

IRONTEC TRUST, INC.

REGULATORY ADOPTION ROADMAP

Consumer-protection evidence first

Version 1.1.0 - August 2026

CONFIDENTIAL WORKING DOCUMENT - Strategic planning material. Not a warranty, legal opinion, regulatory filing, government endorsement or securities offering.

North Star

Build a private certification standard strong enough that government recognition would be a logical extension of demonstrated buyer-protection and market-transparency value, rather than a substitute for a working business.

Adoption Phases

Phase	Indicative Timing	Primary Deliverable	Consumer-Protection Gate
0 - Build the Standard	Now	Controlled standards, evidence rules, qualifications, disputes, audit trail.	Can claims and evidence be documented consistently?
1 - Private Pilot	0-12 months	Real examinations, outcomes, discrepancies, complaints and verification use.	Does the process give buyers materially better information?
2 - Independent Validation	6-18 months	Engineering/quality review, repeatability study, legal analysis.	Are findings reliable, limited appropriately and reproducible?
3 - Policy Research	9-18 months	Jurisdiction memo, harm/dispute study, authority map, fiscal analysis.	Is there a measurable public-interest problem?
4 - Government Education	12-24 months	Evidence briefings; request feedback, study or pilot.	Can IronTec describe the problem without overstating the solution?
5 - Pilot / Recognition	18-36 months	Procurement use, accepted record format, narrow pilot or recognition.	Do outcomes justify broader adoption at reasonable cost?
6 - Legislative / Rulemaking	24+ months	Only if justified: targeted disclosure, recordkeeping, licensing or inspection framework.	Does public benefit exceed compliance burden?
7 - Scale	After validated adoption	Replication and possible harmonization.	Can protections scale without reducing quality?

Decision Gates

- A - Do examinations demonstrate consistent and defensible results?
- B - Can primary evidence show a material buyer-information or misrepresentation problem?
- C - Can IronTec demonstrate that certification improves available information or transaction outcomes?
- D - Is there a legally viable government authority path?
- E - Does public benefit exceed compliance cost, especially for small businesses?
- F - Is there broad enough stakeholder support that the policy is not perceived as a single-company mandate?
- G - Can the program be administered without unreasonable government cost or bottlenecks?

Policy Ask Sequence

1. Education / listening meetings.
2. Formal study or agency review.
3. Voluntary private or public-sector pilot.
4. Recognition of a standard, electronic record or procurement evidence format.
5. Approved-provider / qualified-facility concept where legally appropriate.

6. Targeted disclosure or recordkeeping requirement.
7. Targeted inspection requirement where evidence demonstrates necessity.
8. Broader mandate only after demonstrated necessity, authority and proportionality.

Internal Rule

IronTec should never let the regulatory thesis outrun the evidence. Every consumer-protection, fraud-reduction, economic or government claim should be traceable to a source, pilot metric, technical standard, economic analysis or legal memorandum stored in the IronTec Admin Console.

Selected Public Sources

- FTC Used Auto Parts Guides (16 CFR Part 20): <https://www.ftc.gov/legal-library/browse/rules/rebuilt-reconditioned-other-used-automobile-parts>
- FTC used-vehicle consumer guidance: <https://consumer.ftc.gov/articles/buying-used-car-dealer>