

RFC-0509 v0.8 Version Note

Receiving-Boundary Reliance Grammar

Public download-page companion note | July 2026

Document	RFC-0509 v0.8 Version Note
Purpose	Short public-facing version note for the RFC-0509 download page.
Applies to	01 - RFC-0509 - Receiving-Boundary Reliance Grammar - Public Draft v0.8.docx
Status	Companion note only; not a certification, legal opinion, conformance approval, or protected implementation disclosure.

Summary

RFC-0509 v0.8 is a controlled public draft update to the v0.7.1 receiving-boundary grammar. The update hardens the draft around receiver-side outcome signaling, proof-attribute verification posture, receiver-side conformance, and public-reference controls while preserving the core premise: *better proof is supply; receiver need is demand; RFC-0509 is the grammar that lets them meet at the boundary.*

What changed from v0.7.1 to v0.8

- Distinguishes proof-side presentment from receiver-side local outcome records.
- Narrows the normative boundary outcome vocabulary to ACCEPT, HOLD, NARROW, and REFUSE.
- Separates boundary outcomes from receiver-internal process states such as escalation, manual review, override, reconstruction, regulatory notification, and other internal workflows.
- Distinguishes object-verifiable proof attributes from custody-posture, deployment, or key-custody claims requiring separate attestation or deployment evidence.
- Adds argument-commitment posture language, including whole-payload commitment, field-level commitment, selective-disclosure commitment, and opaque digest distinctions.
- Adds receiver-side local outcome record language for records that preserve receiver requirements applied, proof attributes evaluated, fit result, boundary outcome, reason codes, scope, limitations, and consequence posture.
- Adds receiver-side conformance requirements to distinguish genuine receiver-side reliance formation from field parsing, proof-side profile mapping, vendor-side evaluation, or signed-record issuance alone.
- Recognizes interested-receiver or self-confirmation risk as a receiver-posture consideration without creating an independence-certification regime.
- Clarifies public reference, self-assessed compatibility, and controlled approval claims.
- Preserves receiver sovereignty, receiver-local reliance, non-transitive outcomes, and anti-badge / anti-certification posture.

Boundary outcome vocabulary

RFC-0509 v0.8 uses the following minimal normative boundary outcome set:

Outcome	Receiver-local meaning
ACCEPT	The presented proof satisfies the receiver requirements for the requested action or processing context.
HOLD	Qualification cannot be resolved at this time; processing is suspended, delayed, or paused pending receiver-local resolution.
NARROW	Proof satisfies requirements only for a restricted subset of the requested scope, consequence, exposure, or time window.
REFUSE	Proof does not satisfy receiver qualification requirements; no local reliance is granted for the requested context.

Escalation, manual review, reconstruction, override, regulatory notification, board approval, and similar steps are not normative boundary outcomes. They may be receiver-internal process states disclosed as optional metadata if the receiver chooses.

Public-reference and conformance posture

Public reference to RFC-0509 is permitted for discussion, implementation analysis, interoperability research, proof-side profile mapping, and receiver-boundary design. A party may describe its own work as mapped to, informed by, or designed for interoperability with RFC-0509 if the statement is accurate and does not imply endorsement, certification, commercial alignment, receiver reliance, or profile approval by 3PMobile.

Controlled approval claims remain restricted. Claims such as RFC-0509 certified, 3PMobile approved, officially conformant, approved RFC-0509 profile, joint architecture, commercial alignment with 3PMobile, or access to a receiving-boundary consequence layer require prior written approval from 3PMobile.

Receiver-side conformance is not field parsing. A receiver-side implementation must preserve receiver-controlled requirement expression, evaluate proof attributes against those receiver requirements, record an explicit receiver-local boundary outcome, preserve reason codes and scope limitations, and make the resulting local outcome record inspectable as the receiver's decision. Proof-side profile mapping, vendor-side evaluation, or issuance of a signed record alone is not sufficient.

What RFC-0509 v0.8 does not do

- It does not define one universal proof object.
- It does not certify proof objects, profiles, vendors, or implementations.
- It does not decide reliance, liability, settlement, legal effect, economic value, or consequence attachment.
- It does not grant commercial alignment with 3PMobile.
- It does not require a receiver to accept any proof object, attestation, receipt, credential, or compliance packet.
- It does not make one receiver's outcome binding on another receiver.

Recommended website use

This version note is intended to sit next to the RFC-0509 v0.8 download link. It is a public-facing orientation note, not a substitute for the RFC text and not a detailed internal change history.