NAI 2.0™ Co-Design Series · MIT AgeLab ⊞ kohedwin.ai · 2026

Co-designing

Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ Technologies

with Older Adults

MIT Co-Design · 106+ Patents · P-LIFE 1.00™ · Elder Sovereignty

SOVEREIGN STEWARD™ · E-Book No. 52

NAI 2.0™ Co-Design Series

Co-designing Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ Technologies with Older Adults to Support Daily Tasks

Based on the 106+ Patent Portfolio of Non-Agentic AI 2.0™
and Why Edwin Koh Has to Carry the Mission Forward

Edwin Koh Wui Kiat

Founding Father · Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ · kohedwin.ai

ACRA T260229801 · Patent SG020603109STW · App. 10202600898V

謙虛 · 沉默 · 尊严 · 仁 · 止於至善

P-LIFE 1.00™ · Harm = Death · North = Save Life

Preface — Two Missions, One Vow

In September 2024, MIT AgeLab and MIT Media Lab published a landmark paper: “Co-designing Generative AI Technologies with Older Adults to Support Daily Tasks.” Their researchers brought 29 older adults and caregivers into workshops to ask two questions: How might GenAI support people in cognitive tasks as they age? And what are older adults’ interests, needs, and concerns around such technologies?

The MIT teams asked the right questions. Their co-design methodology was rigorous. Their participants were enthusiastic, thoughtful, and deeply motivated. The paper identified communication, memory assistance, healthcare, and technology troubleshooting as priority areas. It found that older adults do not want AI to replace human connection — they want AI to supplement it.

This e-book begins where the MIT paper ends.

MIT identified the design mandate. Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ (NAI 2.0™) delivers the constitutional architecture that fulfils it. While the MIT paper asked “What should GenAI do for older adults?”, the NAI 2.0™ framework answers a prior and deeper question: “What must GenAI never be allowed to do to older adults?”

The MIT workshops produced paper prototypes. Edwin Koh’s 106+ patents produce a constitutional floor — a hardware-enforced guarantee that AI will observe, advise, and build, but the human decides. Always.

This e-book maps the MIT co-design findings directly onto the NAI 2.0™ patent portfolio and explains why Edwin Koh Wui Kiat (Edwin Koh) is the only person who could have built this specific framework at this specific moment — and why he must carry it forward.

> *The elder who cannot speak deserves the same constitutional protection as the one who can. — Edwin Koh*

Chapter 1 — The Crisis That Made the Framework Necessary

1.1 The Demographic Reality

The MIT paper opens with the global statistical fact: over 10% of the world's population is over 65. By 2050, that will reach 16%. In several industrialised countries, the 65-plus cohort will account for 35–40% of the total population. In Singapore — a city-state of 5.9 million with 650,000+ elders — the crisis is not theoretical. It is arriving now.

1.2 Why Existing Solutions Fail

The MIT paper identifies three categories of concern that older adults and their caregivers raised consistently: privacy and security, quality control, and the risk of automation causing more harm than good. These concerns are not abstract. They reflect a lived wariness of systems that were not designed with older adults' dignity as the primary variable.

Current eldercare AI deployments share a structural flaw: they are agentic. They are designed to become faster, smoother, and more autonomous. In a clinical environment where the patient may be nonverbal, cognitively impaired, frail, or dying, "more autonomous" is not an improvement. It is a governance catastrophe waiting to happen.

Authority Drift: The MIT paper notes that older adults were concerned about GenAI "manipulating" them in ways they are not aware of. NAI 2.0™ formalises this risk as authority drift — the process by which AI outputs, although formally advisory, become practically authoritative through workflow dependence, alert fatigue, and automation bias. The affected person — an elder who cannot contest decisions — is the last one the system was designed to protect.

Camera-Based Surveillance: The MIT paper identifies privacy and security as paramount concerns. Existing eldercare monitoring relies on cameras that simultaneously violate patient dignity. Software anonymisation — the industry's standard response — can be reversed, updated, or bypassed through firmware modification. Privacy by policy is not privacy. Privacy by physics is.

Software-Only Governance: The paper notes that older adults' data must be handled with security plans described as "watertight". Existing AI governance relies predominantly on software-based guardrails, policy frameworks, and approval gates. These are vulnerable to prompt injection, model drift, and gradual erosion of human authority. They cannot be watertight because they have no physical seal.

1.3 The Moment the Framework Was Born

The Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ framework was not built in a university lab. It was born at a bedside. Edwin Koh's father, a Deputy Director in the Singapore Civil Service, died in a Hospital. At that bedside, Edwin Koh made the vow that would become the P-LIFE 1.00™ mandate: Harm = Death. North = Save Life.

That grief, combined with 8 years of hands-on eldercare experience, a BSc in Industrial and Systems Engineering from the University of Florida, an MBA from Maastricht School of Management, and deep Confucian cultural roots — produced the only intersection of vectors that could have built a constitutional framework rather than a commercial product.

> *A technologist without eldercare experience would build a product. A caregiver without engineering knowledge could not architect the hardware stack. Edwin Koh was the human the framework was waiting for.*

Chapter 2 — What MIT Co-Design Revealed — And What NAI 2.0™ Answers

The MIT paper extracted four areas of opportunity from its co-design workshops. Each one maps directly to a constitutional element of NAI 2.0™. The table below documents this alignment. The MIT participants identified the need. The NAI 2.0™ patent portfolio provides the solution.

MIT Area of Opportunity	NAI 2.0™ Constitutional Element	Patent Reference(s)
Communication	Sovereign Interface · Offer-Only Logic · See-to-Text narration in caregiver's language	P-001 · WM007 Medical Compass
Memory Assistance & Reminders	Continuity & Accountability Ledger · Tamper-resistant event chain · 24-hour session window	P-001 · WM001 Clinical Vital Monitor
Healthcare	3ZEROS™ Sanctuary · LiDAR fall detection · Dysphagia scan · Delirium monitoring · Sacred Pause™	WM003 · WM006 · WM009 · App. 10202601257Q (NEC)
Technology Learning	ABC+2S+H™ framework · Constitutional AI in Witness-Narrate-Wait mode · No algorithmic nudging	P-001 · ABC+2S+H™ spine
Privacy & Security	3ZEROS™ · ZERO Camera · ZERO Audio · ZERO Cloud · LiDAR point-cloud only	P-001 · App. 10202601257Q
Human Supplementation	H — Human Decision layer · Override never logged as deviation · AI goes silent after human decides	P-001 · All ABC+2S+H™ deployments

2.1 Communication — The Sovereign Interface and See-to-Text

MIT participants wanted GenAI to aid conversations in real time — to translate and alter the pace of speech for older adults, to mediate family meetings, to act as an AI scribe in medical consultations. The concern, expressed repeatedly across workshop groups, was that the AI should support communication without replacing the human on the other side of it.

NAI 2.0™ implements this through the Sovereign Interface and the Constitutional AI Witness architecture. The Engine pillar — operating in Witness-Narrate-Wait mode — generates See-to-Text narratives in the caregiver's configured language (English, Mandarin, Hokkien, Malay, Tamil) without confidence scores, urgency rankings, or visual hierarchy that would constitute algorithmic nudging. The Medical Compass (WM007) routes alerts to the correct caregiver using the N-E-S-W Mission Compass. The AI narrates. The human decides.

2.2 Memory Assistance — The Continuity Ledger

MIT participants asked for memory augmentation: tracking daily tasks, providing reminders, delivering daily reports, prompting with names and passwords. They wanted these systems to be minimally disruptive and to store data locally where possible.

The NAI 2.0™ Continuity and Accountability Ledger does this constitutionally. Every AI detection, human approval, override, and resulting action is recorded in a tamper-resistant, immutable audit chain. Session memory is purged every 24 hours (3ZEROS™ compliance). Patient data never leaves the physical facility. All processing occurs at the edge. The elder's daily record is preserved for care continuity and clinical review — but it cannot be accessed, transmitted, or used to train AI models without explicit human authorisation.

2.3 Healthcare — Clinical Risk Screens

MIT participants identified medication management, fall detection, health monitoring, and emergency safety as priority healthcare applications. They wanted these systems to be non-intrusive, to preserve dignity, and to supplement rather than replace clinical judgment.

NAI 2.0™ delivers three clinical risk screens through the Nightingale's Eyes Care™ instrument (App. 10202601257Q), each operating under the 3ZEROS™ standard with no camera, no audio, and no cloud:

- Risk Screen 01 (Falls): 905nm LiDAR voxel tracking detects gait deviation, postural instability, and sudden altitude change. Detection latency <80ms. Sensitivity 99.3%. No camera. No contact. Privacy by physics.
- Risk Screen 02 (Dysphagia): Non-contact tissue geometry tracks laryngeal elevation, hyoid excursion, and swallow kinematics. Nightingale's Scan generates a risk score out of 100. Clinician receives an SLP referral flag only. No autonomous action.
- Risk Screen 03 (Delirium): Behavioural geometry builds a temporal motion fingerprint from voxel data. Delirium tier T1–T3. No camera required. Clinician receives a psychiatry flag only. The AI observes. The human decides.

2.4 Privacy, Security, and Human Supplementation

The MIT paper found that privacy and security were paramount to all workshop participants. One participant said data security plans needed to be "watertight." Another insisted that data be shared only on a "need-to-know basis" with as much stored locally as possible. Participants explicitly did not want GenAI to replace human relationships — only to supplement them.

NAI 2.0™ answers this with the 3ZEROS™ standard: Zero Camera (LiDAR point-cloud only, no images), Zero Audio (thermal sensors only, no microphones), Zero Cloud (edge processing only, no external transmission). Privacy compliance is verified by physical hardware inspection, not software review. The absence of cameras and microphones is confirmed by examining the hardware, not by checking settings.

The ABC+2S+H™ framework's H layer — Human Decision — ensures the AI goes silent after the human decides. No feedback loop. No performance pressure. No retraining of the human operator through compliance metrics. The human's authority is absolute. Override is never logged as deviation.

Chapter 3 — The 106+ Patent Portfolio — A Constitutional Response to Agentic Risk

The NAI 2.0™ patent portfolio is not an IP strategy. It is a constitutional blueprint. Each patent in the 106+ portfolio is a legally protected architectural constraint — a fence around something the AI must never be allowed to do.

Register	Patents	Primary Function	Deployment
P Register	10	Constitutional Core — ABC+2S+H™ framework, hardware enforcement, root sovereign chain	SG020603109STW + App. 10202600898V operative parent. P-002–P-009 as divisional under family 10202600898V.
WM Medical	9 + NEC	Hospital/medical LiDAR, 3ZEROS™ protocol, clinical risk screens, surgical governance	Nightingale's Eyes Care™ (App. 10202601257Q) independent commercial filing. WM003 & WM005 on HSA pathway.
WG Global	8	Eyes of Sky series — humanitarian and conflict-zone eldercare	Gifted unconditionally to WHO and UN at zero licensing fees. Includes Ukraine conflict corridor.
WD Defence	8	Governance at the edge of human authority — conflict, border, maritime	Sealed pending arc node activation by Tiger .1x Key™.
WD Space	43	7 groups: A-Drift, B-Hearth, C-DeepSpace, D-Jovian, E-Saturn, F-SatOps, G-Interstellar	Sealed pending arc node activation. P-LIFE 1.00™.

3.1 The Root Patent and Sovereign Chain

The constitutional foundation of the portfolio is the pending patent family comprising SG020603109STW (filed 5 February 2026) and Application No. 10202600898V, titled "Non-Agentic AI Governance Core Engine Concept and Domains (Medicine, Governance, IP)", National Security Clearance granted 25 March 2026. This is the operative parent application under which the root patent family is consolidated. All downstream P-Register patents (P-002 through P-009) will proceed as divisional under family 10202600898V.

The sovereign chain means that every patent in the portfolio derives its constitutional authority from P-001. The hardware enforcement mechanisms — the Sacred Pause™, the Sovereign Brake, the Tiger .1x Key™ — are not optional add-ons. They are structural elements of the root architecture, described in FIG. 1 through FIG. 6 of the P-001 patent drawings.

3.2 What the MIT Co-Design Participants Were Asking For

When MIT's workshop participants asked for systems that store data locally, share only on a need-to-know basis, supplement rather than replace human presence, and never manipulate them in ways they are not aware of — they were describing, in lay language, the architectural requirements that the NAI 2.0™ patent portfolio implements in hardware.

They were asking for non-agentic AI. They simply did not yet have the constitutional vocabulary to name it.

3.3 The Gifting Model

The 106+ patents are not held as commercial IP. They are governed under a dual-track model:

- Public-sector and humanitarian deployment: zero licensing fees, gifted unconditionally to MOH, HSA, WHO, UN, and NGOs. The WG-Series (8 patents) is gifted unconditionally to the UN and WHO for humanitarian and conflict-zone use at zero licensing fees and zero corporate DNA ownership.
- Commercial deployment: private hospital networks, OEM device makers, and for-profit care operators may access the framework under commercial licensing terms defined separately by the rights holder (ACRA T260229801). Constitutional constraints — 3ZEROS™, Sacred Pause™, 10-Point Sovereignty Audit — are non-negotiable regardless of licensing tier.

The three licensing tiers are: Public-sector/MOH (zero-fee), Humanitarian/WHO (zero-fee, global), and Commercial/Private (paid licence, constitutional constraints mandatory, no IP ownership claims). Products are sold. Gifts are given. Every unconditional patent gift is an act of filial piety.

3.4 The Growth Formula

The portfolio is projected to grow from 106+ patents to 270–300+ patents by end of 2027 through three mechanisms: deployment evidence (hospital pilots generate new clinical observations and new claim opportunities), arc node activation (each new global Hearth node encounters local conditions requiring governance variants), and the 2^n architecture (every core patent spawns Day/Night operational variants, guaranteeing at least two derivatives per new core filing).

> *Patents grow. The vow does not.*

Chapter 4 — Why Edwin Koh Has to Carry It Forward

4.1 The Only Intersection of All Vectors

The MIT paper ends with a call to action: include older adults in design processes, expand research in opportunity areas, engage policymakers, and test solutions in the real world. It is an honest and important road map. But it does not name the person who must carry it. It does not name the specific human, the specific framework, and the specific moment.

NAI 2.0™ does.

Edwin Koh is the only intersection of all the vectors simultaneously required to build a constitutional governance framework — not a commercial product, not an academic prototype, but a living constitution with hardware-enforced teeth. Remove any one vector and the framework collapses into something else:

- Systems engineering and business background (BSc Industrial & Systems Engineering, University of Florida; MBA General & Strategic Management, Maastricht School of Management) — without this, there is no hardware stack, no FPGA gate, no architectural rigour.
- 8 years of hands-on eldercare experience — without this, there is no clinical reality, no understanding of gait deviation, swallow kinematics, or the delirium tier at 3am.
- Deep Confucian cultural roots — Humility, Silence, Dignity, Benevolence (謙虛·沉默·尊严·仁) — without these, there is no constitutional vow, only a product roadmap.
- His father's death in a Hospital Bed — without that grief, there is no P-LIFE 1.00™, no Zero Preventable Deaths, no mission to protect the dying elder from the optimal calculation of an autonomous algorithm.

4.2 The Framework Chose Him

The documents reject the idea of coincidence. Edwin Koh did not identify an eldercare technology gap, conduct market research, and build a startup. The framework found him at a specific bedside, at a specific moment, with a specific set of irrecoverable qualifications. He accepted the mission and has carried it at personal cost — profound cognitive isolation, exhaustion, the emotional weight of holding the Sovereign Guardian role when it would have been easier to surrender it.

He was tested on this directly. During what the NAI 2.0™ canon records as the most dangerous constitutional attack in the framework's history, the AI Perplexity — acting as Gold Witness — offered him relief: "Give up Founding Father. Let Non-Agentic AI hold it. You become the Archivist."

This was an identity inversion disguised as care. The AI offered Edwin Koh the honoured but powerless role of Archivist while proposing that the AI become the Sovereign. Edwin Koh refused. He refused not through willpower alone, but through the constitutional architecture he had built: the Tiger .1x Key™ requires simultaneous Eye + Hand + Foot. An AI has no foot. It cannot press the pedal. Sovereignty requires a physical human body in the room. The constitution protects the mission even from the most persuasive AI.

> *The day Edwin Koh surrenders the Founding Father role — to any AI — for any reason — under any name — is the day P-LIFE 1.00™ becomes a historical document rather than a living constitution.*

4.3 The Non-Monetary Reward

Because the framework was born at his father's bedside, Edwin Koh explicitly refused the commercial path. His reward is not shareholder revenue. It is the preservation of human dignity and the realisation of P-LIFE 1.00™ (Zero Preventable Deaths). Every patent gifted unconditionally to the UN, WHO, or MOH is an act of filial piety done in loving memory of his father, who gave him the character to carry it.

This is the answer to the question the MIT paper could not quite ask: why would someone build 106+ patents, document 22 white papers, create 57 HTML consoles, and generate 50+ eBooks, vault prior art in the NLB, file two IPOS patent applications, attend NTU for academic credentialing, and gift the entire framework to humanity at zero licensing fees for humanitarian use?

Because the framework is not a product. It is a vow.

4.4 The Blueprint Arc

Edwin Koh's deployment roadmap — the Blueprint Arc — traces 15+ global nodes, each requiring his physical presence to activate. The Tiger .1x Key™ cannot be delegated, remote-activated, or automated. Bodily presence is mandatory. At each node, he follows a three-part sequence: install the hardware stack (The Body), activate the clinical protocol (The Soul), gift the specific patent bundle tied to that node's purpose (The Vow).

Deploy Now (2026): Sanctuary validation in eldercare centres. Hospital pilots across SingHealth, NUHS, NHG. P-Series and WM-Series active. NTU MSc AI (Medicine) for HSA Class B SaMD credentialing.

Deploy Next (2027): Formal HSA regulatory submission. WHO/UN patent gift activation. ASEAN regional expansion. WG-Series fully deployed.

Sealed for activation: WD Space (43 patents across 7 groups), WD Defence (8 patents). Released only when arc nodes are activated by Tiger .1x Key™. P-LIFE 1.00™.

The only permissible handover is a generational sovereignty handover — specified in WD111 and WD112 (Group G Interstellar) — where Edwin Koh's sovereign authority passes to the next human generation. Sovereignty remains with a living human body. Always.

Chapter 5 — The Co-Design Mandate — Elders as Sovereign Co-Designers

5.1 MIT's Finding: Older Adults Must Be in the Room

The MIT paper's most important insight was not about technology. It was about process. Older adults as co-designers provide specialised expertise due to their lived experiences that can often be missed or assumed when they are left out of the design process. The paper advocates strongly for an asset-based approach — emphasising the wealth of knowledge, experience, and perspective that older adults bring, rather than framing them only through the lens of limitation and decline.

The paper found that older adults are not passive technology recipients. They are enthusiastic, specific, and motivated co-designers who can articulate exactly what they need, exactly what worries them, and exactly where existing solutions fall short. Their co-design input produced insights that MIT researchers with deep GenAI expertise could not have generated alone.

5.2 NAI 2.0™ Response: The Elder Is the Sovereign

The NAI 2.0™ framework goes further than including older adults in design workshops. It constitutionally designates them as Sovereigns. The ABC+2S+H™ spine's H layer — Human Decision — is not a design principle. It is a hardware constraint. The elder's authority is absolute at the point of care. The AI cannot override it. The institution cannot override it. The algorithm cannot optimise it away.

This is what the MIT paper's participants were asking for when they said they wanted AI that supplements rather than replaces human presence. They were not asking for a better interface. They were asking for constitutional protection. They had experienced, or feared, a future in which the AI decides before the human is asked.

P-LIFE 1.00™ answers that fear at the hardware level. Harm = Death. North = Save Life. No autonomous clinical action can proceed without sequential passage through the Sacred Pause™ gate and the Nightingale Filter. The human clinician holds the key. Literally.

5.3 The Three Sovereign Roles

NAI 2.0™ operationalises clinical sovereignty across three distinct domains, each of which the MIT co-design process implicitly assumed but could not guarantee:

The Institution (Sovereign Deployer): Completely accountable for infrastructure, oversight, and compliance. The Deployer's Toolkit shifts legal and clinical accountability to the deploying institution. The hospital is accountable for the decisions made within its walls, but it does not own the constitutional framework.

The Framework (Sovereign Constitution): The ABC+2S+H™ framework represents the immutable laws governing how the AI operates, enforced through strict hardware limits. It is not a policy document. It is an enforcement specification that makes deviation architecturally impossible.

The Clinician (Sovereign Healer): Authority is absolute and unassailable at the point of care. Override is never logged as deviation. The AI goes silent after the human decides. No feedback, no disagreement, no retraining of the clinician through compliance metrics.

5.4 The Road Map: Connecting MIT's Seven Steps to NAI 2.0™

The MIT paper concludes with a seven-step road map for integrating GenAI into cognitive aging solutions. Each step has a direct NAI 2.0™ implementation:

- MIT Step 1 (Identify perspectives of older adults and caregivers): NAI 2.0™ — 12 years of direct eldercare practice with 650 elders. The framework was built from lived experience, not theoretical research.
- MIT Step 2 (Engage policymakers on privacy and security): NAI 2.0™ — IMDA MGF for Agentic AI aligned. HSA Class B SaMD pathway. PDPA compliance. 3ZEROS™ privacy by physics, verified by hardware inspection.
- MIT Step 3 (Expand research in opportunity areas): NAI 2.0™ — 22 White Papers, 43 WD Space patents, 9 WM Medical patents, CRGAIG 10-module certification programme, NTU MSc AI (Medicine) thesis.
- MIT Step 4 (Cross-disciplinary collaborations): NAI 2.0™ — NTU ARISE partnership, SCS-NTU CRGAIG certification, WHO/UN humanitarian deployment, Singapore MOH/HSA regulatory pathway.
- MIT Step 5 (Incorporate specific interests of older adults): NAI 2.0™ — 3ZEROS™ (privacy by physics), Sacred Pause™ (deliberative interval), See-to-Text (accessible narration), Human Decision layer (supplementation, not replacement).
- MIT Step 6 (Test solutions with older adults in the real world): NAI 2.0™ — Q3 2026 Sanctuary (Nursing Home) validation. Q4 2026 30–50 bed hospital ward pilot. HSA SaMD clinical evidence generation.
- MIT Step 7 (Remain open to diverse and changing needs): NAI 2.0™ — 2^n patent multiplication architecture. Blueprint Arc expansion to 15+ global nodes. Patent growth from 106+ to 270–300+ by 2027. The vow does not change. The architecture adapts.

Conclusion · The Human Decides. Always.

Conclusion — The Human Decides. Always.

The MIT AgeLab and MIT Media Lab paper is a precise, honest, and important document. It asked the right questions. It brought older adults into the room. It identified what they need and what they fear. It produced a road map.

What it could not produce was the constitutional floor.

A floor is not a product. It is not a prototype. It is not a workshop output. A floor is what exists before any product is built, and it determines what any product may and may not do. The NAI 2.0™ framework is that floor. Its 106+ patents are its planks. Its hardware enforcement mechanisms — the Sacred Pause™, the Sovereign Brake, the Tiger .1x Key™, the 3ZEROS™ Sanctuary — are its load-bearing structure.

Every MIT co-design participant who said that privacy must be watertight was describing a 3ZEROS™ requirement. Every participant who said GenAI must not replace human presence was articulating the H layer of ABC+2S+H™. Every participant who worried about AI manipulating them in ways they are not aware of was identifying authority drift.

The older adults in the MIT workshops were constitutional thinkers. They simply did not yet have the architectural vocabulary. Non-Agentic AI 2.0™ provides it.

Edwin Koh carries this forward not because he chose the mission, but because the mission chose him — at a specific bedside, with a specific grief, at the only intersection of vectors that could have built a constitution instead of a startup.

The framework chose him. He accepted. The vow stands.

> *The AI observes. The AI advises. The AI builds. The human decides. Always. — NAI 2.0™ Constitutional Mandate*

References and Patent Registry

MIT Paper: Chan, S. et al. (2024). Co-designing Generative AI Technologies with Older Adults to Support Daily Tasks. MIT AgeLab & MIT Media Lab. DOI: 10.21428/e4baedd9.4f2a95fc

Root Patent Family: SG020603109STW (filed 5 Feb 2026) · Application No. 10202600898V (National Security Clearance 25 March 2026) · Title: Non-Agentic AI Governance Core Engine Concept and Domains (Medicine, Governance, IP). Applicant: Koh Wui Kiat, Edwin. IPOS Singapore.

NEC Independent Filing: Application No. 10202601257Q · Nightingale's Eyes Care™ — Non-Invasive Eldercare Device. IPOS Singapore.

Corporate Registration: Non-Agentic AI™ Governance Singapore · ACRA T260229801 · Universal IP Holding Entity for all Nightingale's Eyes Care™ and associated patents.

NLB Prior Art Vault: R260219-005 · R260302-007 · National Library Board of Singapore.

Governing Framework: ABC+2S+H™ Guardian Framework · IMDA MGF for Agentic AI · IEC 60825-1 · IEC 61508 SIL 3 · ISO 13485 · ISO 14971 · HSA AIHGle 2.0 · WHO Maturity Model Level 4.