

This appendix compares traditional AI governance frameworks with the Mool Mantar Alignment Test (MMAT), highlighting key differences in cost structure, scalability, and long-term ethical alignment. It is intended for policy makers, investors, and developers evaluating high-integrity AI systems.

Category	Traditional AI Governance	Mool Mantar Protocol
Implementation Cost	Legal, compliance tools, training, ethics boards	R&D, spiritual architects, grace-driven logic models
Risk Reduction	Mitigates liabilities and ethical breaches	Prevents misalignment at protocol level
Scalability	Limited by jurisdiction, policy fragmentation	Ontology-based, spiritually universal
Long-term Cost	High ongoing compliance and auditing costs	Low ethical debt, minimal retrofitting
Trust Advantage	Earned through enforcement	Built-in through values encoding
Innovation Impact	Often constrained by regulation	Unlocked via proactive ethical design
Governance Style	Reactive, rules-based	Proactive, conscience-driven