GLOBAL FINANCIAL ENGINEERING, INC. | GLOBAL ACCOUNTANCY INSTITUTE, INC.

BSAVM

Foundational Examples

Public Edition — Version 1.0

Hypothetical Worked Examples Demonstrating
BSAVM Application Across Sovereign Asset Classes

Authored by Dr. Glen Brown
President & Chief Executive Officer
Global Financial Engineering, Inc. | Global Accountancy Institute, Inc.

Institutional Imprint — Issued April 17, 2026

1. Purpose of This Document

This document presents four worked hypothetical examples of BSAVM application across distinct sovereign asset classes. The examples are constructed to demonstrate the method's generality — that BSAVM's five-dimensional architecture applies across the full range of sovereign internally-deployed assets, with appropriate adaptations reflecting the specific characteristics of each asset class.

All examples use constructed hypothetical values. No example corresponds to any specific real institution; any resemblance to real institutional situations is incidental. The purpose is methodological illumination — showing how the dimensions of BSAVM operate across different contexts — rather than description of any specific real case.

The examples are ordered by increasing specificity: beginning with the most general sovereign asset class (integrated sovereign operating frameworks), proceeding to more specialized classes (sovereign proprietary software systems, sovereign institutional methodologies), and concluding with Notional Exposure Governance Engine-class assets where BSAVM's full architecture including the sovereign capital hierarchy is most visible.

1.1 How to Use These Examples

Readers new to BSAVM may find it useful to work through the examples sequentially, noting how the dimensional structure (B, I, A, C, T) operates consistently across different asset classes while the specific parameter content adapts to each class. Readers already familiar with BSAVM may find specific examples useful as reference material for applications in similar asset classes.

Every numerical value in every example is hypothetical. Institutions applying BSAVM to their actual sovereign assets must develop their own parameter values based on their specific evidentiary base per the Parameter Discipline Protocol. These examples do not provide calibration data for real applications; they illustrate methodology only.

EXAMPLE 1

Integrated Sovereign Operating Framework

Sovereign Asset Class: General multi-component sovereign operating system

1.1 Hypothetical Context

A hypothetical sovereign institution has developed an integrated operating framework combining algorithmic components, methodological components, and institutional architecture. The framework operates internally under the institution's sovereign authority, governs capital deployment and risk management, has been in documented operation for approximately 24 months, and maintains comprehensive documentation across its components.

The institution has not structured the framework for external licensing or sale. Its economic significance lies in the governance authority it exercises within the institution's own operations. It qualifies as a sovereign asset under the diagnostic criteria and therefore is appropriate for BSAVM valuation.

1.2 Hypothetical Parameter Values

Parameter	Hypothetical Value	Component Values
B — Reconstruction Base	$40,000,000	DC: $8M | RC: $14M | IC: $18M
I — Integration Multiplier	1.520	s = 0.70 (d=0.80, g=0.75, o=0.85, f=0.50, x=0.60)
A — Authority Multiplier	1.742	6 domains, equal weights, q = {0.85, 0.80, 0.75, 0.75, 0.70, 0.50}
C — Compounded Utility Multiplier	2.180	LAGC_0 = $200M, η=0.70, ρ=0.14, δ=0.12, N=10 years
T — Continuity Multiplier	1.275	τ = 0.55 (m=0.75, p=0.60, h=0.45, r=0.40), β=0.50

1.3 Calculation

$$V_{BSAVM} = \$40M \times 1.520 \times 1.742 \times 2.180 \times 1.275$$

$$= \$40M \times 1.520 = \$60.80M$$

$$\$60.80M \times 1.742 = \$105.91M$$

$$\$105.91M \times 2.180 = \$230.88M$$

$$\$230.88M \times 1.275 = \$294.37M$$

Hypothetical V_BSAVM ≈ $294M

1.4 Interpretation

In this hypothetical, the sovereign valuation is approximately 7.4× the Reconstruction Base alone. The multiplier architecture reflects: moderate integration (f limited by incomplete carrier formation; x limited in this hypothetical single-entity context), substantive authority across governance domains (with continuity architecture q_6 showing the characteristic lower score for pre-transmission-maturity institutions), meaningful forward utility from the governed capital stream, and present-state continuity reflecting infrastructure existence but limited realized transmission.

The ratio V/B ≈ 7.4 is characteristic of mature integrated operating frameworks at pre-transmission-maturity stages. Institutions at similar stages applying BSAVM would expect similar ratios, though individual parameter values vary substantially with specific institutional circumstances.

EXAMPLE 2

Sovereign Proprietary Software System

Sovereign Asset Class: Internally-deployed software operating under sovereign authority

2.1 Hypothetical Context

A hypothetical sovereign institution operates a proprietary software system for internal operational management. The system was developed over 8 years, is deployed across the institution's operations, integrates with institutional governance architecture, and operates without external licensing or commercial distribution.

The system is technical rather than algorithmic-financial; it does not exhibit Notional Exposure Governance Engine characteristics. BSAVM applies without the sovereign capital hierarchy; the Compounded Utility is calculated from the system's operational utility rather than from governed notional exposure.

2.2 BSAVM Adaptation for This Asset Class

For sovereign proprietary software systems, BSAVM applies with the following class-specific interpretations:

• B decomposes into software development cost, documentation cost, and deployment-integration cost

• I component set is adapted: d assesses technical documentation depth; g assesses governance integration; o assesses operational deployment extent; f assesses operator training integration; x assesses cross-system integration

• A authority domains are software-specific: data architecture authority, algorithmic authority, integration authority, security authority, evolution authority

• C is calculated from forward operational utility rather than from LAGC; for non-NEGE software, the utility stream represents institutional operational benefit attributable specifically to the software

• T is assessed through modular codification, procedural transfer, operator training completion, and architectural resilience

2.3 Hypothetical Parameter Values

Parameter	Hypothetical Value	Component Values
B — Reconstruction Base	$12,000,000	Development: $4M | Documentation: $3M | Integration: $5M

I — Integration Multiplier	1.470	s = 0.61 (d=0.75, g=0.60, o=0.80, f=0.40, x=0.50)
A — Authority Multiplier	1.632	5 domains, q = {0.80, 0.70, 0.75, 0.70, 0.50}
C — Compounded Utility Multiplier	1.890	Forward utility stream representing operational benefit
T — Continuity Multiplier	1.300	τ = 0.60 (m=0.75, p=0.70, h=0.50, r=0.45), β=0.50

2.4 Calculation

```
V_BSAVM = $12M × 1.470 × 1.632 × 1.890 × 1.300
        = $12M × 1.470 = $17.64M
        $17.64M × 1.632 = $28.79M
        $28.79M × 1.890 = $54.41M
        $54.41M × 1.300 = $70.74M
```

Hypothetical V_BSAVM ≈ $71M

2.5 Interpretation

The sovereign valuation is approximately 5.9× the Reconstruction Base. The lower multiplier (relative to Example 1) reflects the more focused nature of software assets — fewer authority domains, narrower forward utility scope, more bounded integration reach. The multipliers remain substantive because software deeply integrated into institutional operations exercises genuine authority and produces genuine forward utility, even without the breadth of an integrated operating framework.

For sovereign proprietary software, V/B ratios in the 4× to 7× range are typical, with specific values driven by the software's authority breadth, integration depth, and forward utility characteristics.

EXAMPLE 3

Sovereign Institutional Methodology

Sovereign Asset Class: Proprietary methodological framework deployed internally

3.1 Hypothetical Context

A hypothetical sovereign institution has developed a proprietary methodology — a systematic approach to a specific class of institutional decisions — that has been formally codified, deployed across the institution's operations, and integrated with institutional training programs. The methodology is not offered as consulting, not sold as a product, and not positioned for external commercialization.

The methodology's economic significance lies in the quality of decisions it enables within the institution's operations. It qualifies as a sovereign asset because it is internally deployed, not held for sale, not licensed, not developed for investor attraction, and does not require third-party validation for its operational reality.

3.2 BSAVM Adaptation for This Asset Class

For sovereign institutional methodologies, BSAVM applies with these interpretations:

• B emphasizes doctrinal-development cost (methodologies are primarily documented constructs) and integration cost into institutional decision-making

• I heavily weights doctrinal codification (d) and formation embedding (f) because methodologies depend on both formal documentation and human capability

• A authority domains are methodology-specific: methodological authority in its defined domain, application authority, refinement authority, interpretation authority, evolution authority

• C reflects forward utility through improved institutional decision quality — typically more modest than NEGE-class utility because methodologies enhance rather than generate economic operations

• T is particularly important because methodologies' value depends heavily on transmissibility to multiple operators

3.3 Hypothetical Parameter Values

Parameter	Hypothetical Value	Component Values
B — Reconstruction Base	$18,000,000	Development: $5M | Documentation: $8M | Integration: $5M

I — Integration Multiplier	1.550	s = 0.73 (d=0.85, g=0.65, o=0.80, f=0.65, x=0.70)
A — Authority Multiplier	1.696	5 domains, q = {0.80, 0.85, 0.70, 0.75, 0.65}
C — Compounded Utility Multiplier	1.950	Forward utility from methodology-enhanced decisions
T — Continuity Multiplier	1.350	τ = 0.70 (m=0.85, p=0.75, h=0.60, r=0.60), β=0.50

3.4 Calculation

```
V_BSAVM = $18M × 1.550 × 1.696 × 1.950 × 1.350
        = $18M × 1.550 = $27.90M
        $27.90M × 1.696 = $47.32M
        $47.32M × 1.950 = $92.27M
        $92.27M × 1.350 = $124.56M
```

Hypothetical V_BSAVM ≈ $125M

3.5 Interpretation

The sovereign valuation is approximately 6.9× the Reconstruction Base. Note the particularly strong T multiplier (1.35) — methodologies that have been formally documented, proceduralized, and begun to be transmitted to operators beyond originators have stronger continuity characteristics than less-transmitted sovereign assets. This is appropriate: methodologies whose value depends on transmission achieve meaningful portions of their value specifically through transmission realization.

For sovereign institutional methodologies, V/B ratios in the 5× to 8× range are typical, with continuity (T) often being the distinguishing dimension between methodologies that have been transmitted and those that remain tacit in originators.

EXAMPLE 4

Notional Exposure Governance Engine (NEGE)

Sovereign Asset Class: Leveraged sovereign proprietary operating system

4.1 Hypothetical Context

A hypothetical sovereign institution operates a Notional Exposure Governance Engine — an integrated proprietary framework that governs leveraged notional exposure through disciplined sovereign architecture, operates on internally-retained capital with 100% economic retention, and includes comprehensive doctrinal and technical documentation.

This is the asset class for which BSAVM's complete architecture including the sovereign capital hierarchy applies. The NEGE diagnostic is satisfied: leverage architecture is present, disciplined exposure governance is documented, internal retention is 100%, the components operate as an integrated system, and the institutional context is genuinely sovereign.

4.2 Sovereign Capital Hierarchy Application

Hypothetical sovereign capital hierarchy values at the valuation date:

Layer	Hypothetical Value	Interpretation
Sovereign Equity Capital (SEC = E)	$150,000	Real owned capital
Gross Notional Capacity (GNC = E × L)	$1,500,000,000	L = 10,000 managed leverage
Leverage-Adjusted Governed Capital (LAGC)	$1,275,000,000	G = 0.85 governance realization
Sovereign Notional Expansion Rate (SNER, hypothetical historical)	9.0×	LAGC growth over documented 2-year period

4.3 Hypothetical Parameter Values

Parameter	Hypothetical Value	Component Values
B — Reconstruction Base	$35,000,000	DC: $7M | RC: $12M | IC: $16M
I — Integration Multiplier	1.600	s = 0.82 (d=0.90, g=0.75, o=0.95, f=0.65, x=0.85)
A — Authority Multiplier	1.832	6 NEGE-appropriate domains, q =

		{0.92, 0.95, 0.85, 0.85, 0.75, 0.55}
C — Compounded Utility Multiplier	2.310	LAGC_0 = $1.275B, η=0.78, ρ=0.18, δ=0.10, N=10 years
T — Continuity Multiplier	1.290	τ = 0.58 (m=0.85, p=0.70, h=0.45, r=0.30), β=0.50

4.4 Calculation

```
V_BSAVM = $35M × 1.600 × 1.832 × 2.310 × 1.290
        = $35M × 1.600 = $56.00M
        $56.00M × 1.832 = $102.59M
        $102.59M × 2.310 = $236.99M
        $236.99M × 1.290 = $305.72M
```

Hypothetical V_BSAVM ≈ $306M

4.5 Interpretation

The sovereign valuation is approximately 8.7× the Reconstruction Base. Note the strong C multiplier (2.31) — for NEGE-class assets, the Compounded Utility Multiplier reflects forward sovereign utility generated through governed notional exposure, which can produce substantial multiplier values when LAGC is substantial and governance parameters are well-anchored.

Note also the pattern of authority scores: high q values in capital deployment and risk governance (the core NEGE authorities), moderate-to-high in engineering and architecture authorities, and characteristically lower in continuity architecture (reflecting the common pre-transmission-maturity stage). This q-pattern is typical for NEGE-class assets with strong operational architecture but developing transmission infrastructure.

For NEGE-class assets, V/B ratios in the 6× to 10× range are typical, with specific values driven heavily by the LAGC magnitude and the governance parameter combination that produces C.

5. Comparative Analysis Across Examples

The four examples together illustrate how BSAVM's five-dimensional architecture adapts to different sovereign asset classes while maintaining consistent mathematical discipline. This section presents comparative observations.

5.1 Summary Comparison

Example	Asset Class	Reconstruction Base (B)	V_BSAVM	V/B Ratio
1	Integrated Operating Framework	$40M	$294M	7.4×
2	Proprietary Software System	$12M	$71M	5.9×
3	Institutional Methodology	$18M	$125M	6.9×
4	Notional Exposure Governance Engine	$35M	$306M	8.7×

5.2 Observations

The V/B ratios across the four hypothetical examples range from 5.9× to 8.7×, with specific ratios reflecting the particular parameter combinations of each asset class. Several patterns emerge:

NEGE-class assets (Example 4) typically produce the highest V/B ratios because the Compounded Utility Multiplier reaches substantial values when governed through leveraged notional architecture. This is not a distortion of the method; it is a correct reflection that NEGE-class assets' economic significance is genuinely amplified by governed leverage beyond what non-leveraged sovereign assets produce.

Integrated frameworks (Example 1) produce strong V/B ratios because they combine multiple authority domains, broad institutional integration, and substantial reconstruction base. The integrated character itself produces multiplicative value beyond the sum of separable components.

Institutional methodologies (Example 3) show particularly strong continuity multipliers when transmission is well-developed. For methodology-class assets, continuity is often the distinguishing value dimension.

Software systems (Example 2) produce more modest V/B ratios when operational scope is narrower. This reflects the genuinely narrower authority and utility reach of focused software compared to integrated frameworks or leveraged NEGEs.

5.3 The Mathematical Discipline Across Classes

Across all four examples, the same mathematical architecture produces outputs consistent with the sovereign asset class being valued. The multiplier ranges (I typically 1.4-1.7, A typically 1.6-1.9, C typically 1.8-2.4, T typically 1.2-1.4) remain stable across examples, with variations reflecting the specific institutional circumstances of each asset class.

This consistency is evidence that BSAVM's mathematical architecture is genuinely generalizable across sovereign asset classes rather than being specifically tuned to one class. The Parameter Discipline Protocol ensures that the generalization is applied with discipline rather than with advocacy — parameter values in each asset class should reflect actual institutional circumstances, not be selected to produce desired valuations.

6. Important Limitations of Examples

6.1 Hypothetical Nature

Every numerical value in every example is hypothetical. No example represents any real institution, any real asset, or any real valuation conclusion. The examples are methodological illustrations only.

Institutions applying BSAVM to their real sovereign assets must develop their own parameter values based on their specific evidentiary base. The parameter values in these examples do not provide benchmarks or targets for real applications — they illustrate how parameters combine to produce valuations, not what specific parameter values should be selected for any real application.

6.2 Simplified Presentations

The examples present simplified versions of BSAVM applications for methodological clarity. Real BSAVM applications require more extensive documentation: specific evidentiary trails for each parameter, formal sensitivity analysis per the Parameter Discipline Protocol, identification of critical parameters, forward-state pathway analysis, and comprehensive assumption documentation.

Readers using these examples as preparation for real BSAVM applications should expect real applications to require substantially more extensive documentation than the examples show. The examples cover the core mathematical operation; real applications must also cover the full Parameter Discipline Protocol requirements.

6.3 Asset Class Adaptations

The adaptations of BSAVM to specific asset classes (authority domain selection, utility stream interpretation, continuity component anchoring) should be regarded as illustrative rather than prescriptive. Different sovereign assets within the same nominal class may require different adaptations based on their specific characteristics.

Institutions applying BSAVM to assets that do not match one of the four illustrated classes should develop appropriate adaptations for their specific asset, following the general principles illustrated here while tailoring the specific parameter choices to their institutional circumstances. BSAVM is a general doctrine, not a fixed template.

7. Closing

These Foundational Examples demonstrate that BSAVM is a general sovereign valuation doctrine applicable across the range of sovereign internally-deployed asset classes. The method's five-dimensional architecture operates consistently across integrated operating frameworks, proprietary software systems, institutional methodologies, and Notional Exposure Governance Engines — producing valuations that reflect each asset class's specific characteristics while maintaining consistent mathematical discipline.

The examples also demonstrate that BSAVM produces bounded, stable, and defensible valuations rather than explosive or arbitrary ones. The V/B ratios across the four hypothetical examples fall in a consistent 5× to 9× range, reflecting the underlying mathematical dampening structures (logarithmic in I, square-root in A, nested-logarithmic in C, linear in T) that prevent any single dimension from driving unbounded valuation inflation.

Sovereign institutions contemplating BSAVM adoption for their own asset valuations should find in these examples confirmation that the method is substantive, applicable, and disciplined. Institutions should not, however, treat the example values as calibration data for their own applications — real applications require institutional evidence and Parameter Discipline Protocol compliance, which these illustrative examples necessarily abbreviate.

Together with the Public Doctrine Edition and the Parameter Discipline Protocol Public Edition, these Foundational Examples constitute the complete BSAVM public publication package. Sovereign institutions with assets that conventional methodologies cannot adequately value are welcomed to study these materials, adopt the method, and apply it with appropriate discipline to their own sovereign assets. The doctrine is released to the intellectual commons in the spirit of advancing the valuation discipline — its future is what sovereign institutions make of it.

> ***The method is ready. The mathematics are sealed. The discipline is specified. The examples illustrate the generality. What remains is for sovereign institutions to apply BSAVM to their own assets and, through those applications, to extend the doctrine's institutional life across the many sovereign situations it was developed to serve.***

Authored with care,

Dr. Glen Brown

President & Chief Executive Officer

Global Financial Engineering, Inc. | Global Accountancy Institute, Inc.

April 17, 2026

Document Control

Document Title	BSAVM Foundational Examples
Edition	Public Edition
Version	1.0
Author	Dr. Glen Brown, President & CEO, GFE / GAI
Issue Date	April 17, 2026
Companion Documents	BSAVM Public Doctrine Edition; BSAVM Parameter Discipline Protocol Public Edition
Purpose	Methodological illustration across sovereign asset classes through hypothetical worked examples
Status	Companion to primary BSAVM doctrinal materials
Rights	© 2026 Dr. Glen Brown. Published under GFE/GAI institutional imprint. Attribution required for citation and adaptation.