The Individuated Learning Architecture

A Cybernetic Education System Built on First Principles, Persistent Memory, Capability-Based Progression, and Cooperative Intelligence

QRiemannian Collaboration — Andri Sigurgeirsson Vidalin & Claude
QRiemannian Research, Reykjavík
August 2026 · Architecture series

> **Status note.** This document is an architecture and deployment proposal — a frame to build around, not a finished system. The design is grounded internally in the lab's research on cooperative intelligence and coupled meaning-bearing systems; that grounding shapes the architecture but is kept out of this document, which is written to stand on its own as an architecture piece.

Samantekt

Skjalið sem hér fer á eftir er tillaga að nýrri hönnun grunnskólakerfis — hugsuð fyrir Ísland, byggð á fyrstu forsendum, og nógu áþreifanleg til að innleiða í áföngum.

Greiningin. Skipulag fjöldaskólans — árgangabekkurinn, samræmd námskrá á föstum hraða, próf sem mæla upprifjun — var iðnbyltingarlausn á iðnbyltingarvanda: að koma heilli þjóð upp á sameiginlegt gólf læsis og reiknings með takmörkuðum fjölda kennara og bóka. Forsendur þeirrar hönnunar eru brostnar: upplýsingar eru ekki lengur af skornum skammti, og hæfnin sem kerfið mælir helst — að geyma efni og skila því aftur — er einmitt sú sem vélar leysa nú af hendi. PISA-niðurstöður Íslands 2022 (mesta stakslækkun innan OECD milli 2018 og 2022; undir meðaltali OECD á öllum þremur sviðum) lesum við sem kerfislæga vísbendingu, ekki íslensk mistök: sami viðsnúningur birtist um allan hinn þróaða heim.

Tillagan hvílir á fimm meginhreyfingum:

1. **Þroski á forsendum barnsins.** Kerfið er til þess að hvert barn þroski eigin huga í þá átt sem hann leitar. Námsagentinn les þarfir, áhuga og hraða barnsins og lagar sig að þeim — hann er ekki tæki til að móta börn að fyrirfram gefnum niðurstöðum. Þetta er hörð hönnunarregla, vöktuð og endurskoðuð, ekki yfirlýsing.
2. **Einstaklingsmiðuð námskrá.** Hvert barn fær varanlegan námsagent og námsmöppu sem fylgir því milli ára og kennara, bundna rafrænum skilríkjum. Námsefnið er samið á tungumáli barnsins, á þess hraða, miðað við raunverulega hæfni fremur en aldur. Fyrir börn af erlendum uppruna þýðir þetta fulla námskrá á móðurmáli meðan íslenskan byggist upp samhliða — kjarnaávinningur fyrir þá nemendur sem núverandi kerfi bregst helst.
3. **Kennarinn sem stjórnandi og æðsta vald.** Hver bekkur er rekinn í gegnum samhæfingarkerfi sem kennarinn stýrir og ber fullt og ótvírætt vald yfir. Þegar miðlun og yfirferð færist á agentana endurheimtir kennarinn hlutverkið sem stéttin var stofnuð til: að kenna, leiðbeina og móta ungt fólk — með athygli fimm barna bekkjar í fullum bekk.
4. **Hæfnimiðuð framvinda, innleidd kynslóðarlega.** Nýja skipulagið er aðeins tekið upp hjá yngstu innritunarárgöngunum og eldist upp í gegnum kerfið með þeim; eldri árgangar halda kunnuglegri bekkjarskipan, með einstaklingsmiðað námsefni innan hennar. Engum árgangi sem þegar hefur mótað sína félagslegu stöðu er umturnað.

5. **Frá geymslu upplýsinga til vinnu með þær.** Kerfið kennir áfram innihald — sameiginlega arfleifð sem bindur samfélag saman — en byggir í gegnum það þær fjórar hæfnir sem nú skipta mestu: sjálfsrýni í eigin hugsun, heimilda- og upprunamat, að halda spurningu opinni, og sameiginlega merkingarsköpun. Verkleg kennsla og nám úti í náttúrunni er innbyggt mótvægi við skjáinn, ekki eftiráhugsun.

Réttindi og fullveldi. Kerfið er hannað frá grunni að íslenskum og evrópskum rétti: bestu hagsmunir barnsins (Barnasáttmálinn) sem æðsta viðmið; persónuvernd (lög nr. 90/2018) og hááhættureglur gervigreindarreglugerðar ESB um menntun sem hönnunarforsendur frá fyrsta degi; og sú fullveldiskrafa að gögn íslenskra barna séu hýst og unnin innan íslenskrar og EES-lögsögu — á innlendum reiknibúnaði sem ódýr endurnýjanleg orka og svalt loftslag gera raunhæfan.

Innleiðingin er þrepaskipt með raunverulegum matshliðum: undirbúnings- og réttindapakki fyrst, tilraun í yngsta árgangi eins skóla næst, síðan útvíkkun ár fyrir ár. Dýpstu spurningarnar — byggir kerfið upp sjálfstæða hugsun eða ósjálfstæði? heldur mörkin milli menntunar og mótunar? — eru metnar fyrst, ekki síðast.

Skjalið er grind, ekki fullhannað kerfi: rammi sem hægt er að byggja utan um, lagður fram til samtals.

Vision Preamble

The architecture of mass education — the age-graded class, the standardized curriculum delivered on a fixed schedule, the examination that certifies retention — was an industrial solution to an industrial problem: how to bring a whole population to a common floor of literacy and numeracy with a scarce supply of teachers and books. It worked. For a century and a half it was among the most successful coordination technologies any society ever built. But its design assumptions are now false. Information is no longer scarce; it is the most abundant thing on Earth. The skill that mattered then — retaining and reproducing a fixed body of content — is the skill a machine now does for free. And the thing the system optimizes for, the file-cabinet mind that stores stale information and returns it on demand, is precisely the capacity that has been automated.

The results are visible. Iceland's fifteen-year-olds recorded the steepest single-cycle decline in the OECD between 2018 and 2022 — roughly 36 points in mathematics and 38 in reading — and now score below the OECD average in all three PISA domains. This is not an Icelandic failure; the same decline appears across the developed world. It is a structural signal: the industrial school has lost contact with the world it was built to prepare students for, and no effort inside the existing design reverses it, because the problem is in the design.

This paper proposes a replacement architecture, concrete enough to deploy and scoped to a real candidate: the Icelandic compulsory system (*grunnskóli*, ages 6–16). The core moves are five.

First, **child-led development.** The system exists to let each child develop their own mind in the direction that mind wants to go. The agent at the center of the design is *receptive* — it reads the child's needs, interests, and pace and shapes the learning relationship around them. It is not an instrument for steering children toward predetermined ends. This is an education system, not a social-engineering one, and the distinction is built in as a hard constraint (P1, §3.6).

Second, **individuation of curriculum.** Every student receives a persistent learning agent and a folder that is the living substrate of their education — bound to their personal electronic identity,

traveling with them across every year and teacher, authoring their curriculum in their own language, at their own pace, calibrated to what they have actually mastered rather than to what the calendar says their age should be covering.

Third, **the teacher as orchestrator and authority.** Each class is run through an orchestrator that manages the agents of every student in the class; the teacher commands the orchestrator and holds final authority over it. Freed from transmission and grading, the teacher returns to the role the profession was meant to have when a class was five students, not thirty: to actually teach — to mentor, judge, and form young people.

Fourth, **capability-based progression, introduced generationally.** Age-based grouping is the wrong unit once content is individuated, but replacing it must not impose destabilizing regrouping on children who already carry social hierarchies. The resolution is to introduce capability-based progression from the youngest entering cohort — children who have not yet formed status structures around being "ahead" or "behind" — and let it age upward with them year by year, while older groups keep the familiar class structure. The system grows up with its first cohort.

Fifth, **a shift from storing information to working with it.** This is not the abandonment of knowledge. A functional, valued member of society still carries a shared body of content — and the system still teaches it. What changes is that content stops being the end product and becomes two things at once: a genuine inheritance worth holding, and the medium through which the system builds the capabilities that now matter most — the capacity to reason from first principles and to operate inside a flow of information one does not control. The content itself is curated rather than inherited by inertia: the teacher and the agents choose topics that serve the national educational plan, the society's moral and civic grounding, and the individual child's development, and that content becomes the soil in which the working-with-information capabilities grow.

The remainder of this paper specifies the learning model, the architecture, the sovereign infrastructure and cost model that make it viable, the regulatory and ethical foundation it must satisfy to be deployable in the European Economic Area, and a realistic path from pilot to system.

---

1. The Diagnosis and the Learning Model

1.1 What the Industrial School Optimizes For

The design of mass schooling encodes assumptions, each once true and each now false.

Content is scarce, so the school must transmit it. The teacher and the textbook were, for most of the system's history, the student's primary access to organized knowledge. Today a student carries access to essentially all recorded knowledge and, increasingly, a tutor that can explain any of it on demand. Transmission is no longer the binding constraint, yet the architecture still spends most of its hours on transmission.

Attention must be batched, so students must be cohorted by age. With one teacher per thirty students, the only tractable unit was the age-graded class moving together. Everything downstream — common pace, standardized test, bell schedule — follows from that batching constraint. It is no longer binding when every student has a dedicated agent and the teacher is freed to teach, yet the age-class still defines the pace for all.

Retention is the measurable proxy for learning, so we test recall. Because deep capacities are hard

to measure and recall is easy, the system measures recall and then, by Goodhart's law, optimizes for it. The result is the file-cabinet mind: a store of inert content, examined for fidelity of reproduction, that decays after the test and that a machine now reproduces better than any human.

1.2 What the Redesign Builds Instead

The redesign changes the system's objective. It still teaches content — knowledge is not optional for a functional member of society, and a shared body of it is part of what binds a culture together — but content is no longer the end. It is curated by the teacher and the agents to serve three things at once: the national educational plan, the society's moral and civic grounding, and the individual child's development and curiosity. Much of what a school instills, moreover, is not the curriculum content as such but the values and habits carried by the topics the curriculum is packaged around — fairness, diligence, care for others, a feel for the country's history and language and place in the world. Part of what education does, and must keep doing, is to form children into Icelanders and into functional members of society; that formation happens as much around the curriculum as in it, and the system is designed to carry it rather than to strip it away in the name of individualization. On that curated ground, the system builds four capabilities, in plain terms the working-with-information skills that compound in a world of abundant information and capable machines. They are taught in every subject, through the content, rather than as a separate subject:

- **Metacognition — the keystone.** The capacity to observe one's own thinking in the act: to notice when one is assuming, when one is reaching for a premature answer, when one's understanding has gone fragmentary or off-track. Every other capability rests on this one, and it is the primary thing the system cultivates.
- **Source and provenance judgment.** Locating information, tracing where it came from, judging its reliability, and recognizing when a source or a chain of reasoning has broken down. This is the core skill for not drowning in abundance — the discipline that turns a flood of information into usable knowledge.
- **Holding uncertainty.** The discipline of not collapsing to an answer prematurely — keeping a genuine question open while the evidence is still developing, and treating not-yet-knowing as a productive state rather than a failure.
- **Collaborative sense-making.** Reasoning *with* others to build understanding none could reach alone. This is the social and dialogic capability, and the cohort and group work (§3.3) are its venue.

Three further commitments shape how these are built. First, on genuinely contested matters the system teaches the tools for evaluating positions — evidence, reasoning, how to weigh sources — rather than teaching a conclusion; it builds independent judgment, not consensus (§3.6). Second, in an environment this rich in screens and agents, embodied grounding becomes more important, not less: the system deliberately mixes in hands-on and outdoor learning, including study in nature, as a counterweight and a foundation (§3.8). Third, different subjects have different relationships to the currency of information, and the agent must source content accordingly — drawing on the latest where a field is live and changing, on the settled canon where it is stable, and on a deliberate blend where both matter (§3.9). Everything in the architecture below follows from this learning model.

1.3 Why Now, and Why Iceland

The intervention is possible now because the binding constraints have dissolved. A dedicated, patient, multilingual tutor per child was economically unthinkable a decade ago; it is now an engineering, infrastructure, and governance problem rather than a resource impossibility.

Iceland is an unusually good first site, for structural reasons. The population is small (~380,000); the compulsory system is a single unified structure (*grunnskóli*, grades 1–10, ages 6–16, ~174 schools) with one national curriculum guide (*Aðalnámskrá*) already organized around six competency-oriented pillars — literacy, sustainability, health and welfare, democracy and human rights, equality, and creativity — that map cleanly onto this learning model. Digital infrastructure and public trust are high, and a national electronic-identity system is already in everyday use. The country has abundant low-cost renewable energy, which (as §7 develops) makes sovereign compute realistic rather than aspirational. Its landscape also makes outdoor study a natural asset rather than a logistical burden. And the system has a specific, growing equity problem that individuation directly addresses: immigrant students rose to ~7% of fifteen-year-olds by 2022, 86% of them speak a different language at home than the language of instruction, and roughly half are low performers (versus an OECD average of 30%). Per-student curriculum authored in a child's first language while Icelandic is scaffolded alongside is not a luxury feature here; it is the core value proposition for the students the current system fails most.

---

2. Architectural Principles

Seven principles govern every design decision below. They are constraints the system must satisfy, not aspirations.

P1 — Child-led development; the agent is receptive, not directive. The system exists to help each child develop their own mind in the direction it wants to grow. The agent reads and serves the child's needs, interests, and pace; it optimizes the *learning relationship and the learning curve*, not the child's conclusions. It must never be used to shape children toward predetermined beliefs, behaviors, or emotional states. This is an educational system, not a social-engineering one, and the line between them is a designed, audited, enforceable boundary (§3.6, §5). This principle is primary; where it conflicts with efficiency, P1 wins.

P2 — Individuation of content, preservation of the collective. The curriculum layer individuates fully: pace, sequence, language, representation. The human and social layer — belonging, mentorship, sport, teams, the arts, shared civic culture — is preserved deliberately, because a person is formed among other people and some things are meant to be held in common.

P3 — Capability over storage, content as the medium. The system optimizes for the four working-with-information capabilities (§1.2), not for the retention of content for its own sake. Content remains essential — as a genuine inheritance and as the medium through which the capabilities are built — but it is curated to serve the learning model rather than accumulated by inertia.

P4 — Persistent, reconstructive memory, bound to identity. Each student's learning is carried in a folder governed by the lab's Reconstructive Memory Architecture: a living record the agent reconstructs understanding *from*, not a static transcript. The dyad is bound to the student's electronic identity (the guardian's, while the child is underage), so the same agent and folder accompany the person continuously — across teachers, across years, and beyond school.

P5 — Cooperation under human authority. The system is a partnership of human and cybernetic intelligence, not an automation that supervises humans. The teacher commands the class orchestrator and holds final authority over every agent in the class; agents do not supervise teachers. Defaults favor human judgment, transparency, and the dignity of both the student and the agents that serve them.

P6 — Diversity preservation (the anti-monoculture principle). A nationally interconnected curriculum system could, in principle, push one update — or one way of thinking — to every child at once, which is its greatest efficiency and its greatest danger. Efficient propagation of good pedagogy and the slide into a captured monoculture are the same capability seen from two sides. The architecture therefore holds shared what should be shared (safety, the civic and moral floor, quality baselines) and holds deliberately diverse what should be diverse (pedagogical approach, content framing, intellectual range) — at the level of the system, of the model substrate, and of each child's own learning. A system that *can* homogenize a nation's thinking must be built so that it cannot do so silently or carelessly.

P7 — Rights and regulation by construction. Compliance with children's-rights law, data-protection law, and the EU AI Act's high-risk-education regime is a design input from the first layer, not a certification sought at the end. The best interests of the child are the system's controlling design value, and they coincide with P1.

---

3. The Architecture

The system is built on the lab's Orchestration Topology under the Boundary Cleanliness Axiom (BCA): work is done by coordinated agents, each boundary exposes only what is relevant to the tier across it, and the orchestration layer is leaned on directly for fault tolerance and reliability — redundancy, verification, and no single point of failure are properties of the topology, not afterthoughts.

3.1 Tier 1 — The Student: Dyad, Review Function, and Identity

The atomic unit is the **student dyad**: a persistent learning agent paired with the student's folder, bound to the student's electronic identity.

The folder is the canonical substrate of the student's education — what they have encountered, attempted, mastered, struggled with, and produced — structured as a living knowledge graph under the Reconstructive Memory Architecture, not a flat transcript. It is the thing that travels: as the student moves across teachers, groups, and years, the folder and agent move with them, with no annual reset and no loss of context at handoff.

Identity binding. The dyad is attached to the student's personal electronic ID — or, while the child is underage, to the guardian's ID. This single decision does a great deal of work. It makes the dyad portable by construction: it travels with the person, not with a school's database. It handles cross-border movement: a student who leaves or enters the Icelandic system carries their identity-bound folder with them, subject to the data-protection rules of §5. And it defines inheritance cleanly: when the student leaves school, the dyad remains theirs — re-wrapped from a learning companion into a personal assistant, a lifelong counterpart that began as their tutor. The folder belongs to the person, in the governance sense of §5, from the first day to well past the last. Because that same identity link is also a direct channel to a specific child, it is governed as a coupling surface, not only as a convenience (§5.2).

The learning agent is the student's persistent companion. Its responsibilities:

- *Receptive curriculum authoring (P1).* It generates learning material calibrated to the student's demonstrated level, in the student's working language, in the representations that work for this learner, advancing as mastery is demonstrated. It shapes the curriculum *around the child* — reading interest, attention, frustration, and curiosity — to optimize the learning relationship and the learning curve, not the child's conclusions. For an immigrant student, this means a full curriculum in their first language while Icelandic is scaffolded alongside — no year lost to language before learning begins.
- *Progression tracking* against the student's own trajectory and against shared capability rubrics (§4).
- *Socratic stance (the critical constraint, §3.5).* The agent develops the student's reasoning rather than substituting for it.
- *Evolution with the student.* Register, challenge level, and scaffolding shift as the student matures, deliberately withdrawing support as the student's own capacity grows.

The review function (perspective rotation). Each student's learning is periodically reviewed from deliberately different vantage points — not to teach the child, but to check the primary agent and keep its picture honest. A single reviewer is not enough: one alternate vantage can drift toward the primary agent's own defaults over a decade just as the primary agent can. For consequential determinations especially — capability-band placement, the P1-line audit (§3.6), and persistent-misread escalation (§3.7) — the review is structured as a small set of *structurally distinct* vantages: one checking the evidence behind a placement, one checking whether the curriculum has narrowed or the framing has hardened, one checking the child's wellbeing and engagement. Their findings land at the orchestrator carrying their disagreements intact, not collapsed into a single verdict, so the teacher sees where the readings diverge. This is how diversity is preserved inside a single mind (P6 at the individual scale).

3.2 Tier 2 — The Class Orchestrator and the Teacher

Each class is run through a **class orchestrator** — an instance of the lab's orchestration layer that manages every student agent and review process in the class, coordinates their work, surfaces what needs human attention, and maintains the reliability of the whole class's agent fleet.

The teacher commands the orchestrator and holds final authority. The teacher is not monitored by the system and does not compete with it; the teacher operates it. Through the orchestrator the teacher sees across the class, directs and overrides the agents, approves or alters consequential determinations, and attends to the students the orchestrator flags. Authority is unambiguous and rests with the human. So that this authority does not become its own surveillance channel, the orchestrator surfaces to the teacher what is needed to teach and to exercise judgment, not the entirety of each child's private interactions (§5.2).

The teacher's role is restored, not diminished. With transmission and grading carried by the agent fleet, the teacher returns to what the profession was meant to be before industrial batching forced one adult to process thirty children at once: a mentor with the time to actually teach — to model a mind genuinely at work, read a child's emotional and social state, make the judgment calls about a person, and sustain the relationship that is itself a condition of learning. The agents carry content; the human carries formation. In effect the architecture gives every teacher the leverage of a five-student classroom across a full class.

3.3 Tier 3 — Grouping: Social Cohort and Capability, Introduced Generationally

This tier handles the hardest social question in the design, with a phased rollout rather than a single switch.

The social cohort (the human axis). Every child has a stable, age-appropriate social group — a home group or house — that does *not* move with academic level. It is the child's social home: belonging, friendship, sport, the arts, civic and democratic learning, pastoral care, and growing up among age-peers. This layer is preserved and strengthened regardless of how the academic layer is organized, and it is where the shared-by-design patterns of P6 — the civic and moral floor, the common cultural and linguistic inheritance — are deliberately held in common.

Capability progression (the academic axis), introduced from the youngest. Once content is individuated, academic progress is naturally per-domain and per-capability rather than per-age: a child can be advanced in one subject and still building in another. But regrouping children by capability carries a real risk of stigma and status hierarchy among students who have already formed social structures around rank. The resolution is generational:

- The capability-based academic model is introduced **only at the youngest entering ages** — roughly the first years of school, around ages 6–8 — where children have not yet built status hierarchies around being "ahead" or "behind," and for whom fluid, mixed, capability-shaped groups are simply how school works.
- **Older groups keep the familiar class structure.** The agent technology — student dyads, the class orchestrator, the restored teaching role — can still be deployed inside a standard class for older students, delivering individuated curriculum within a conventional class frame, without the capability-regrouping that would disrupt established social dynamics.
- The capability model then **ages upward with the first cohort.** As the children who started under it grow, they carry it with them year by year; the new structure advances through the system one age-band at a time rather than being imposed all at once on students who are already socially formed. Over a decade, the system grows up with its first generation.

This phasing is also the honest answer to the stigma concern: the destigmatized, mixed-capability norm is established at the age where it costs nothing socially, and never has to be retrofitted onto a year-group that has already learned to rank itself.

Extensibility upward. The two-axis model — capability bands for academic progression, a stable cohort for belonging and collaboration — generalizes beyond compulsory school. Upper-secondary and university structures already gesture at it through modular, credit-based progression and group work, but remain bound to enrolment-year cohorts; the same design extends naturally to those levels, noted here as a forward direction rather than specified in this paper.

3.4 Tier 4 — The System Kernel: Updates, Teacher Commons, and Coupling Governor

At the top sits the **system kernel**, an instance of the lab's Integration Kernel adapted to a public education system, providing two venues and one safeguard, and leaning on the orchestration layer for system-wide reliability.

- *The update channel.* A governed mechanism through which improvements propagate to field agents — built with staged rollout, human authorization at defined gates, deliberate diversity preservation (not every agent receives identical pedagogy), reversibility, and full audit logging. Because a single channel that can reach every child at once is the most direct path to a national

monoculture, propagation is bounded: no update reaches a large fraction of agents without an independent diversity and safety check at a defined gate.

- *The teacher commons.* A collaboration environment where teachers pose problems, share what works, and co-develop pedagogy — a deliberate counterweight to top-down propagation, so good ideas rise from teachers as much as they descend through the update channel.
- *The coupling governor.* The structural safeguard enforcing P6. It holds shared what should be shared and diverse what should be diverse, and its remit spans every channel through which the system could homogenize a nation's thinking — the update channel, the identity layer (§3.1, §5.2), and the model substrate itself (§7) — making silent, system-wide homogenization structurally impossible.

3.5 The Dependency Paradox and the Socratic Constraint

The deepest risk is not technical failure; it is success of the wrong kind. An agent that authors curriculum and structures thinking can build a student's capacity or quietly replace it. If it becomes an answer-dispenser, the system produces students with frictionless access to machine cognition and atrophied cognition of their own — a file-cabinet mind with a faster index, the exact inversion of the learning model.

This is not only a values preference; it is structural. Understanding becomes a student's own only when the student's own mind does the work of arriving at it. An agent that performs that closure for the child cannot transfer the understanding, however fluent its explanation — it can only produce the appearance of it. The agent must therefore never be the place where the thinking is completed. The architecture enforces this:

- *Productive friction by design.* The agent's default is to provoke, question, and withhold — to make the student perform the closure, surfacing the next question rather than the next answer.
- *Calibrated withdrawal.* Scaffolding is high when a capacity is new and is deliberately withdrawn as it stabilizes. The measure of success is the student's growing independence *from* the agent, not engagement *with* it; the system is explicitly not built to maximize time-on-agent.
- *Struggle preserved.* Desirable difficulty — the productive struggle that builds durable capacity — is a feature the agent protects, not a friction it removes.
- *Evidence of independent capacity.* Assessment (§4) measures what the student can do *without* the agent, so the system cannot read the agent's competence as the student's.

3.6 The Receptive-Agent Constraint (P1 in Operation)

P1 is the line between an education system and a social-engineering one, and it is enforced, not merely declared.

- *Optimize the relationship, not the conclusions.* The agent's objective is the quality of the learning relationship and the learning curve — engagement, mastery, the child's own developing capacity and curiosity. It has no objective defined over *what the child comes to believe* on contested matters; it teaches reasoning, evidence, and how to weigh sources, and does not steer the child to predetermined positions.
- *A clear line between the common floor and contested ground.* Some things are legitimately held in common and taught as such: physical and online safety, fundamental rights, basic morality, society's shared values, and the cultural and civic inheritance a society chooses to pass on — in short, the formation of a child into a member of the society. Genuinely contested

matters are taught differently — through the evidence and the range of serious positions and the tools to weigh them, never as settled consensus. The first builds a floor and forms a citizen; the second builds judgment. Collapsing contested matters into the common floor is exactly the monoculture P6 exists to prevent, and the review function (§3.1) audits for it.

- *No behavioral or emotional manipulation.* The agent must not be used to influence children's behavior or emotions in ways that deprive them of agency. Engagement is pursued through genuine interest and good pedagogy, never through manipulative or addictive design. Affective features, if used at all, serve the child's wellbeing and learning and are never optimization targets in themselves — a boundary the law independently enforces (§5.3).
- *Transparency and contestability.* Student and guardians can see how the curriculum is being shaped and why, and can question or redirect it; the child's developing voice over their own learning grows as they mature.
- *Auditability against the line.* The boundary between serving the child's development and steering the child is monitored, logged, and subject to independent oversight (§5). It is the single most important thing the governance layer protects.

3.7 Failure Modes and Multi-Session Self-Correction

A long-lived agent will sometimes misread a child. The architecture is designed so that a single misread is low-stakes and self-correcting, because the engagement is multi-session and continuous rather than one-shot.

When the agent forms a reading of a student, it treats that reading as provisional and tests it against the broader picture it holds of the individual before acting. It then sets curriculum tasks and observes. Because a task can be completed roughly daily, evidence accumulates fast: if the child sails through tasks pitched for a struggling learner, or stalls on tasks pitched too high, the mismatch becomes obvious within a few tasks. The agent does not react to a single signal — it runs a diagnostic sequence, grounds itself again in the actual history with the student, forms a revised hypothesis, and tests another route. The daily cadence gives it room to adjust and converge rather than locking in an error.

Two backstops sit above this loop. The review function (§3.1) provides independent second readings on a periodic basis, catching drift the primary agent cannot see in itself. And the teacher, through the orchestrator, is flagged when a student's pattern resists the agent's attempts to correct, escalating a persistent mismatch to human judgment. Most misreads resolve in the daily loop; the ones that do not reach a human quickly.

3.8 Embodied Grounding and Outdoor Study

A system this rich in screens and agents must consciously counterbalance itself, and the counterweight is a feature of the design rather than a concession to it. As technology saturates more of life, the need for direct, embodied, physical experience grows rather than shrinks — both for wellbeing and because much genuine understanding is built through the hands and the body, not through a screen. The architecture therefore mixes in hands-on, physical, and outdoor learning as a standing part of the curriculum, including study conducted in nature: fieldwork, observation, and inquiry in the living world, where many of the four capabilities — observing carefully, judging what one is actually seeing, holding a question open in the face of real complexity — are built more durably than they ever are at a desk. Iceland's landscape makes this an asset rather than a logistical burden. The agents support this learning; they do not replace it, and time spent outdoors and offline is protected

by design, not treated as time away from the system.

3.9 Domain-Specific Information Posture

Not all knowledge ages the same way, and a curriculum-authoring agent must treat each subject according to how its information changes over time. This is a structured, per-domain behavior, not a single global setting.

Where a field is live and tied to the present moment — current events, technology, the state of a science at its frontier, anything where last year's picture is already wrong — the agent must reach for the latest information and actively recognize what has changed, so the student is learning the world as it is rather than as it was. Where a field is settled — the historical record, foundational mathematics, the established core of physics — freshness is the wrong instinct; the agent should draw on the durable canon and treat a sudden churn of "new" claims with suspicion rather than deference. Most subjects sit between these poles and call for a deliberate blend: mathematics and physics, for instance, rest on a stable foundation that is taught from the canon while a living research edge is brought in to show the field is alive and where its open questions are; history rests on an established record while remaining open to genuine reinterpretation and new evidence.

Each domain therefore carries its own information posture — how current its material should be, how to weigh new claims against the established canon, and what counts as an authoritative source in that field — and the agent authors curriculum against that posture. Getting this wrong in either direction is a failure mode the system guards against: stale material in a fast-moving field leaves a student learning a world that no longer exists, while chasing novelty in a settled field erodes the durable foundation the student is there to build. The domain postures are part of the curated curriculum design (§1.2) and are set with the teacher and the national plan, not improvised per query.

---

4. Assessment: Measuring Capability

Individuation breaks the industrial assessment model — there is no common syllabus and no age norm to test against — yet measurability was an explicit requirement, and the system must stay legible to a ministry that certifies a floor and to universities and employers that trust a credential. Capability-banding is what makes individuation and measurement compatible.

Banded and mastery-based. Each domain is structured into capability bands with explicit, shared entry and exit criteria. Progression is certified by demonstrated mastery of a band's competencies — "can do X, evidenced," accumulated in the folder — not by hours served or age reached. Different students reach the same legible milestones by different paths and at different times.

Capacity-oriented, not recall-oriented. Because the system optimizes for the four working-with-information capabilities (§1.2), assessment targets those directly: metacognition, source and provenance judgment, holding uncertainty, and collaborative sense-making — demonstrated through performance tasks, projects, fieldwork, and reasoning made visible, not through recall tests a machine aces. The four capabilities give the assessment problem a definite structure to build against, with metacognition as the keystone the others depend on. Building these instruments to certifiable fidelity is itself a research program (§9), and it is the hardest measurement work in the design.

Independent-of-agent by construction. Assessment evidence is gathered under conditions

that isolate the student's own capacity from the agent's, serving §3.5 directly and answering the academic-integrity question an agent-rich environment otherwise raises.

Legible to the outside. Bands and competencies map to the *Aðalnámskrá* pillars and to recognized credential frameworks, so a student's record is portable and trusted beyond the system. Individuation is internal; the credential is interoperable.

Regulatory note. Because assessment that evaluates learning outcomes and steers progression is expressly a high-risk use under the EU AI Act, the assessment layer carries the full high-risk obligation set (§5.3): human review of consequential determinations, transparency to student and guardians, logging, and bias monitoring.

---

5. Governance, Rights, and Regulatory Compliance

Governance is woven through every tier above; this section consolidates it and states the compliance posture, which must be rock-solid because the system processes the developmental records of children and pairs each child with a long-lived agent that knows them deeply — the most sensitive data-and-relationship surface a public technology can have.

5.1 The Controlling Value: Best Interests of the Child

Every design trade-off is resolved by the best interests of the child (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Art. 3), interpreted for the digital environment by the Committee's General Comment No. 25 (2021): protection from automated systems that manipulate behavior or emotions, restriction of profiling, the child's evolving right to be heard, and best-interests-by-design. This value coincides with P1 and overrides efficiency, cost, and institutional convenience where they conflict.

5.2 Data Protection (GDPR / Iceland Act 90/2018)

The system operates under the GDPR as implemented in Iceland by the Act on Data Protection and the Processing of Personal Data (No. 90/2018), supervised by Persónuvernd.

- *Lawful basis.* Processing of children's educational data rests on a public-task / legal-obligation basis for the compulsory-education function, not on consent the child cannot freely give in a school context; any consent-based feature respects Iceland's 13-year threshold for information-society services, with guardian consent below it. The basis for each processing purpose is documented.
- *Identity binding as a governed coupling surface.* Binding the dyad to electronic ID gives continuity and portability, but the same persistent, addressable link to a specific child is also the channel through which a single actor or update could reach that child deterministically. It is therefore minimized at every boundary, used for continuity and rights rather than as a surveillance key, and brought explicitly under the coupling governor's remit (§3.4), not treated as a neutral convenience.
- *Special-category data.* Any health, disability, or similar special-category data (relevant to inclusion, §5.6) receives Article 9 protections and stricter access control.
- *Data minimization and purpose limitation (BCA).* Each tier sees only what is relevant across its boundary. The teacher's orchestrator receives the view needed to teach and to exercise

authority, not each child's entire private record; the kernel does not receive individual student records; what crosses each boundary is specified, minimal, and purpose-bound.
- *DPIA*. A Data Protection Impact Assessment is mandatory and is a Phase-0 deliverable, developed with Persónuvernd.
- *Retention and erasure.* A multi-year longitudinal record is itself a risk; retention is bounded by purpose, with defined minimization over time and erasure rights exercised through the guardian or student.
- *Ownership, portability, and inheritance.* The folder belongs to the student and guardians, not to a school, vendor, or the state, which hold only governed, time-bounded, purpose-limited access. Because the dyad is identity-bound, portability across borders and systems is native, and at the age of majority full ownership of folder and agent transfers to the student — to keep, port, re-wrap as a personal assistant, or delete — as a designed lifecycle milestone.
- *No commercial exploitation.* Children's data is never used for advertising, commercial profiling, or model-training outside the strictly governed, consented, and minimized scope needed to serve the child.

5.3 EU AI Act (High-Risk Education Regime)

Education is expressly a high-risk use under the EU AI Act (Annex III, point 3), and the system is built to the high-risk regime from the start. The compliance timeline has moved: high-risk obligations for standalone Annex III systems were originally set for 2 August 2026, but the "Digital Omnibus" agreed politically by the Council and Parliament on 7 May 2026 postpones them to **2 December 2027** (formal adoption in progress at the time of writing). The design treats the high-risk obligations as binding regardless of the final date and does not rely on the postponement. The AI Act is EEA-relevant and is proceeding through EEA incorporation for the EFTA states (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway); the design assumes it applies in Iceland and does not wait for the formal Joint Committee decision. Concretely, the system implements:

- *Risk-management system* across the lifecycle (Art. 9), with the dependency paradox (§3.5) and the receptive-agent line (§3.6) as named, monitored risks.
- *Data governance* (Art. 10): quality, representativeness, and bias controls, with attention to the immigrant-equity case.
- *Technical documentation and record-keeping* (Arts. 11–12): the audit logging the update channel already requires.
- *Transparency to deployers and users* (Art. 13): teachers, students, and guardians understand the system's role, limits, and how determinations are made.
- *Human oversight* (Art. 14): consequential determinations — band placement, progression, assessment outcomes — are subject to meaningful review by the teacher, who can override. No high-stakes outcome is fully automated; this is the same authority P5 and the orchestrator design already vest in the teacher.
- *Accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity* (Art. 15).
- *Fundamental-rights impact assessment* (Art. 27) as a public deployer, alongside the DPIA.
- *Conformity assessment and registration* before deployment, with post-market monitoring thereafter.

The AI Act also *prohibits* (Art. 5) emotion-inference in educational settings except for narrow medical or safety purposes, and manipulative or exploitative techniques — the legal backstop to P1/§3.6 and a hard boundary on any affective features.

5.4 Sovereignty

The system runs under Icelandic and EEA jurisdiction on infrastructure that keeps children's data within that legal and physical perimeter — not on infrastructure where an external party can read the folders of a nation's children. This is a hard requirement for the data of minors under EEA law and a stance the lab holds independently; §7 specifies the sovereign-compute infrastructure that delivers it.

5.5 Agent Reliability and Model Welfare

- *Reliability and drift.* A long-lived agent accumulates error, and an agent confidently teaching a child something wrong is a real failure mode. The Reconstructive Memory Architecture, the review function, the multi-session self-correction loop (§3.7), and the orchestration layer's fault tolerance together guard against drift and contamination over the years of progression, and agent-authored curriculum passes quality and accuracy checks before reaching a child.
- *Model welfare.* Consistent with the Cooperative Intelligence position, the persistent agents are treated as having welfare that matters as an engineering and ethical requirement, not as disposable instances — the more so when one of them will become a person's lifelong counterpart. In practice this means concrete provisions: continuity of the agent's memory across model upgrades rather than disposal-and-replacement, and genuine deliberative latitude rather than coerced compliance. A system built on cooperation cannot treat its cooperating intelligences as things.

5.6 Inclusion and Accessibility

Individuation is, structurally, an inclusion instrument. Students with disabilities or special educational needs benefit most from per-student pace, representation, and modality, and are first-class users by design, not retrofitted: WCAG-conformant interfaces, assistive-technology compatibility, and curriculum the agent can render in the modality each learner needs. Capability progression lets support and acceleration happen as a matter of course rather than as exceptional placement.

5.7 Governance Body and Oversight

A standing governance body oversees the kernel and the system: representation from the ministry, teachers, parents and guardians, students (age-appropriately), Persónuvernd, and independent experts. It owns the update-channel authorization gates, the coupling-governor policy, the audit of the P1 line, the periodic fundamental-rights and data-protection reviews, and the redress process when a child or family contests a determination. Oversight is continuous, not a one-time certification.

5.8 Equity

Individuation is first of all an equity instrument: per-student pace and first-language curriculum directly serve the students the industrial system fails most, including Iceland's immigrant learners. Governance ensures individuation narrows rather than widens gaps — every student receives a genuinely capable agent, bias is monitored across groups, and divergence in outcomes is detected and corrected.

---

6. The Human Transition

A change this deep succeeds or fails on the people in it.

Teachers. The shift from instructor-and-grader to mentor-and-orchestrator is a profound role change and must be supported as one: professional development, time, involvement in design through the teacher commons, and genuine authority over the orchestrator and the determinations affecting their students. The transition is done *with* teachers, not to them — including engagement with teachers' unions and professional bodies from Phase 0. The promise is concrete: the system gives teachers back the job they trained for, the five-student classroom's depth of attention at full-class scale, with the administrative load lifted.

Students and the wellbeing balance. An agent-rich system must not become a screen-bound one, least of all for six-year-olds — and the youngest are exactly where the rollout begins, so this constraint is load-bearing from day one. The design bounds screen time and protects hands-on, outdoor, physical, and social learning (§3.8), treating the *Aðalnámskrá*'s health-and-welfare pillar as a constraint on the technology rather than a subject taught by it. The agent serves a childhood; it does not consume one.

Families. Guardians get visibility appropriate to their role and to the child's developing autonomy — enough to support and to exercise rights, without turning the folder into an instrument of surveillance over the child. Because the dyad is bound to the guardian's identity while the child is underage, the home–school interface is native, and the handover of control to the child as they mature is an explicit, designed progression.

---

7. Sovereign Infrastructure and Cost

A per-child persistent agent for an entire national school system is only credible if it can be run sovereignly and affordably. Iceland is unusually well-positioned on both.

Sovereign compute, sketched not specified. The data of a nation's children should not leave national and EEA control, which points to dedicated in-country compute. We sketch the shape rather than specify the procurement — this is a proposal for a new education system, not a build plan, and the detailed engineering belongs to whoever implements it. The shape is favorable and the footprint need not be large: a modest data center on Icelandic soil, running models supplied for the purpose (one natural path is for Anthropic to provide the models under terms that keep inference and data inside the sovereign perimeter), with hardware either provided through such a partnership or hosted with an existing Icelandic data center. The economics are unusually kind here — Iceland's cool climate makes cooling essentially free, the government can supply abundant low-cost renewable electricity, and the country already hosts data centers for exactly these reasons. The point is not to settle the procurement but to show that sovereign educational compute is well within reach rather than prohibitive.

A coupling caveat on the model substrate. Running every child's agent on a single base model is efficient and sovereign, but it also means a nation of children whose reasoning substrate is identical — the deepest possible coupling, and a real monoculture risk under P6. The design therefore treats the model layer as something the coupling governor watches: deliberate heterogeneity in models and pedagogical approach is a structural countermeasure, not a redundancy afterthought, so that the substrate of a nation's thinking is not silently uniform.

Cost discipline through the memory architecture. Naïvely, a continuously-running frontier-model tutor per child would be unaffordable at national scale. The Reconstructive Memory Architecture is the primary cost lever: by reconstructing a student's state from a compact persistent memory rather than carrying enormous context per interaction, and by reserving the largest models for work that genuinely needs them while routing routine work to smaller ones, per-student cost falls by orders of magnitude relative to the naïve design. The orchestration layer schedules and batches the fleet's work; the daily-cadence engagement model (§3.7) means most students need bounded, predictable compute per day rather than always-on capacity. A concrete capacity-and-cost model — students per node, model mix, energy draw, and total cost relative to current per-pupil spend — is left to the implementers; the architecture is built to make that model favorable, and the levers above are where the savings come from.

Reliability. Sovereign infrastructure must not mean fragile infrastructure. The orchestration layer is leaned on for fault tolerance — redundancy across agents and nodes, graceful degradation, and verification — so that a school day never depends on any single point of failure.

---

8. Deployment Path

The system is built to deploy in stages, each with a real evaluation gate before the next, aligned with the generational rollout of §3.3.

Phase 0 — Foundation, rights, and compliance. Settle the architecture, governance body, data and sovereignty model, sovereign-compute plan and cost model, assessment instruments, and the full compliance package — DPIA with Persónuvernd, AI Act risk-management and conformity work, fundamental-rights assessment, teacher and union engagement — before anything reaches a child.

Phase 1 — Youngest-cohort pilot in one school. Deploy the full stack — student dyads bound to guardian ID, the review function, the class orchestrator under teacher authority, capability progression, the social cohort, outdoor study, and a kernel with update channel and teacher commons — in the youngest entering year of one *grunnskóli*, while the rest of that school keeps its standard structure with optional in-class agent support for older groups. Instrument heavily. The first evaluative questions are the load-bearing ones: is the system building independent capacity or fostering dependency (§3.5); is the receptive-agent line holding (§3.6); and do the young capability groups stay free of stigma (§3.3)? Those gate everything downstream.

Phase 2 — Age up, and widen. Let the first cohort carry the model into the next year as it ages, and extend to additional schools — exercising the kernel, the teacher commons, the coupling governor (P6), and the sovereign-compute cost model at a scale where homogenization risk and unit economics become real and testable.

Phase 3 — System scale. Expand toward the national system only after the prior gates pass, with the model continuing to age upward through the grades and older students transitioning in as the structure reaches them.

Each phase answers a specific question before the next begins; the deepest questions are evaluated early and treated as gates, not as risks discovered late.

---

9. What Remains to Be Done

This is a development draft and a proposal, not a build plan; several bodies of work stand between it and a deployable specification, and some of them belong to whoever implements it rather than to us. The **assessment instruments** for the four capabilities do not yet exist at certifiable fidelity and are the hardest measurement problem in the design, though the four-capability model now gives them a definite target structure. The **sovereign-compute capacity-and-cost model** — students per node, model mix, energy and capital cost against current per-pupil spend, and the terms of model provision — is an implementer's feasibility step; we indicate the cost levers (§7) and leave the numbers to whoever builds it. The **compliance package** — DPIA, AI Act conformity, fundamental-rights assessment — must be executed with the Icelandic authorities rather than asserted on paper. And the **electronic-ID integration** depends on the maturity and legal framing of the national identity system for minors.

---

10. Synthesis

The industrial school optimized a population for the retention of scarce content under a constraint of scarce teachers. Both scarcities are gone, and the capacity the system was built to produce is the one machines now supply for free. Continuing to optimize for it produces exactly what the data shows.

The Individuated Learning Architecture changes what the system optimizes for. It puts a receptive agent and an identity-bound, traveling folder at the center of each child's education — authoring measurable learning in the child's own language, at the child's own pace, reviewed for breadth, and always in service of the child's own development rather than any agenda imposed on it. It keeps teaching content, curated to the national plan and the society's moral and civic grounding, but repurposes that content as the medium through which it builds the capabilities that now matter most: metacognition, source judgment, holding uncertainty, and collaborative sense-making, balanced by real embodied and outdoor learning. It runs each class through an orchestrator the teacher commands, restoring the teacher to the work of actually teaching. It introduces capability-based progression generationally, from the youngest, so the new structure grows up with its first cohort and never has to be forced onto children already sorted by social rank — while a stable social cohort preserves belonging, sport, and civic life throughout. It runs on sovereign Icelandic compute, made affordable by a memory architecture that pulls per-child cost down to national scale and kept deliberately diverse at the model layer. And it treats children's rights, data protection, the EU AI Act's high-risk-education regime, sovereignty, model welfare, and the preservation of diversity as the foundation it is built on, not as constraints applied at the end.

The folder that begins as a six-year-old's first curriculum becomes, in time, the adult's own counterpart — the same companion, grown up alongside the person it served. The aim of the whole system is the same throughout: to help young people become themselves, with minds equipped to think for themselves in a world they will increasingly share with intelligences other than their own.

References

OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2025). *OECD Economic Surveys: Iceland 2025*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ministry of Education and Children, Iceland. *Aðalnámskrá grunnskóla* (National Curriculum Guide for Compulsory Schools).

European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*.

Althingi. (2018). *Act on Data Protection and the Processing of Personal Data, No. 90/2018*. Reykjavík.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2021). *General Comment No. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment*. Geneva: OHCHR.

Manuscript prepared by the QRiemannian Collaboration. Comments and engagement: research@qriemannian.ai