PUBLIC TECHNICAL REVIEW PACKAGE

# Evidence, Scope, and Public Review Records

A detailed public review document for evidence structure, objective wording, readiness status, and presentation control.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Core in one sentence**<br>The evidence package makes the work understandable, objective, and safe to present publicly. | **Most important point**<br>Every strong point is paired with an external comparison, readiness state, and public boundary. |

| 6 PDFs | Live site | Linked | Scope |
|---|---|---|---|
| review package | public deployment | evidence packaging readiness | private internals excluded |

## What this PDF is meant to prove

- The evidence pack turns scattered development records into a public review package.
- Each document should help answer what was developed, what changed, what evidence exists, and what remains bounded.
- Enterprise reviewers should see lab capability, delivery evidence, technical value, risk control, and next validation steps quickly.
- The public package must sound objective, not exaggerated.
- The presentation should consistently say Formysec develops AI infrastructure and AI system layers.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Evidence types**<br>Comparison evidence, screenshots, live checks, PDFs, deployment logs, and text audits. | **Enterprise lens**<br>Company-facing review questions are answered with visible records and clear public boundaries. |
| **Scope control**<br>Public records explain component roles and boundaries without protected internals. | **Readiness**<br>Portfolio readiness percentages clarify current public packaging state. |
| **Next step**<br>A dated evidence index would make the package stronger and easier to review. | |

## Inside this document

| Page | Section | What the reviewer should learn |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | 7. Public Evidence Density Ledger | This page answers the portfolio-review question: is there enough public material to evaluate the work without exposing private internals?. |
| 9 | 8. Public Wording Control | The wording should be strong but not exposed. |
| 10 | 9. Goal Achievement Status | This table should be included in the evidence package because it answers the user's original goal directly. |
| 11 | 10. Presentation Checklist | Use this checklist before showing the portfolio to another person. |
| Guide | Plain-English Presenter Guide | Simple public explanation and Q&A; for non-specialist review. |
| Final | Public Boundary and Presentation Notes | How to explain the work strongly while keeping private internals excluded. |

## Fast presentation line

Formysec develops AI security infrastructure by connecting security modules, custom execution foundations, LLM acceleration, and Web AI system development into one reviewable portfolio.

# 1. Evidence Philosophy

Evidence should make the portfolio more credible, not more complicated. The strongest public package is clear about what exists, what is measured, what is still prototype-labeled, and what remains outside public release.

- Every performance detail should stay behind a workload or condition label.
- Every developed component should have a public role and a review boundary.
- Every document should be understandable by a non-specialist while still sounding technical.
- The phrase pattern should be development-centered: develops, built, measured, packaged, reviewed.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Good evidence**<br>Specific record, clear component, clear date or source, clear boundary. | **Weak evidence**<br>A number without context or a feature list without an external comparison point. |
| **Best tone**<br>Objective, technical, careful, and confident. | **Public boundary**<br>Strong public explanation without sensitive construction detail. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 1. evidence philosophy in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 1. Evidence Philosophy describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 2. Enterprise Review Lens

This table answers the business-facing review questions before moving into detailed evidence lists.

| Enterprise question | Portfolio answer | Visible evidence | Current boundary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Can a small lab produce real output? | Formysec shows a lean research lab building across security modules, custom foundation work, LLM acceleration, Web AI delivery, and adjacent protocol systems. | Live site, six PDFs, external comparison tables, screenshots, deployment checks, AIME, and FairVote evidence. | Public package proves reviewable output, not external product approval. |
| Is the work understandable to non-specialist reviewers? | The portfolio separates architecture, external comparison, evidence, readiness, and scope. | Master PDF, architecture register, external comparison register, baseline comparison, and evidence PDF. | Deep construction details remain outside the public version. |
| Why is this valuable for enterprise review? | The lab connects security research, AI performance work, API behavior, web delivery, and evidence control into one stack. | Security-module comparison, validator-workflow comparison, LLM-infrastructure comparison, Web AI layer, and review package. | Detailed performance evidence remains condition-labeled. |
| How is risk controlled? | Strong statements are paired with boundaries: comparison evidence, prototype boundary, public-scope summary, or next validation step. | Scope language, public scans, wording rules, and readiness tables. | External review would further strengthen the package. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 2. enterprise review lens in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 2. Enterprise Review Lens describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 3. Evidence Register

This register describes what each public evidence type proves and what it does not prove.

| Evidence type | What it proves | Development meaning | Boundary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Comparison evidence | Security-module, validator-workflow, and LLM-infrastructure comparison evidence exists. | Shows developed module behavior under stated conditions. | Does not prove universal performance. |
| Website | The portfolio is live and organized. | Shows public packaging and Web AI development layer. | Not external certification. |
| PDF package | Fields are split by research area. | Supports presentation and review. | Needs updates as evidence grows. |
| Screenshots | Visual state and deployment checks were captured. | Helps verify public presentation state. | Not a technical audit by itself. |
| Text scans | Sensitive public wording is controlled. | Supports safe public release. | Does not replace legal or security review. |
| Roadmap | Remaining work is stated. | Keeps the presentation honest. | Future work remains future work. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 3. evidence register in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 3. Evidence Register describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 4. Statement-to-Evidence Map

This page connects the strongest public statements to concrete evidence and review boundaries.

| Public statement | Evidence item | Reviewer check | Boundary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Formysec develops AI security infrastructure. | Portfolio structure page, topology, and master PDF. | Confirm the chain: security base, modules, foundation, acceleration, Web AI. | Public system map only. |
| RMEP is structure-first module development. | RMEP PDF and external comparison register. | Check that structure is presented as the source and execution paths carry it. | Not a final-standard statement. |
| The strongest public story is comparison-backed and evidence-linked. | Security-module comparison, validator-workflow comparison, LLM-infrastructure comparison, and implementation-check summaries. | Check workload, environment, baseline, and status labels. | Condition-labeled records only. |
| LLM work is AI infrastructure development. | Cache, routing, streaming API, Web AI behavior, and LLM infrastructure comparison evidence. | Check the LLM section and LLM PDF. | Performance depends on baseline and workload. |
| The package is ready for public review. | Live site, six PDF links, deployment checks, text scans, and scope pages. | Open the site and PDF set. | Review package, not external certification. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 4. statement-to-evidence map in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 4. Statement-to-Evidence Map describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 5. Review Route Map

This table tells a presenter where to begin depending on who is reviewing the portfolio.

| Audience | Start here | Open next | Close with |
|---|---|---|---|
| Non-specialist reviewer | Overview and architecture. | Master portfolio PDF. | One AI security infrastructure stack, explained without private internals. |
| Security reviewer | Architecture, external comparison, and baseline comparison. | RMEP PDF and FHE/ZK/VFHE PDF. | RMEP is structure-first; records stay condition-labeled. |
| AI systems reviewer | LLM acceleration layer and Web AI delivery path. | LLM acceleration and Web AI PDF. | AI work is service infrastructure, not simple model use. |
| Evidence reviewer | External comparison register, evidence index, and scope language. | Evidence and scope PDF. | Evidence is organized; protected internals remain excluded. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 5. review route map in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 5. Review Route Map describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 6. Presentation Timing

This table keeps short and long presentations consistent.

| Time | What to show | What to say | What not to overstate |
|---|---|---|---|
| 30 seconds | Hero and overview. | Formysec develops an AI security infrastructure stack from modules to Web AI. | Do not start with internal benchmark numbers. |
| 3 minutes | Architecture and external comparison register. | The layout separates what was built from how it compares externally. | Do not turn records into universal guarantees. |
| 10 minutes | Tracks, baseline comparison, evidence, readiness, and PDFs. | Each area has a role, result, comparison point, and boundary. | Do not expose private construction details. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 6. presentation timing in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 6. Presentation Timing describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 7. Public Evidence Density Ledger

This page answers the portfolio-review question: is there enough public material to evaluate the work without exposing private internals?

| Evidence block | What is now public | What it proves | Boundary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Architecture evidence | Stack map, layer roles, foundation path, and public boundary language. | The work is organized as one AI security development program. | Architecture-level public explanation only. |
| External comparison evidence | Security-module comparison, validator-workflow comparison, LLM-infrastructure comparison, implementation-check summaries, and public package checks. | Core technical statements are tied to measured or test-backed records. | Records are condition-labeled and should not be generalized. |
| Comparison evidence | Baseline comparison tables for security modules, validation path, LLM acceleration, and Web AI delivery. | Reviewers can see what each part improves or complements. | Some directions remain candidate or prototype-labeled. |
| Delivery evidence | Live site, PDF links, deployment checks, screenshots, and text scans. | The package is deployed and reviewable, not just written. | Checks verify public packaging, not external security approval. |
| Scope evidence | Public wording rules, private-internal exclusions, and presentation notes. | The public version is strong while protected details stay private. | Not a substitute for formal external review. |
| Adjacent system evidence | AIME chain identity review, FairVote governance protocol records, and evidence automation workflow. | The portfolio has breadth beyond one module family. | Used as build evidence, not as external certification. |
| Enterprise review evidence | Lab capability framing, enterprise review lens, readiness table, and presentation route. | A company reviewer can see capability, delivery, evidence, risk control, and next validation steps quickly. | Business-facing framing does not change technical boundaries. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 7. public evidence density ledger in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 7. Public Evidence Density Ledger describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 8. Public Wording Control

The wording should be strong but not exposed. This table gives the safer public phrasing.

| Topic | Better public wording | Why it works | Avoid |
|---|---|---|---|
| AI work | Develops LLM acceleration and Web AI system infrastructure. | Makes the work sound like system development. | Wording that sounds like simple model access. |
| Security modules | Developed RMEP security modules with condition-labeled records. | Strong but scoped. | Universal performance statements. |
| Private internals | Private internals remain outside public disclosure. | Clear and professional. | Detailed protected construction language. |
| Readiness | Public portfolio readiness. | Prevents product-certification confusion. | Production guarantee language. |
| Scoped evidence | Scoped evidence under selected conditions. | Keeps records credible. | Context-free metrics. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 8. public wording control in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 8. Public Wording Control describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 9. Goal Achievement Status

This table should be included in the evidence package because it answers the user's original goal directly.

| Goal area | Original target | Current readiness view | Remaining strengthening step |
|---|---|---|---|
| Security module packaging | Show RMEP and related security modules as a credible development track. | Ready: modules, roles, comparison language, and boundaries are now packaged. | Add more repeatable external comparison tables. |
| FHE/ZK/VFHE presentation | Connect privacy computation and verification direction to AI infrastructure. | Clear: the public story exists while deeper review evidence can still grow. | Add more dated research notes and review examples. |
| LLM acceleration story | Present AI system development rather than ordinary model access. | Strong: acceleration, routing, streaming, API, and Web AI framing are aligned. | Add more model-by-model workload tables. |
| Web AI development layer | Show a developed public AI system layer on the web. | Live: site, links, PDF package, deployment checks, and public scans are ready. | Add richer product-like demos when ready. |
| Evidence packaging | Turn scattered work records into a public review package. | Linked: site and PDF pack exist, while the evidence index can become more formal. | Add a date-based record register and independent review notes. |

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 9. goal achievement status in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 9. Goal Achievement Status describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# 10. Presentation Checklist

Use this checklist before showing the portfolio to another person.

| | |
|---|---|
| **First message**<br>Formysec develops AI security infrastructure and Web AI system layers. | **Second message**<br>The work is organized by modules, records, comparison scope, and public boundaries. |
| **Third message**<br>The strongest public comparison points are RMEP modules, validator workflow, and LLM infrastructure. | **Fourth message**<br>Protected internals remain private while public evidence stays reviewable. |

- Open with the full stack, then zoom into modules.
- For each module, state role, external alternative, difference, advantage, and boundary.
- When discussing AI, emphasize development of acceleration and service infrastructure.
- Keep one consistent research-lab identity across the site and PDFs.

## Presenter Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Plain-English angle**<br>This page explains 10. presentation checklist in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed. | **Technical angle**<br>Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary. |
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | 10. Presentation Checklist describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# Plain-English Presenter Guide

This page gives the short explanation before a deeper technical review. It is designed for non-specialists and for fast presentation flow.

| Review step | What it explains | What evidence follows | Do not mix with |
|---|---|---|---|
| Thesis | Formysec develops AI security infrastructure from modules to Web AI. | Master portfolio and topology. | Internal benchmark details. |
| Enterprise lens | A small research lab produced a broad, reviewable security and AI infrastructure package. | Enterprise review table and evidence ledger. | Universal deployment promises. |
| Architecture | Security base, RMEP modules, foundation, LLM acceleration, and Web AI delivery. | Stack map and layer descriptions. | Baseline comparison. |
| External comparison | Comparison evidence for module role, validation workflow, consistency, and LLM infrastructure. | Security-module comparison, validator-workflow comparison, LLM-infrastructure comparison, and implementation-check summaries. | General overview language. |
| Track details | Each field gets its own role, value, evidence style, and boundary. | Field PDFs and component pages. | One overloaded table. |
| Comparison | What the work may replace, complement, or improve. | Baseline comparison table. | Private construction details. |
| Evidence and scope | What is public, what was checked, and what remains private. | Evidence PDF, public scans, live checks. | Sensitive internal design notes. |

## Reviewer Q&A;

| Reviewer question | Short answer | Evidence to point at | Boundary |
|---|---|---|---|
| What is the portfolio? | A technical review package for AI security infrastructure built from modules, foundation work, LLM acceleration, and Web AI. | Portfolio structure page and master PDF. | Private internals excluded. |
| Why should a company care? | It shows a lean lab with broad execution: security modules, AI acceleration, Web AI delivery, protocol builds, and evidence control. | Enterprise review lens, evidence ledger, and live site. | Not a final product approval statement. |
| Where is the evidence? | It is organized in the external comparison register so evidence does not get mixed with overview text. | External comparison table and evidence PDF. | Records are condition-labeled. |
| How is RMEP framed? | RMEP is structure-first module development; execution paths carry the structure rather than replace it. | RMEP PDF and result register. | Not a final-standard statement. |
| Is this ordinary model access? | No. The public position is development of acceleration code, routing, API behavior, Web AI layer, and evidence packaging. | LLM acceleration PDF and Web AI section. | Performance varies by workload and baseline. |

## Presenter Notes

**Plain-English angle**
This page explains plain-english presenter guide in simple terms: what was developed, why it matters, and how it should be reviewed.

**Technical angle**
Focus on component role, existing-role comparison, advantage, limit, evidence type, and public boundary.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Strong answer**<br>Start with the developed part, compare it with a familiar external role, then state the boundary so the statement stays credible. | **Review caution**<br>Keep protected construction details outside the public explanation and point back to the published evidence package. |

## Review Questions

| Reviewer question | Public answer |
|---|---|
| What was developed? | Plain-English Presenter Guide describes a developed part of the Formysec stack and connects it to the larger AI security infrastructure story. |
| How is it different? | The page compares the developed role against an existing technical role, then explains the advantage and the current evidence. |
| What is the boundary? | The public answer stays with component role, external comparison, readiness state, and public evidence while protected construction details remain excluded. |

# Public Boundary and Presentation Notes

This final page keeps the package strong and objective during presentation.

- The document presents component roles, external comparison labels, evidence scope, and readiness state.
- Private technical internals, protected implementation details, and sensitive construction notes stay outside this public package.
- Performance evidence remains tied to workload, environment, review method, and external comparison baseline.
- The language is intentionally objective: strong enough for a technical presentation, careful enough for review.

## Recommended speaking frame

- Say that Formysec develops AI security infrastructure across security modules, execution foundations, LLM acceleration, and Web AI system layers.
- Say records are review records with stated boundaries, not universal production guarantees.
- Say that the portfolio is designed to be understandable without exposing protected internal construction.
- When asked for deeper internals, redirect to public component roles, comparison evidence, and review roadmap.