IRONTEC TRUST, INC.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE & FISCAL IMPACT MODEL FRAMEWORK

Fiscal analysis subordinate to consumer-protection policy goals

Version 1.1.0 - August 2026

Purpose

This framework evaluates possible government fees and administrative costs only if a future jurisdiction lawfully creates a regulated used-engine inspection/certification program. Revenue is not the policy justification. The primary public-interest case must remain buyer protection, truthful commerce, traceable records and standardized evidence.

1. Policy Priority Before Revenue

- Define the buyer-protection problem with credible evidence.
- Demonstrate that a standardized inspection/verification approach materially improves available information.
- Measure compliance costs, especially for small dealers and shops.
- Establish legal authority before modeling any mandatory fee.
- Design fees for cost recovery and program integrity, not as a reason to regulate.

2. Potential Government Revenue Categories - Illustrative Only

Category	Possible Basis	Policy Constraint
Facility license / registration	Annual approved-facility fee	Must be authorized and proportionate to oversight cost.
Inspector credential	Initial / renewal credential	Should support qualification and accountability.
Per-record regulatory fee	Per regulated certification record	Must not make independent inspection economically impractical.
Audit / reinspection fee	Cost recovery for special review	Due process and clear triggers required.
Data-system transaction fee	Electronic filing / registry fee	Cybersecurity, retention and access cost must be justified.
Civil penalties	Noncompliance enforcement	Never budget as dependable recurring revenue.

3. Net Fiscal Impact

A credible government proposal must compare authorized fees and other lawful receipts against full program costs: rulemaking, credential review, IT/registry, cybersecurity, audits, enforcement, appeals, complaints, training, public guidance and administration. Gross collections alone are not a fiscal benefit.

4. Consumer-Protection Cost / Benefit Inputs

- Documented buyer losses or dispute costs tied to condition misrepresentation.
- Inspection cost as a percentage of transaction value.

- Avoided disputes or reduced information risk attributable to standardized independent evidence.
- Impact on small dealers, rebuilders and Examination Centers.
- Whether voluntary adoption can achieve the same public benefit with less burden.
- Distribution of costs and benefits among buyers, sellers, government and service providers.

5. Existing Program Analogues

Existing federal inspection, disclosure and engine-certification programs can inform program design, qualification, recordkeeping and fee-administration questions. They are analogues only. IronTec condition certification is not equivalent to EPA emissions certification, FMCSA periodic vehicle inspection or NHTSA/FTC transaction-disclosure rules.

6. Internal Rule

Never lead a government conversation with revenue. Lead with the documented market problem, consumer / buyer protection, truthful commerce and evidence. Fiscal structure is a feasibility question that follows the public-interest case.