Level 2	AGCP-201 AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner	Apply concepts to workflows.	Workflow analysis and governance mapping.

Level	Course	Competence Demonstrated	Primary Output
Level 3A	Runtime Governance Assessor	Evaluate adequacy and evidence.	Assessment observations and findings.
Level 3B	Runtime Governance Architect	Design or critique architecture.	Architecture and control-pattern design.
Level 4	Conformance Assessor	Apply AGCP criteria to scoped implementations.	Evidence-based conformance review.

AGCP-101 establishes the common vocabulary and conceptual foundation. AGCP-201 is the common applied technical foundation for both the Assessor and Architect pathways before those specializations diverge.

3.3 Course Boundary Rules

- Foundations completion demonstrates conceptual understanding; it does not imply assessor, architect, or conformance competence.
- Practitioner completion demonstrates applied workflow analysis; it does not imply formal assurance authority or independent architecture-design mastery.
- Completion certificates acknowledge training participation and course-level learning; they are not professional certifications.
- Formal AGCP conformance conclusions must be tied to AGCP-specific requirements, tests, evidence criteria, scope rules, and separate program authorization.

4. Program-Level Coverage and Learning Outcomes

4.1 Coverage Designations

Designation	Meaning
Introduce	The learner is exposed to the concept and can recognize it at a basic level.
Explain	The learner can describe the concept, its purpose, and its relationship to runtime governance.
Apply	The learner can use the concept in representative scenarios or workflows.
Reference	The material supports terminology, provenance, professional use, or deeper study but is not itself a course-level performance objective.

4.2 Body of Knowledge Domain Coverage

BoK Domain	Foundations	Practitioner
Purpose, Scope, and Status	Explain	Apply
Audience and Professional Role Profiles	Explain	Explain
Professional Competency Model	Explain	Explain
Core Runtime Governance Thesis	Explain	Apply
AGCP Conceptual Vocabulary	Explain	Apply
Runtime Governance Architecture	Introduce	Apply
Governance Compilation and Policy-to-Execution Translation	Introduce	Apply
Proposal, Context, Evidence, and Canonical State	Explain	Apply

BoK Domain	Foundations	Practitioner
Admissibility, Authorization, Binding, and Commit	Explain	Apply
Determinism, Replayability, and Safety Properties	Introduce	Apply
Runtime Governance Control Categories	Introduce	Apply
Lifecycle Sequence and Governance Flow	Introduce	Apply
Multi-Agent, Distributed, and Cross-System Governance	Introduce	Apply
Assessment, Testing, and Conformance Foundations	Introduce	Explain
Standards and Framework Alignment	Introduce	Explain
Source Provenance and Traceability	Reference	Reference
Glossary of Core Terms	Explain	Apply
Appendix A - Competency and Professional Use	Explain	Explain
Appendix B - Representative Runtime Governance Work Products	Introduce	Apply
Appendix C - Suggested Reading	Reference	Reference

4.3 Representative Work Products

Course	Representative Work Products	Purpose
AGCP-101 Foundations	Terminology worksheet; key-distinction analysis; reasoning-governance-execution diagram; guided scenario response.	Demonstrate conceptual understanding and accurate use of vocabulary.
AGCP-201 Practitioner	Governed action inventory; actor-agent-target map; proposal analysis record; policy and evidence dependency map; canonical-state dependency map; lifecycle map; commit-boundary analysis; runtime-governance gap summary.	Demonstrate applied workflow analysis and governance mapping.

5. AGCP-101: Runtime AI Governance Foundations - Syllabus

AGCP-101: Runtime AI Governance Foundations

Duration	90 minutes
Delivery	Instructor-led virtual course
Prerequisites	None
Competency level	Level 1 - Understand
Primary text	Runtime Governance Body of Knowledge for Artificial Intelligence and Other Autonomous Systems, Version 1.0 (Zenodo Edition)
Completion document	AGCP Runtime AI Governance Foundations - Certificate of Completion

5.1 Course Description

This course introduces the principles of runtime AI governance and the Artificial Intelligence Governance Control Plane (AGCP). Participants learn why execution-layer governance is necessary for AI-enabled, autonomous, agentic, and programmatic systems; develop a precise baseline vocabulary; and examine how AGCP complements existing AI governance, cybersecurity, identity, risk, audit, and secure-by-design frameworks.

The course is conceptual rather than implementation-focused. It prepares participants to recognize the Runtime Governance Gap, distinguish proposed action from execution, explain the role of canonical state and qualified evidence, and identify the commit boundary as the final governance decision point before operational consequence.

5.2 Intended Audience

- executives, sponsors, and governance leaders who need a common runtime governance baseline
- AI governance, responsible AI, risk, compliance, and GRC professionals
- cybersecurity, identity, secure-by-design, and cloud security professionals
- auditors, assessors, architects, engineers, product owners, and technical consultants
- professionals preparing to enter the AGCP Practitioner, Assessor, Architect, or Conformance Assessor pathways

5.3 Learning Objectives

- Define runtime governance for AI-enabled, autonomous, agentic, and programmatic systems.
- Explain the Runtime Governance Gap and why governance must operate before proposed action becomes operational consequence.
- Distinguish runtime governance from model governance, lifecycle governance, AI ethics governance, static authorization, workflow approval, monitoring, and post-execution audit.
- Explain the AGCP separation among reasoning, governance, and execution.
- Define the core concepts of proposed transition, canonical state, admissibility, authorization, authority at commitment, binding, commit boundary, structural refusal, governance receipt, and replayability.
- Explain why proposed transition is not execution, authorization is not authority at commitment, and evaluation is not enforcement.
- Explain why identity is necessary but insufficient for runtime governance.
- Explain why canonical state and qualified runtime evidence are required for admissibility evaluation.
- Explain why structural refusal and runtime assurance are required for effective execution-layer governance.
- Describe how AGCP runtime governance complements NIST AI RMF, NIST CSF 2.0, NIST SP 800-53, ISO/IEC 42001, CISA Secure-by-Design guidance, MITRE ATLAS, OWASP Agentic AI guidance, CSA controls, and enterprise governance frameworks.

5.4 Instructional Agenda

Module	Topic	Time	Instructional Focus	BoK Alignment
1	Why Runtime Governance?	15 min	Purpose, scope, relationship to AGCP and existing frameworks, foundational principle, Runtime Governance Gap.	BoK 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.7, 1.9
2	The Runtime Governance Thesis	20 min	From model governance to action governance; governance at the point of consequence; secure-by-design relationship.	BoK 4.1-4.3, 4.13-4.16
3	Core Runtime Governance Vocabulary	25 min	Proposed transition, canonical state, admissibility, authorization, authority at commitment, binding, commit boundary, structural refusal, receipts, replayability, runtime assurance.	BoK 5.3, 5.6, 5.13, 5.15-5.20, 5.27, 5.29-5.34, 5.39-5.40
4	The AGCP Control Plane	15 min	Architectural premise and objectives; reasoning -> governance -> execution; introduction to control-plane placement.	BoK 6.1-6.3, selected 6.8-6.10 and 6.18
5	Integrated Scenario Exercise	10 min	Guided analysis of a simple AI-enabled action request.	Applies BoK Sections 4-6
6	Wrap-Up and Training Pathway	5 min	Enterprise fit, standards relationship, Practitioner course preview, formative knowledge check.	BoK Section 15 selected; Section 3 and Appendix A selected

Total instructional time: 90 minutes. The practical exercise is integrated with the vocabulary and architecture discussion.

5.5 Integrated Practical Exercise

Participants analyze a simple scenario, such as an AI agent requesting permission to provision a cloud resource. Working from the scenario, participants identify:

- the proposed transition
- the actor or agent and execution target
- the relevant canonical state
- the governance decision point or commit boundary
- the evidence or authority needed to proceed
- whether the transition should be admitted, escalated, or structurally refused

5.6 Demonstration of Learning

- concept checks and terminology matching
- short-answer explanations of key distinctions
- scenario recognition and guided discussion
- completion of the integrated practical exercise
- a formative 10-15 question knowledge-check item set, administered as course conditions allow

The initial instructor-led delivery uses formative knowledge checks rather than a proctored individual examination. A Foundations learner should be able to recognize runtime governance issues and explain them accurately, but is not expected to perform formal assessment, architecture design, or conformance evaluation.

5.7 Required Body of Knowledge Reading

BoK Sections	Required Focus
1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.7, 1.9	Purpose, runtime-governance purpose, AGCP relationship, framework relationship, and foundational principle
4.1-4.3, 4.13-4.16	Core thesis, action governance, point of consequence, secure-by-design relationship, Runtime Governance Gap, and summary
5.3, 5.6, 5.13, 5.15-5.20, 5.27, 5.29-5.34, 5.39-5.40	Core conceptual vocabulary and required distinctions

BoK Sections	Required Focus
6.1-6.3	Purpose, premise, and objectives of runtime-governance architecture
15 selected	Standards and framework alignment overview
17 selected	Glossary definitions supporting the terminology used in the course

5.8 Course Boundaries

AGCP-101 establishes conceptual fluency. It does not prepare the learner to conduct a formal runtime governance assessment, design a complete runtime governance architecture, execute AGCP conformance tests, review a conformance evidence package, or issue a conformance conclusion.

6. AGCP-201: AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner - Syllabus

AGCP-201: AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner

Duration	4 hours, including one 10-minute break
Delivery	Instructor-led virtual course
Prerequisites	AGCP-101 Runtime AI Governance Foundations or equivalent knowledge
Competency level	Level 2 - Apply
Primary text	Runtime Governance Body of Knowledge for Artificial Intelligence and Other Autonomous Systems, Version 1.0 (Zenodo Edition)
Completion document	AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner - Certificate of Completion

6.1 Course Description

The AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner course develops the ability to analyze AI-enabled workflows using runtime governance principles and the AGCP control-plane model. Participants learn to identify governed actions, map actors and execution paths, identify governance context and canonical-state dependencies, evaluate runtime evidence requirements, locate commit boundaries, and recognize runtime governance gaps.

Unlike the Foundations course, which emphasizes conceptual understanding, the Practitioner course emphasizes application. Participants use representative enterprise scenarios to map governance intent through proposal formation, evidence and state resolution, admissibility evaluation, authority derivation, binding, commit, structural refusal, execution, and governance recording.

6.2 Intended Audience

- AI governance and responsible AI professionals
- AI, security, enterprise, platform, cloud, and solution architects
- cybersecurity, identity, DevSecOps, MLOps, and platform engineering professionals
- GRC, risk, model risk, audit, assurance, and compliance professionals
- AI product owners, program managers, technical consultants, and control analysts
- professionals preparing for the AGCP Assessor or Architect learning paths

6.3 Learning Objectives

- Identify proposed transitions in representative AI-enabled, autonomous, agentic, and programmatic workflows.
- Distinguish advisory outputs from consequential proposed actions.
- Map actors, agents, tenants, tools, targets, systems, and execution paths in a governed workflow.
- Identify policy, authority, evidence, and canonical-state dependencies associated with a proposed transition.
- Apply AGCP conceptual vocabulary accurately to practical workflow scenarios.
- Explain governance compilation and identify the machine-evaluable artifacts needed to translate governance intent into runtime control.
- Describe the lifecycle of a proposed transition from formation through authorization, escalation, refusal, commit, execution, or abandonment.
- Locate the commit boundary and identify whether evaluation occurs before or after operational consequence.
- Identify whether enforcement is structural or merely advisory.
- Recognize stale authorization, stale evidence, target substitution, tenant mismatch, state drift, bypass, and other basic runtime governance failure modes.
- Identify when human-in-the-loop review, quorum, escalation, or structural refusal may be required.
- Map runtime governance control categories to a representative workflow.

- Explain how governance receipts, refusal records, execution receipts, and ledger entries support assurance and replayability.
- Identify basic runtime governance gaps and describe their operational significance.
- Map a representative workflow to the AGCP runtime governance architecture.

6.4 Instructional Agenda

Module	Topic	Time	Instructional Focus	BoK Alignment
1	Runtime Governance Review	15 min	Foundational principle, Runtime Governance Gap, core distinctions and terminology.	BoK 1.5, 1.9; Sections 4-5 selected
2	Runtime Governance Architecture and Control Placement	25 min	Architectural layers, five-stage pipeline, control-plane placement, reasoning-governance-execution separation, control categories.	BoK Section 6; Section 11 selected
3	Governance Compilation	20 min	Governance intent, policy-to-execution translation, compiled artifacts, constraints, evidence, authority and refusal rules.	BoK Section 7
4	Governed Action Proposals	20 min	Proposal identity, structure, completeness, validity, registration, lifecycle management, degradation and abandonment.	BoK 8.2-8.7, 8.29-8.32
5	Governance Context and Canonical State	25 min	Context envelope, continuity, canonical-state resolution, state freshness and drift, proposal/state binding.	BoK 8.8-8.11, 8.20-8.28
Break	Course Break	10 min	Included in the four-hour course duration.	-
6	Qualified Runtime Evidence	20 min	Evidence sufficiency, freshness, provenance, integrity, applicability and continuity.	BoK 8.12-8.19
7	Admissibility, Authority, Binding, Commit, and Safety	30 min	Admissibility, authorization, authority at commitment, binding, commit boundary, refusal, escalation, TOCTOU, replayability and non-bypassability.	BoK Section 9; Section 10 selected
8	Lifecycle Sequence and Governance Flow	25 min	Proposal, continuous governance, pre-commit re-evaluation, commit authorization, execution, refusal, receipts and derived lifecycle state.	BoK Section 12; Section 11 selected
9	Scenario Workshop and Applied Mapping	35 min	Multiple enterprise scenarios; workflow mapping; gap recognition; multi-agent and assessment previews.	Applies BoK Sections 6-13; Section 14 selected; Appendix B
Wrap	Synthesis and Formative Knowledge Check	15 min	Review of work products, discussion of findings, pathway to Assessor and Architect courses.	BoK Section 3; Section 17; Appendix A

Total elapsed course time: 240 minutes, including one 10-minute break. Module timings include guided discussion and practical analysis.

6.5 Scenario Workshop

Participants analyze representative AI-enabled workflows. Scenarios may include:

- identity provisioning or access modification
- cloud or infrastructure change
- AI agent tool use or API invocation
- financial or operational approval
- cybersecurity response action
- multi-agent coordination or delegated execution

For each scenario, participants identify and document:

- proposed transition and governed action
- actor, agent, tenant, tool, target, and execution path
- governance context and relevant policy sources

- canonical-state dependencies and state-freshness concerns
- qualified runtime evidence and provenance requirements
- admissibility conditions and authority at commitment
- commit boundary and enforcement point
- authorization, escalation, refusal, commit, execution, or abandonment outcome
- governance receipt, refusal record, execution receipt, and ledger evidence
- basic runtime governance gaps and failure modes

6.6 Practical Exercises and Work Products

Exercise	Task	Representative Work Product
1	Identify the governed action	Governed action inventory and proposed-transition statement.
2	Map the governance context	Actor-agent-target map, proposal analysis record, and context dependency worksheet.
3	Determine admissibility	Policy and evidence dependency map plus canonical-state dependency map.
4	Locate the commit boundary	Runtime-governance lifecycle map and commit-boundary analysis.
5	Identify runtime governance gaps	Runtime-governance gap summary with observed condition and potential consequence.
6	Map the workflow to AGCP architecture	Reasoning-governance-execution and lifecycle flow map.

6.7 Demonstration of Learning

- scenario analysis and guided workflow mapping
- completion of the six practical exercises
- production of practitioner-level analysis artifacts
- short-answer and discussion-based explanation of governance decisions
- a formative item set drawn from approximately 30-40 multiple-choice, scenario-analysis, and short-answer questions, administered as course conditions allow

The initial instructor-led delivery emphasizes applied participation and work-product completion rather than a proctored individual examination. A Practitioner learner should be able to apply runtime governance concepts to realistic examples, but is not expected to issue formal assurance conclusions, conduct official AGCP conformance assessments, or design a complete architecture independently.

6.8 Body of Knowledge Coverage

BoK Section	Coverage	Practitioner Focus
1	Review	Relationship to AGCP, purpose of runtime governance, and foundational principle.
2	Selected overview	Professional roles and cross-role knowledge foundation.
3	Selected overview	Apply-stage competence and competency boundaries.
4	Review and apply	Core runtime-governance thesis and Runtime Governance Gap.
5	Review and apply	Controlled vocabulary and required distinctions.
6	Required - apply	Runtime-governance architecture, architectural layers, and five-stage pipeline.
7	Required - apply	Governance compilation and policy-to-execution translation.
8	Required - apply	Proposals, context, qualified evidence, canonical state, continuity, and drift.

BoK Section	Coverage	Practitioner Focus
9	Required - apply	Admissibility, authorization, authority, binding, commit, refusal, and escalation.
10	Required - apply	Determinism, replayability, safety properties, and non-bypassability.
11	Required - apply	Runtime-governance control categories.
12	Required - apply	Lifecycle sequence and governance flow.
13	Selected overview and application	Multi-agent, distributed, and cross-system governance.
14	Selected overview	Assessment, testing, evidence, and conformance foundations.
15	Selected overview	Standards and framework alignment.
16	Reference	Source provenance, publication status, version interpretation, and traceability.
17	Required reference	Glossary definitions and terminology consistency.
Appendix A	Overview	Practitioner competency, professional-use boundaries, and relationship to the training program.
Appendix B	Required - apply	Representative workflow-analysis work products used in the course exercises.
Appendix C	Optional reference	Suggested reading for deeper study.

6.9 Course Boundaries

AGCP-201 develops applied workflow competence. It prepares learners to recognize runtime governance gaps and produce structured analysis artifacts, but does not by itself grant formal assessment authority, architecture-design mastery, professional certification, or authorization to issue AGCP conformance conclusions.

7. Combined Course Alignment Matrix

7.1 Learning Area Progression

Learning Area	AGCP-101 Foundations	AGCP-201 Practitioner
Runtime governance thesis	Explain	Apply
AGCP vocabulary	Define and distinguish	Apply with precision
Proposed transitions	Explain	Identify and map
Governed action proposal	Introduce	Analyze
Governance context	Introduce	Map dependencies
Canonical state	Explain	Map and analyze dependencies
Qualified runtime evidence	Explain	Identify requirements
Authorization and authority	Distinguish	Apply to workflow
Binding and commit boundary	Explain	Locate and analyze
Structural refusal	Explain	Identify refusal paths
Replayability and receipts	Introduce and explain	Identify required records
Multi-agent governance	Introduce	Apply to selected scenarios

Learning Area	AGCP-101 Foundations	AGCP-201 Practitioner
Standards alignment	Introduce	Apply at a basic level
Assessment framing	Introduce	Recognize gaps and evidence needs

7.2 Course-at-a-Glance Comparison

Attribute	AGCP-101 Foundations	AGCP-201 Practitioner
Primary competency	Understand and explain	Apply and analyze
Duration	90 minutes	4 hours including a 10-minute break
Prerequisite	None	AGCP-101 or equivalent knowledge
Primary question	Why is runtime governance needed, and what are its core concepts?	How do I apply runtime governance concepts to a representative workflow?
Primary instructional mode	Conceptual explanation and guided recognition	Scenario analysis, mapping, and work-product development
Primary output	Baseline vocabulary and conceptual model	Workflow analysis and governance mapping artifacts
Completion document	Foundations Certificate of Completion	Practitioner Certificate of Completion
Does not confer	Assessment, architecture, or conformance authority	Formal assurance, architecture, certification, or conformance authority

7.3 Recommended Sequence

1. Complete AGCP-101 to establish the common runtime governance vocabulary and conceptual distinctions.
2. Complete AGCP-201 to apply those concepts to representative enterprise workflows and produce practitioner-level analysis artifacts.
3. Proceed to the Assessor pathway for evidence-based evaluation competence or the Architect pathway for design competence.
4. Pursue AGCP Conformance Assessor training only when AGCP-specific requirements, test criteria, evidence handling, classification rules, and program authorization are required.

8. Assessment, Completion, and Certificates

8.1 Assessment Approach for Version 1.0

The Version 1.0 instructor-led courses use formative assessment methods designed to reinforce learning and demonstrate participation. Methods may include concept checks, live polling, terminology matching, guided discussion, scenario questions, short-answer prompts, and completion of practical work products. Because individual proctored testing is not part of the current delivery model, knowledge checks are not presented as professional certification examinations.

8.2 Completion Expectations

- attendance and substantive participation in the instructor-led course
- engagement with the required Body of Knowledge reading
- participation in knowledge checks and guided discussion
- completion of the integrated Foundations scenario or Practitioner exercises, as applicable
- adherence to course conduct and participation expectations

8.3 Certificates of Completion

Participants who satisfy the course completion expectations will receive the applicable Certificate of Completion:

- AGCP Runtime AI Governance Foundations - Certificate of Completion
- AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner - Certificate of Completion

Credential boundary

A Certificate of Completion confirms participation in a defined training course. It does not constitute professional certification, accreditation, licensure, formal assessor authorization, or authority to issue AGCP conformance statements.

9. Body of Knowledge and Source Foundations

9.1 Body of Knowledge Relationship

The Runtime Governance Body of Knowledge for Artificial Intelligence and Other Autonomous Systems, Version 1.0 (Zenodo Edition) is the common knowledge foundation for the training program. Sections 1-15 define the substantive runtime-governance domains. Section 16 documents source provenance and traceability; Section 17 provides the controlled glossary. Appendix A explains competency progression and professional use, Appendix B defines representative runtime-governance work products, and Appendix C provides suggested reading.

The Body of Knowledge intentionally does not function as a course catalog, credentialing standard, instructor guide, or examination blueprint. Detailed course coverage, sequencing, learning objectives, exercises, assessment methods, and completion requirements are maintained in this Version 1.0 program overview and combined syllabus. The course maps in Sections 5 and 6 translate the Body of Knowledge into the instructional scope of AGCP-101 and AGCP-201.

9.2 Source Document Crosswalk

Source	Use in This Combined Document
AGCP Runtime Governance Training Program Overview and Combined Course Syllabus, Version 1.0	Current governing training document for program purpose, scope, audience, pathway, course boundaries, instructional coverage, exercises, completion expectations, and certificates.
Runtime Governance Body of Knowledge for Artificial Intelligence and Other Autonomous Systems, Version 1.0 (Zenodo Edition)	Common knowledge foundation. Sections 1-15 supply the substantive domains; Section 16 supplies source provenance and version interpretation; Section 17 supplies the glossary; Appendices A-C support competency use, work products, and deeper study.
AGCP-101 Runtime AI Governance Foundations course design source	Foundations duration, delivery mode, course description, instructional modules, integrated exercise, formative knowledge checks, certificate, and reading basis.
AGCP-201 AGCP Runtime Governance Practitioner course design source	Practitioner prerequisites, audience, applied objectives, instructional modules, scenario workshop, practical exercises, certificate, and pathway position.
AGCP specification, runtime-governance requirements, and conformance test suite	Technical and normative authority for implementation behavior, requirement interpretation, conformance testing, evidence criteria, and formal conformance conclusions.

9.3 Authority and Version Control

This Version 1.0 syllabus governs the instructional scope, sequence, exercises, completion expectations, and certificate provisions for AGCP-101 and AGCP-201. The Runtime Governance Body of Knowledge, Version 1.0

(Zenodo Edition) governs the common explanatory knowledge foundation and terminology for these courses. The AGCP specification, runtime-governance requirements, conformance test suite, and other designated technical sources remain authoritative for implementation and conformance questions. Where sources differ, the current source designated for the specific subject governs within its scope.

Course content, module timing, exercises, and assessment methods may be refined in later versions while preserving the competency boundaries defined by the Body of Knowledge.

9.4 Contact and Program Information

Program website: agcp.ai

Training contact: training@agcp.ai

Organization: Sustainable Future Tech, Inc.

Program summary

AGCP-101 establishes the language of runtime governance. AGCP-201 teaches learners to apply that language to real workflows. Together, the courses provide the common conceptual and applied foundation for later assessment, architecture, and conformance specializations.