

Supplement S4 — Standards Body Submission Packet

Kingdom Conformance RFC v1.3.6 (Public Draft) — replayable conformance evidence + fail-closed gates

Public-safe | Text license: CC BY 4.0 (text) | Patent notice: patent rights are not licensed | Contact: MeridianVerity@proton.me

A. Purpose

This one-page packet accompanies the Kingdom Conformance RFC and its procurement/audit kit for submission to a standards body, review committee, or consortium. It summarizes scope, included materials, and a fast reviewer path.

B. What is being requested

- Requested action: evaluate adoption of Kingdom Conformance as a candidate standard / best-practice profile for high-stakes AI governance.
- Standardized contract: Policy Packs + deterministic validators (PASS/FAIL/HOLD + stable reason codes) + replay-verifiable receipts + Conformance Packs.
- Enforcement posture (L2+): fail-closed gates at real control points; permits minted only after PASS and validated at gates to reduce time-of-check/time-of-use drift.
- Non-goals: does not prescribe vendor internals, cryptography choice, or model-development methodology; it standardizes evidence and replay semantics.

C. Package contents (by role)

Normative	Informative / non-normative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• RFC specification (PDF): Kingdom Conformance RFC v1.3.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standardization Brief (one page)• Claim Card template (one page)• RFP Appendix template (one page)• S1 Auditor Playbook (aggressive audit gauntlet)• S2 Reference verifier + test vectors (ZIP)• S3 Submission checklist (Zenodo metadata + files)• Zenodo Upload Pack (paste-ready abstract + SHA-256 manifest)• S4 (this submission packet)

D. Fast reviewer path (30–60 minutes)

1. Read the one-page Standardization Brief to understand scope and claims.
2. Read RFC Sections 3–9 and 11; skim Appendices B and D.
3. Run the S2 verifier on examples + vectors to confirm replay behavior (PASS/HOLD negative cases).
4. Use the S1 Auditor Playbook to map failures to findings taxonomy F1–F6.

E. Questions for the committee / working group

- Are PASS/FAIL/HOLD semantics and the fail-closed posture appropriate for high-stakes workflows?
- Are replay bindings (policy/validator versions, CanonicalFormID(s), registry snapshot refs, audit window) sufficient for independent verification?
- Which registries should be standardized first (reason codes, evidence-handle types, action classes, CanonicalFormID profiles)?
- What minimum conformance tests should be mandatory for L1 and L2 (and how should results be reported)?