

Contents

Universal Quality Gates - Kleis Verification Across Domains	1
Status	1
Core Principle	1
Domain Applications	1
The Universal Pattern	14
The Universal Pattern	26
Why This Works: Game Theory	27
Implementation Strategy	28
Market Opportunity	28
Social Impact	29
Challenges & Risks	29
Roadmap	30
Vision Statement	30

Universal Quality Gates - Kleis Verification Across Domains

Status

Vision Document - How Kleis verification principles apply beyond mathematics

Core Principle

“Quality gates reduce volume but increase value”

Requiring formal verification before submission/application: - Reduces volume by 50-90% (self-filtering) - Increases quality by 200-400% (only verified work submitted) - Lowers processing costs (fewer items to review) - Increases outcome value (better decisions, fewer errors)

This principle applies to **any structured domain** where: 1. Many submissions, few accepted 2. Manual review is expensive 3. Errors are costly 4. Quality matters more than quantity

Domain Applications

1. Grant/Funding Applications

The Problem Today NSF/NIH receives: 50,000 grant proposals/year - Review cost: \$500/proposal \times 50,000 = **\$25M/year** - Acceptance rate: ~20% (40,000 rejections) - Common rejection reasons: - Budget doesn't add up - Timeline infeasible - Claimed results mathematically impossible - References to non-existent prior work

Pain: Reviewers waste time on nonsense proposals.

With Kleis Verification

```
structure GrantProposal {  
    title: String  
    budget: Budget
```

```

timeline: Timeline
personnel: List<Person>
deliverables: List<Deliverable>

// Financial axioms
axiom budget_balance:
    budget.total = sum(budget.line_items.map( i. i.amount))

axiom overhead_correct:
    budget.overhead = budget.direct_costs * institution.overhead_rate

axiom salary_realistic:
    p personnel. p.salary max_salary(p.position, p.location)

// Timeline axioms
axiom deliverables_before_deadline:
    d deliverables. d.completion_date project_end_date

axiom dependencies_ordered:
    d1,d2 deliverables.
        d2.depends_on(d1) d1.completion_date < d2.start_date

axiom timeline_realistic:
    d deliverables. d.effort_months available_person_months(d.period)

// Feasibility axioms
axiom expertise_match:
    d deliverables. p personnel. p.expertise.covers(d.requirements)

axiom prior_results_exist:
    ref preliminary_results. verify_citation(ref) = true
}

```

```

// Submit proposal
my_proposal: GrantProposal = {...}

```

```

verify my_proposal
// budget_balance: Off by $15,000
// timeline_realistic: Year 2 overcommitted by 8 person-months
// prior_results_exist: Citation [23] not found

```

Fix errors → re-verify → All axioms pass → Submit

Impact Submissions: 50,000 → 15,000/year (-70%) - Self-filtering: Proposers fix errors before submission - AI-generated spam eliminated - Only serious, well-planned proposals submitted

Review cost: \$25M → \$8M/year (-68%) - Reviewers focus on scientific merit (not arithmetic errors) - Faster decisions (clear signal, less noise)

Acceptance rate: 20% → 40% (of submitted) - Higher absolute quality - Better use of funding

Quality: - Before: 30% of funded grants have budget/timeline issues - After: <5% have issues (mostly unforeseen circumstances)

2. Job Applications

The Problem Today **Large company receives:** 10,000 applications/position - HR cost: 30 min/application × 10,000 = **5,000 hours** - 99% rejected (9,900 don't meet requirements) - False claims: ~30% of resumes contain exaggerations/lies

Pain: HR drowns in unqualified applications.

With Kleis Verification

```
structure JobApplication {
  applicant: Person
  position: JobPosting
  resume: Resume
  cover_letter: Text

  // Qualification axioms
  axiom education_requirements:
    position.requires_degree
    d applicant.education.
      d.level position.min_degree
      verify_credential(d) = true

  axiom experience_requirements:
    applicant.years_experience position.min_experience
    exp applicant.experience. verify_employment(exp) = true

  axiom skill_match:
    position.required_skills applicant.skills
    skill applicant.skills. verify_certification(skill) = true

  axiom work_authorization:
    applicant.can_work_in(position.location) = true

  axiom salary_expectations:
    applicant.salary_expectation position.salary_range

  axiom no_employment_gaps_unexplained:
    gap detect_gaps(applicant.experience).
      gap.duration < 6_months gap.explained = true

  // Verification of claims
  axiom references_real:
```

```

    ref  applicant.references. verify_contact(ref) = true

    axiom achievements_verifiable:
      achievement  applicant.achievements.
        achievement.evidence_provided = true
  }

// Applicant submits
my_application: JobApplication = {...}

verify my_application
//  education_requirements: Degree claim cannot be verified
//  skill_match: "Expert in Rust" but no certification/portfolio
//  experience_requirements: Verified via LinkedIn/references

```

Impact Applications: 10,000 → 500/position (**-95%**) - Self-filtering: Unqualified don't bother applying - False claims caught before submission - AI-generated mass applications blocked

HR cost: 5,000 hours → 250 hours (**-95%**) - Review only qualified candidates - No time wasted on spam - Faster hiring cycles

Quality: - Before: 1% of applicants are great fit - After: 30% of applicants are great fit (**30× better signal**)

Verified credentials: - No more fake degrees - No more inflated experience - References actually checked

3. Accounting Audits

The Problem Today Public company audit: - Review 100,000 transactions manually - Cost: \$500K - \$2M for major audit - Time: 3-6 months - Errors still slip through (Enron, WorldCom)

Pain: Manual checking is expensive and fallible.

With Kleis Verification

```

structure FinancialStatement {
  assets: List<Asset>
  liabilities: List<Liability>
  equity: Equity
  revenue: Revenue
  expenses: Expenses

  // Fundamental accounting equation
  axiom balance_sheet:
    sum(assets.map( a. a.value)) =
      sum(liabilities.map( l. l.value)) + equity.value

  axiom revenue_recognition:

```

```

    r    revenue.
    r.recognized_date = service_delivered_date
    r.amount = contract_value

axiom expense_matching:
    e    expenses.
    e.period = revenue_period(e.related_revenue)

axiom depreciation_correct:
    a    assets. a.type = Fixed
    a.annual_depreciation = (a.cost - a.salvage) / a.useful_life

axiom no_double_counting:
    t    transactions.
    count(t in all_accounts) = 1

axiom cash_flow_reconciles:
    cash_flow.net =
        operations_cash_flow + investing_cash_flow + financing_cash_flow

// Fraud detection axioms
axiom benford_law:
    leading_digit_distribution(revenue.amounts)    benford_distribution
    // Deviation indicates potential fraud

axiom related_party_disclosed:
    t    transactions. t.related_party = true    t.disclosed = true
}

// Company submits financials
acme_2024: FinancialStatement = {...}

verify acme_2024
//  balance_sheet: Assets - Liabilities - Equity = $1.2M (should be 0)
//  depreciation_correct: Building depreciation incorrect
//  benford_law: First digit distribution suspicious (possible fraud flag)

```

Impact **Audit cost:** \$1M → \$100K (-90%) - Automated verification handles mechanical checks
- Auditors focus on judgment calls - Real-time verification (not post-quarter)

Error detection: 70% → 98% (+40% **improvement**) - Mathematical errors caught automatically - Fraud indicators flagged immediately - No more “oops, forgot to carry the 1”

Audit time: 3 months → 2 weeks - Continuous verification during quarter - Final audit just validates exceptions - Faster close process

Fraud prevention: - Benford’s law violations auto-flagged - Double-counting impossible - Related party transactions must be disclosed

4. Research Grant Reports (NSF/NIH Progress Reports)

The Problem Annual progress reports: Often contain: - Claimed results that don't match math - Budgets that don't reconcile - Timelines that ignore dependencies - Deliverables copied from proposal (not actual progress)

Review: Program officers manually check → miss errors → bad projects continue

With Kleis

```
structure ProgressReport {
  grant: GrantProposal // Original proposal
  period: TimeInterval
  spending: Spending
  accomplishments: List<Accomplishment>

  axiom budget_within_limit:
    spending.total ≤ grant.budget.allocated_for(period)

  axiom spending_matches_activities:
    expense ≤ spending.items.
      activity ≤ accomplishments.
        expense.related_to(activity)

  axiom deliverable_progress:
    d ≤ grant.deliverables.
      d.due_date ≤ period.end ∧ d.status = Completed

  axiom results_mathematically_valid:
    result ≤ accomplishments.
      result.formula ≤ verify_types(result.formula) = true

  axiom personnel_effort:
    p ≤ personnel.
      reported_effort(p) = actual_payroll(p) / p.salary
}
```

Impact: Stops fraud, ensures accountability, faster reviews.

5. Academic Hiring Committees

The Problem University receives: 1,000 faculty applications - Review: 3 faculty × 40 hours each = **120 hours/person** - Many unqualified applicants - CV inflation common

With Kleis

```

structure FacultyApplication {
  cv: CV
  research_statement: Text
  teaching_statement: Text
  publications: List<Publication>

  axiom publication_record:
    pub  publications.
      verify_doi(pub.doi) = true
      applicant  pub.authors

  axiom h_index_accurate:
    calculated_h_index(publications) = claimed_h_index

  axiom teaching_experience:
    years_teaching  years_since_phd + 6  // PhD + postdoc

  axiom grant_funding_real:
    grant  claimed_grants.
      verify_grant_database(grant) = true
}

```

Applications: 1,000 \rightarrow 50 (-95%) **Review time:** 120 hours \rightarrow 20 hours (-83%) **Quality:** Only qualified candidates get reviewed

6. Legal Contract Review

The Problem **Law firm reviews:** 1,000 contracts/year manually - Cost: \$500/hour \times 3 hours/contract \times 1,000 = **\$1.5M/year** - Errors: Boilerplate mistakes, inconsistent terms, missing clauses

With Kleis

```

structure LegalContract {
  parties: List<Party>
  terms: List<ContractTerm>
  jurisdiction: Jurisdiction

  axiom mutual_consent:
    p  parties. p.signed = true  p.capacity = Legal

  axiom consideration:
    t1,t2  terms.
      t1.benefits(party_1)  t2.benefits(party_2)

  axiom dates_consistent:
    effective_date  termination_date

```

```

        milestone    terms.milestone.date    [effective, termination]

axiom jurisdiction_clauses:
    governing_law.jurisdiction = jurisdiction
    dispute_resolution.venue    jurisdiction.valid_venues

axiom mandatory_clauses_present:
    jurisdiction.required_clauses    contract.clauses
}

```

Review cost: \$1.5M → \$300K (-80%) **Errors:** 5% → 0.1% (98% reduction)

7. Insurance Claims Processing

The Problem Insurance company: 1M claims/year - Review cost: \$50/claim × 1M = \$50M/year - Fraud: 10% of claims (~\$5B/year in US) - Processing time: 30 days average

With Kleis

```

structure InsuranceClaim {
    policy: Policy
    incident: Incident
    claimed_amount: Currency

    axiom policy_active:
        incident.date    [policy.start_date, policy.end_date]

    axiom covered_peril:
        incident.type    policy.covered_perils

    axiom within_limits:
        claimed_amount    policy.coverage_limit

    axiom deductible_applied:
        payout = max(0, claimed_amount - policy.deductible)

    axiom no_duplicate_claim:
        ¬other_claim. other_claim.incident_id = this.incident_id

    axiom timeline_plausible:
        incident.date    claim.filing_date    incident.date + 30_days

    // Fraud detection
    axiom amounts_reasonable:
        claimed_amount    reasonable_range(incident.type, incident.severity)

    axiom pattern_detection:

```



```

    claimant.claim_frequency < suspicious_threshold
}

```

Impact: - **Auto-approve:** 60% of claims (pass all axioms instantly) - **Flag for review:** 30% (axiom warnings) - **Auto-reject:** 10% (clear violations, likely fraud)

Cost: \$50M → \$10M (-80%) **Fraud:** \$5B → \$500M (-90%) **Processing time:** 30 days → 1 day for auto-approved

8. Building Permits

The Problem City receives: 10,000 permit applications/year - Review: 2 weeks/permit average - Common issues: Code violations, missing calculations, unsafe designs - Cost: City employs 50 reviewers full-time

With Kleis

```

structure BuildingPermit {
  design: StructuralDesign
  location: Address
  zoning: ZoningDistrict

  axiom zoning_compliance:
    design.height    zoning.max_height
    design.setback   zoning.min_setback
    design.use       zoning.permitted_uses

  axiom structural_safety:
    member    design.structural_members.
    stress(member, design.loads)    member.material.yield_strength / safety_factor

  axiom load_calculations:
    design.live_load    building_code.min_live_load(design.use)
    design.dead_load = sum(design.components.map( c. c.weight))

  axiom egress_requirements:
    design.exits.count    required_exits(design.occupancy)
    exit    design.exits. exit.width    code.min_exit_width

  axiom accessibility:
    design.ada_compliant = true
}

```

Impact: - **Auto-approve:** 40% instantly (all code requirements met) - **Expedited review:** 40% (minor issues flagged) - **Full review:** 20% (complex/novel designs)

Staffing: 50 reviewers → 15 reviewers (-70%) **Approval time:** 2 weeks → 2 days for auto-approved

9. Tax Returns (IRS) - And Tax Laws Written in Kleis!

The Revolutionary Insight Instead of checking returns against natural-language tax code, write the tax code ITSELF in Kleis.

The Problem with Current Tax Laws **U.S. Tax Code:** 70,000+ pages of natural language - Ambiguous phrasing → different interpretations - Loopholes from unclear wording - Expensive tax lawyers needed to interpret - IRS and taxpayers often disagree - Courts decide what laws “really mean” - Software bugs from misreading code

Example ambiguity:

"Ordinary and necessary business expenses may be deducted"

- What is "ordinary"?
- What is "necessary"?
- Courts decide case-by-case

Tax Code in Kleis (Executable Law)

```
// U.S. Tax Code (Kleis Edition)
// Title 26, Section 162(a) - Business Expenses

structure BusinessExpense {
  amount: Currency
  category: ExpenseCategory
  business: Business

  axiom ordinary_expense:
    category industry_standard_expenses(business.industry)
    amount industry_median(category, business.size) × 2.0

  axiom necessary_expense:
    expense.directly_related_to(business.revenue_activities) = true

  axiom deductible_calculation:
    deductible_amount = amount × business_use_percentage

  // Specific exclusions (unambiguous)
  axiom not_capital_expenditure:
    useful_life(expense) < 1_year amount < 2500

  axiom not_personal:
    expense.personal_benefit_percentage < 0.1
}

// Standard deduction (2024 example)
axiom standard_deduction_2024:
```

```

    standard_deduction(Single) = 14600
    standard_deduction(MarriedFilingJointly) = 29200
    standard_deduction(HeadOfHousehold) = 21900

// Tax brackets (2024)
operation tax_liability : (Currency, FilingStatus) → Currency
  // No ambiguity - exact formula
  match (status, taxable_income) {
    (Single, income) if income < 11600 => income × 0.10,
    (Single, income) if income < 47150 => 1160 + (income - 11600) × 0.12,
    (Single, income) if income < 100525 => 5426 + (income - 47150) × 0.22,
    // ... etc
  }

structure TaxReturn {
  taxpayer: Person
  income: Income
  deductions: List<Deduction>
  credits: List<Credit>

  // AUTOMATICALLY VERIFIED AGAINST TAX CODE AXIOMS

  axiom income_matches_w2:
    income.wages = sum(taxpayer.w2_forms.map(w. w.wages))

  axiom deduction_limits:
    d deductions.
    // Direct reference to tax code axioms!
    verify(d, BusinessExpense) verify(d, CharitableDonation) ...

  axiom standard_or_itemized:
    deductions.type = Standard deductions.type = Itemized

  axiom tax_calculation:
    // References executable tax_liability function from tax code
    tax = tax_liability(taxable_income, filing_status) - credits
}

```

The Transformation Current state:

```

Tax Code (natural language)
  ↓ [interpreted by]
IRS regulations (more text)
  ↓ [interpreted by]
Tax software developers (bugs possible)
  ↓ [interpreted by]
Tax preparers (errors possible)
  ↓

```

Taxpayer return
↓ [checked manually]
IRS auditor

With Kleis:

Tax Code (executable Kleis)
↓ [IS the implementation]
Taxpayer return (Kleis)
↓ [automatic verification]
Verified or Errors flagged

Zero interpretation needed - the code IS the law.

Benefits: Tax Code as Executable Specification 1. **No Ambiguity** - “Ordinary and necessary” → precise algorithmic definition - Courts don’t need to interpret (it’s unambiguous) - Everyone sees same rules (transparent)

2. Instant Compliance Checking

```
// Citizen writes their return
my_return: TaxReturn = {
  income: 75000,
  deductions: [business_expense(500, "office supplies")],
  ...
}
```

```
// Instant verification against tax code
verify my_return against us_tax_code_2024
// business_expense(500, "office supplies"):
// Not ordinary for your industry (software, remote work)
// Did you mean "home office equipment"?
```

3. No Tax Software Bugs - TurboTax, H&R Block just *call* Kleis tax code - Implementation = law (by definition correct) - No more “software calculated wrong amount”

4. Version Control for Laws

```
git diff us_tax_code_2023.kleis us_tax_code_2024.kleis
```

```
+ axiom energy_credit_2024:
+   solar_installation.credit_rate = 0.30
- axiom energy_credit_2023:
-   solar_installation.credit_rate = 0.26
```

Citizens see EXACTLY what changed

5. Impact Analysis Before Passing Laws

```
// Proposed change: Increase standard deduction
axiom proposed_standard_deduction_2024:
  standard_deduction(Single) = 16000 // Up from 14600
```

```
// Simulate impact on 150M returns
impact = simulate(tax_returns_2023, proposed_change)
// Result:
//   Revenue loss: $45B
//   Affected taxpayers: 85M
//   Average savings: $529/taxpayer
//   Distribution by income bracket: [chart]

// Congress sees EXACTLY what law does before voting
```

6. Eliminates Tax Court Ambiguity

Current: "Is home office deduction ordinary and necessary?"
 → Tax Court decides
 → Years of litigation
 → Precedent only

Kleis: "Does this expense satisfy BusinessExpense axioms?"
 → Verify → Answer is yes or no
 → Instant
 → No litigation needed (unambiguous)

Impact on Society IRS: - Processing: \$4B → \$400M (-90%) - Fraud: \$50B → \$5B (-90%) - Audit staff: 75,000 → 15,000 (-80%) - **Saves:** \$3.6B/year + \$45B in fraud

Taxpayers: - Instant verification (not 21-day wait) - No ambiguity (know exactly what's allowed) - No expensive tax preparers for simple returns - Can verify H&R Block got it right - **Saves:** ~\$10B/year in preparation fees

Congress: - Impact analysis before passing laws - No unintended consequences - Version-controlled legislation - Transparent to citizens

Tax Attorneys: - Less work on interpretation - More work on legitimate optimization - Focus on intent, not ambiguity

Political Feasibility Why Congress would adopt this: - Transparency demands (citizens can read executable code) - Cost savings (IRS efficiency) - Fraud reduction (huge political win) - Constituent benefit (faster refunds) - Eliminates "gotcha" taxes (rules are clear)

Objections: - "Lawyers make money from ambiguity" → True, but voters want clarity - "Tax code too complex for code" → Kleis handles complexity better than natural language - "Special interests like loopholes" → Kleis makes loopholes obvious (sunlight is disinfectant)

Precedent: Estonia Estonia already has: - 95% of tax returns filed electronically - Pre-filled returns (government has data) - Average filing time: 3 minutes

With Kleis, Estonia could: - Make tax code executable - Instant verification - Zero interpretation needed - Model for other countries

Impact: 150M Tax Returns/Year

Current: - 150M returns \times \$50 processing = \$7.5B/year - 30% have errors requiring correction
- 45M people pay preparers \$200 avg = \$9B/year - IRS audit cost: \$300M/year - **Total cost to society:** ~\$17B/year

With Kleis Tax Code: - Auto-processing: 95% of returns (-90% manual review) - Errors: 2% (caught before submission) - Preparation: DIY (software = law, unambiguous) - Audits: Automated for simple cases - **Total cost:** ~\$2B/year

Net savings: \$15B/year to American society

The Universal Pattern

10. Loan Applications

The Problem Bank receives: 100,000 mortgage applications/year - Underwriting cost: \$500/app \times 100K = **\$50M/year** - Default rate: 3% (often due to mis-stated income/debt)

With Kleis

```
structure MortgageApplication {
  applicant: Borrower
  property: Property
  loan_amount: Currency

  axiom debt_to_income:
    (applicant.monthly_debt + loan.monthly_payment) / applicant.monthly_income  0.43

  axiom loan_to_value:
    loan_amount / property.appraised_value  0.80

  axiom income_verified:
    income_source  applicant.income.
    verify_w2_or_paystub(income_source) = true

  axiom credit_score:
    applicant.credit_score  620  // Conventional loan minimum

  axiom employment_stable:
    applicant.current_employment.duration  2_years
    applicant.same_field_employment.duration  5_years

  axiom down_payment_sourced:
    down_payment.amount  0.20  $\times$  property.price
    source  down_payment.sources.
```

```

        verify_bank_statements(source) = true
    }

```

Impact: - **Instant decision:** 70% (clear approve/deny) - **Manual review:** 30% (edge cases) -
Processing time: 30 days → 1 day - **Default rate:** 3% → 0.5% (-83% via better screening)

9. Travel Reimbursements

The Problem **Large organization:** 50,000 employees × 4 trips/year = **200,000 reimbursements** - Review: 20 min/request × 200K = **67,000 hours/year** - Common errors: No receipts, over policy limits, duplicate submissions, math errors - Fraud: ~5% of claims have inflated/fake expenses

With Kleis

```

structure TravelReimbursement {
  employee: Employee
  trip: TripDetails
  expenses: List<Expense>
  receipts: List<Receipt>

  axiom receipts_required:
    e  expenses. e.amount > 25    r  receipts. r.matches(e)

  axiom within_policy_limits:
    e  expenses.
      e.amount  policy.max_amount(e.category, e.location)

  axiom trip_authorized:
    trip.approval_date < trip.start_date
    trip.approver.can_authorize(trip.cost)

  axiom dates_consistent:
    e  expenses. e.date  [trip.start_date, trip.end_date + 1_day]

  axiom math_correct:
    claimed_total = sum(expenses.map( e. e.amount))

  axiom no_duplicates:
    ¬ e1,e2  expenses. e1.receipt_id = e2.receipt_id

  axiom mileage_reasonable:
    e  expenses. e.type = Mileage
      e.miles  map_distance(e.origin, e.destination) × 1.2

  axiom per_diem_or_meals:
    ¬(claimed_per_diem  e  expenses. e.type = Meal)

```

```

    // Cannot claim both
}

```

Impact: - **Auto-approve:** 80% (all rules satisfied, receipts attached) - **Flag for review:** 15% (missing receipts, over limit) - **Reject:** 5% (clear fraud indicators)

Processing time: 2 weeks → 1 day **Cost:** 67K hours → 10K hours (-85%) **Fraud:** 5% → 0.5% (-90%)

10. FAFSA (Student Financial Aid)

The Problem US Department of Education: 17 million FAFSA applications/year - Processing: Complex verification, income checks, dependency status - Errors: 30% of applications have mistakes requiring correction - Fraud: \$500M/year in improper aid disbursement - Time: 3-6 weeks for processing

With Kleis

```

structure FAFSAApplication {
  student: Student
  family: FamilyInfo
  income: IncomeInfo
  assets: AssetInfo

  // Dependency status axioms
  axiom dependency_age:
    student.age 24 student.status = Independent

  axiom dependency_married:
    student.marital_status = Married student.status = Independent

  axiom dependency_military:
    student.military_service = true student.status = Independent

  // Income verification axioms
  axiom income_matches_tax:
    family.reported_income = family.tax_return.agi
    verify_irs_data(family.tax_return) = true

  axiom asset_reporting:
    family.net_worth = sum(assets) - sum(liabilities)

  // EFC calculation axioms
  axiom efc_formula:
    expected_family_contribution =
      federal_methodology(family.income, family.assets, family.size)

  axiom pell_eligibility:

```



```

    elif efc < pell_threshold: eligible_for_pell = true

axiom loan_limits:
    requested_loans    federal_loan_limit(student.year, student.dependency)

// Consistency checks
axiom family_size_reasonable:
    family.household_size =
        count(family.members.filter(m. m.supported_by_student_family))

axiom school_attendance:
    student.enrolled_at_least_half_time = true

// Fraud prevention
axiom income_pattern_normal:
    family.income_this_year    family.income_last_year ± 0.5
    family.income_change_explained = true
}

```

Impact: - **Auto-process:** 11M applications (**65%** - all checks pass) - **Simple verification:** 5M (**30%** - minor issues, quick fix) - **Full review:** 1M (**5%** - complex situations)

Processing time: 3-6 weeks → 1 day for verified **Error rate:** 30% → 2% (**-93%**) **Fraud:** \$500M/year → \$50M/year (**-90%**) **Staff savings:** 1,000 processors → 200 (**-80%**)

Student benefit: - Know eligibility instantly (not 6 weeks later) - Clear error messages (not vague rejections) - Auto-correction suggestions - Faster aid disbursement

11. Government Benefits Applications

Unemployment Insurance, Food Stamps, Medicaid **US receives:** ~80M benefit applications/year across programs - Processing cost: \$50/app × 80M = **\$4B/year** - Error rate: 10-15% (improper payments) - Fraud: \$10B/year across all programs

```

structure BenefitApplication {
    applicant: Person
    benefit_type: BenefitProgram
    household: HouseholdInfo

    axiom income_eligibility:
        household.income    benefit_type.income_threshold(household.size)

    axiom asset_limits:
        household.countable_assets    benefit_type.asset_limit

    axiom citizenship_or_status:
        applicant.citizenship = USCitizen
        applicant.status    benefit_type.eligible_statuses
}

```

```

axiom work_requirements:
    benefit_type.requires_job_search
        applicant.job_search_activities    benefit_type.min_activities

axiom no_double_dipping:
    ¬ other_benefit.
        other_benefit.type = this.benefit_type
        other_benefit.active = true

axiom household_composition_verified:
    member    household.members.
        verify_residency(member, household.address) = true
}

```

Impact: - Processing: \$4B → \$800M (-80%) - Errors: 15% → 1% (-93%) - Fraud: \$10B → \$1B (-90%) - Speed: 30 days → 1 day

12. Visa Applications

The Problem US receives: 10M visa applications/year - Processing: 2-12 months - Denial rate: 30% (often due to incomplete/incorrect docs) - Review: Consular officers manually check each

```

structure VisaApplication {
    applicant: ForeignNational
    visa_type: VisaCategory
    documents: List<Document>

    axiom required_documents:
        visa_type.required_docs    documents.map( d. d.type)

    axiom passport_valid:
        applicant.passport.expiry > visa_type.duration + 6_months

    axiom financial_support:
        visa_type.requires_financial_proof
            applicant.bank_balance    visa_type.min_funds
            sponsor.guarantees_support = true

    axiom ties_to_home:
        visa_type = Tourist
            (applicant.owns_property_in_home
             applicant.has_job_in_home
             applicant.has_family_in_home)

    axiom no overstay_risk:
        applicant.previous_visa_compliance = true
}

```

```

    axiom background_clear:
      ¬ violation    disqualifying_violations.
        applicant.history.contains(violation)
  }

```

Impact: - **Instant decision:** 40% (clear approve/deny) - **Interview required:** 30% (need human judgment) - **Rejected before interview:** 30% (clear disqualifications)

Processing time: 6 months → 1 week for verified **Consular officer workload:** -60%

13. Network Protocols & Firewall Rules

The Problem Enterprise networks: - 1,000+ firewall rules per organization - Rules written by hand, applied manually - 60% of breaches due to misconfigured firewalls - Average: 20% of firewall rules are redundant/conflicting - Configuration errors cause 95% of network outages

Protocol implementations: - RFC specifications in natural language → misinterpretations - Packet validation done ad-hoc → vulnerabilities - Routing policies complex → misconfigurations - No formal verification before deployment

Pain: - Security breaches from misconfigured rules - Network outages from conflicting policies - Packet injection attacks from improper validation - Routing loops from policy errors

With Kleis: Network Protocol Verification

```

// IPv4 Packet Structure (RFC 791)
structure IPv4Packet {
  version: Nat           // Must be 4
  ihl: Nat               // Internet Header Length (5-15)
  dscp: Nat              // Differentiated Services
  ecn: Nat               // Explicit Congestion Notification
  total_length: Nat      // Total packet length
  identification: Nat    // Fragment identification
  flags: Flags           // DF, MF flags
  fragment_offset: Nat   // Fragment position
  ttl: Nat               // Time to live (1-255)
  protocol: Protocol     // TCP=6, UDP=17, ICMP=1, etc.
  checksum: Nat          // Header checksum
  source_ip: IPv4Address
  dest_ip: IPv4Address
  options: List<IPv4Option>
  payload: Bytes

  // RFC 791 Axioms - Packet Format Validation
  axiom version_is_four:
    version = 4

  axiom header_length_valid:

```

```

    ihl  5   ihl  15
    ihl * 4 = header_bytes.length

axiom total_length_consistent:
    total_length = (ihl * 4) + payload.length
    total_length 65535

axiom ttl_nonzero:
    ttl > 0    ttl  255

axiom checksum_valid:
    checksum = compute_ipv4_checksum(header_bytes)

axiom fragment_rules:
    (flags.MF = false    fragment_offset = 0)    // Not fragmented
    (flags.MF = true     fragment_offset > 0)     // Fragmented

axiom options_length:
    ihl > 5    options.length = (ihl - 5) * 4

// Security axioms
axiom no_spoofed_source:
    ¬is_private(source_ip)    from_internal_network = true

axiom no_martian_addresses:
    ¬is_martian(source_ip)    ¬is_martian(dest_ip)
    // Martian: 0.0.0.0/8, 127.0.0.0/8, 224.0.0.0/4, etc.
}

// TCP Packet (RFC 793)
structure TCPSegment {
    ip_packet: IPv4Packet
    source_port: Port
    dest_port: Port
    sequence_number: Nat
    ack_number: Nat
    data_offset: Nat
    flags: TCPFlags          // SYN, ACK, FIN, RST, PSH, URG
    window_size: Nat
    checksum: Nat
    urgent_pointer: Nat
    options: List<TCPOption>
    data: Bytes

    axiom protocol_is_tcp:
        ip_packet.protocol = TCP    // 6

    axiom data_offset_valid:

```

```

    data_offset 5    data_offset 15
    data_offset * 4 = tcp_header_bytes.length

axiom checksum_valid:
    checksum = compute_tcp_checksum(ip_packet, tcp_segment)

axiom flag_consistency:
    // Can't have SYN and FIN simultaneously
    ¬(flags.SYN    flags.FIN)
    // ACK must be set if not first SYN
    (flags.SYN    ack_number = 0)    flags.ACK

axiom window_size_reasonable:
    window_size 65535

axiom sequence_number_ordering:
    is_established_connection
        sequence_number > previous_sequence_number
}

```

Firewall Rule Verification

```

structure FirewallRule {
    rule_id: Nat
    priority: Nat
    source_ip: IPRange
    dest_ip: IPRange
    source_port: PortRange
    dest_port: PortRange
    protocol: Protocol
    action: Action          // ALLOW, DENY, REJECT
    direction: Direction   // INBOUND, OUTBOUND
    interface: Interface

    // Rule validity axioms
    axiom ip_ranges_valid:
        is_valid_cidr(source_ip)    is_valid_cidr(dest_ip)

    axiom port_ranges_valid:
        source_port.min    source_port.max
        dest_port.min    dest_port.max
        source_port.max    65535
        dest_port.max    65535

    axiom protocol_port_consistency:
        protocol = ICMP
        (source_port = ANY    dest_port = ANY)
}

```

```

structure FirewallPolicy {
  rules: List<FirewallRule>
  default_action: Action

  // Policy consistency axioms
  axiom no_duplicate_rules:
    r1,r2  rules. r1.rule_id  r2.rule_id
    ¬rules_match_same_traffic(r1, r2)

  axiom no_shadowed_rules:
    r1,r2  rules.
    r1.priority < r2.priority
    r1.matches_superset_of(r2)
    r1.action = r2.action // Otherwise r2 never applies

  axiom no_conflicting_rules:
    r1,r2  rules.
    r1.matches_same_as(r2)  r1.action = r2.action

  axiom explicit_deny_before_allow:
    r_deny,r_allow  rules.
    r_deny.action = DENY  r_allow.action = ALLOW
    r_deny.specificity > r_allow.specificity
    r_deny.priority < r_allow.priority

  axiom no_overly_permissive_rules:
    r  rules. r.action = ALLOW
    ¬(r.source_ip = ANY  r.dest_ip = ANY
    r.dest_port = ANY  r.protocol = ANY)

  // Security best practices
  axiom block_known_malicious_ports:
    r  rules.
    r.dest_port  known_malicious_ports
    r.action = DENY

  axiom rate_limiting_on_public:
    r  rules.
    r.source_ip = ANY  r.direction = INBOUND
    r.has_rate_limit = true
}

```

Routing Protocol Verification

```

structure BGPRoute {
  prefix: IPPrefix
  next_hop: IPv4Address
}

```

```

as_path: List<ASNumber>
local_pref: Nat
med: Nat           // Multi-Exit Discriminator
community: List<Community>

// BGP validity axioms
axiom prefix_valid:
  prefix.length 8  prefix.length 32

axiom no_as_path_loops:
  as  as_path. count(as in as_path) = 1

axiom next_hop_reachable:
  is_directly_connected(next_hop)
  exists_route_to(next_hop)

axiom no_bogon_prefixes:
  ¬is_bogon(prefix)  // 0.0.0.0/8, 10.0.0.0/8, etc.

axiom as_path_not_too_long:
  as_path.length 255

axiom local_pref_for_ibgp_only:
  is_ibgp_session  local_pref  null
}

structure RoutingTable {
  routes: List<Route>
  default_route: Route

  axiom no_routing_loops:
    r  routes. ¬creates_loop(r, routes)

  axiom most_specific_wins:
    r1,r2  routes.
      r1.prefix.contains(r2.prefix)
      r2.prefix.length > r1.prefix.length
      r2 = r1

  axiom next_hop_consistency:
    r  routes.
      r.next_hop  null
      interface. can_reach(r.next_hop, interface)
}

```

Network Configuration Verification

```

structure NetworkConfiguration {
    interfaces: List<NetworkInterface>
    firewall_policy: FirewallPolicy
    routing_table: RoutingTable
    dns_servers: List<IPv4Address>
    ntp_servers: List<IPv4Address>

    // Network-wide consistency axioms
    axiom no_ip_conflicts:
        i1,i2  interfaces.
            i1  i2  i1.ip_address  i2.ip_address

    axiom subnet_consistency:
        i1,i2  interfaces.
            same_subnet(i1.ip_address, i2.ip_address)
            i1.subnet_mask = i2.subnet_mask

    axiom default_gateway_reachable:
        i  interfaces.
            routing_table.default_route.next_hop  i.subnet

    axiom dns_servers_reachable:
        dns  dns_servers.
            route  routing_table. route.can_reach(dns)

    axiom firewall_allows_essential_services:
        allows_dns(firewall_policy)
        allows_ntp(firewall_policy)
        allows_management(firewall_policy)

    // Security axioms
    axiom management_interface_protected:
        i  interfaces. i.type = Management
            firewall_policy.blocks_external_access(i)

    axiom no_promiscuous_mode:
        i  interfaces. i.promiscuous_mode = false
}

```

Real-World Example: Web Server Deployment

```

// Define what a secure web server config looks like
structure WebServerDeployment {
    server_ip: IPv4Address
    https_port: Port          // 443
    http_port: Port           // 80 (redirect only)
    firewall: FirewallPolicy
    network: NetworkConfiguration
}

```



```

axiom https_port_open:
    rule  firewall.rules.
        rule.dest_ip = server_ip
        rule.dest_port = https_port
        rule.protocol = TCP
        rule.action = ALLOW

axiom http_redirect_only:
    rule  firewall.rules.
        rule.dest_port = http_port
        rule.action = ALLOW
    // But application must redirect HTTP → HTTPS

axiom no_plain_http_traffic:
    rule  firewall.rules.
        rule.dest_port = http_port
        rule.action = ALLOW
        application_redirects_to_https = true

axiom management_ports_blocked:
    port  [22, 3389, 5900]. // SSH, RDP, VNC
    rule  firewall.rules.
        rule.dest_ip = server_ip
        rule.dest_port = port
        rule.source_ip = ANY
        rule.action = DENY

axiom rate_limiting_enabled:
    rule  firewall.rules.
        rule.dest_ip = server_ip
        rule.dest_port = https_port
        rule.rate_limit 1000 // requests/second

axiom ddos_protection:
    firewall.has_syn_flood_protection = true
    firewall.has_connection_limit = true
}

// Deploy and verify
my_deployment: WebServerDeployment = {
    server_ip: 203.0.113.42,
    https_port: 443,
    http_port: 80,
    firewall: my_firewall,
    network: my_network
}

```

```

verify my_deployment
//  management_ports_blocked: SSH (port 22) is open to 0.0.0.0/0
//  rate_limiting_enabled: No rate limit on HTTPS rule
//  https_port_open: Verified
//  ddos_protection: Verified

```

Impact: Network Security & Operations Firewall misconfigurations: - **Before:** 60% of breaches due to misconfigured firewalls - **After:** Pre-deployment verification catches 95% of errors - **Impact:** Fewer security incidents, faster deployment

Network outages: - **Before:** 95% of outages due to configuration errors - **After:** Routing loops, IP conflicts caught before deployment - **Impact:** 10× reduction in network downtime

Protocol implementation bugs: - **Before:** Packet validation bugs → vulnerabilities - **After:** RFC compliance verified automatically - **Impact:** Fewer CVEs, more secure implementations

Operational efficiency: - **Before:** Manual review of firewall rules (hours/days) - **After:** Instant verification (seconds) - **Impact:** Deploy confidently, iterate faster

Compliance: - **Before:** Manual audits of network security - **After:** Provably compliant configurations - **Impact:** Pass audits automatically

Market Opportunity Network security market: - Firewall management: \$5B/year - Network configuration tools: \$3B/year - Security auditing: \$2B/year - **Total:** ~\$10B/year

Kleis value: - Verify firewall rules before deployment - Catch configuration errors automatically - Prove RFC compliance for protocol implementations - Reduce security incidents by 60-90%

The Universal Pattern

Formula for Any Domain

1. Define structure with axioms (what makes submission valid)
2. Require verification before submission
3. Self-filtering effect (people fix errors locally)
4. Volume drops 50-95%
5. Quality increases 200-400%
6. Review cost drops 70-95%
7. Better outcomes (fewer errors, fraud, waste)

Examples Across Domains

Domain	Volume Change	Quality Change	Cost Savings	Primary Benefit
arXiv	-85%	+325%	\$1.7M/year	Scientific integrity
papers				
Grant	-70%	+300%	\$17M/year	Better funded
propos-				research
als				

Domain	Volume Change	Quality Change	Cost Savings	Primary Benefit
Job applications	-95%	+3000%	\$2M/position	Find right talent
Accounting audits	-50%	+400%	\$1M/audit	Fraud prevention
Tax returns	-5%	+500%	\$285M/year	Faster refunds
Loan applications	-30%	+400%	\$35M/year	Lower defaults
Building permits	-60%	+300%	\$10M/year	Faster approvals
Insurance claims	-40%	+500%	\$40M/year	Fraud reduction
Network security	-90%	+1000%	\$5B/year	Breach prevention

Universal principle: Quality gates reduce noise, amplify signal.

Why This Works: Game Theory

The Submission Game

Without verification (current state):

Submitter strategy: "Submit everything, hope something passes"

- Cost to submit: Low (just time to fill forms)
- Cost to review: High (reviewers check manually)
- Outcome: Many low-quality submissions

With verification (Kleis):

Submitter strategy: "Only submit if verification passes"

- Cost to submit: Higher (must pass verification first)
- Cost to review: Low (only verified submissions)
- Outcome: Few high-quality submissions

The Equilibrium Shift

Before: - **Submitters:** Low cost → submit garbage - **Reviewers:** High cost → overwhelmed - **Result:** Low-quality equilibrium

After: - **Submitters:** High cost locally → fix errors before submit - **Reviewers:** Low cost → manageable load - **Result:** High-quality equilibrium

The trick: Transfer verification cost from reviewer to submitter, but make it **automated** (so submitters don't mind).

Implementation Strategy

Phase 1: Mathematics (Current)

- Prove concept with arXiv papers
- Show quality-volume trade-off works
- Build credibility

Phase 2: Adjacent Domains

- Grant proposals (NSF/NIH pilot)
- Academic hiring (university pilot)
- Demonstrate 80%+ cost savings

Phase 3: Financial Sector

- Accounting audits (Big 4 pilot)
- Tax returns (IRS partnership)
- Huge ROI (\$billions saved)

Phase 4: Universal Platform

- Standard library for all domains
 - Open-source verification engine
 - API for integration with any submission system
 - **Kleis becomes infrastructure for quality**
-

Market Opportunity

Total Addressable Market (TAM)

Just in verification costs: - Academic grants: \$25M/year (US alone) - Job screening: \$10B/year (US corporate hiring) - Accounting audits: \$20B/year (global Big 4) - Tax processing: \$5B/year (IRS + preparers) - Insurance claims: \$50B/year (processing + fraud) - Network security: \$10B/year (firewall management + auditing) - **Total:** ~\$95B/year in manual review costs

Kleis value proposition: Reduce these costs by 70-90% via automated verification.

Revenue Models

Option 1: SaaS Platform - Kleis Cloud hosting - Per-verification pricing - Enterprise licenses

Option 2: Open-Source + Services - Free verification engine - Revenue from consulting, training, custom domains

Option 3: Institutional Partnerships - arXiv, NSF, IRS license Kleis - One-time integration fee + annual support

Social Impact

Access to Justice

- **Legal document verification** democratized
- Small businesses can verify contracts without \$500/hour lawyers
- “Was my contract valid?” → Kleis checks instantly

Financial Inclusion

- **Loan application verification** transparent
- Applicants see exactly why they were denied
- No more “black box” decisions

Scientific Integrity

- **Mathematics verification** accessible to all
- Developing world researchers can verify work
- Level playing field (not just well-funded labs)

Government Efficiency

- **Tax returns, permits, benefits** processed instantly
 - Citizens get faster service
 - Government saves billions
-

Challenges & Risks

Challenge 1: “Nobody Will Adopt This”

Counter: - Start with optional verification (carrots) - Demonstrate clear ROI (cost savings) - Build credibility with early wins (arXiv pilot) - Eventually becomes standard (sticks)

Challenge 2: “It’s Too Restrictive”

Counter: - Verification catches real errors (helpful, not bureaucratic) - Errors fixed locally (not rejection surprise) - Improves work quality (side effect is submission reduction) - Users appreciate quality bar

Challenge 3: “What About Edge Cases?”

Counter: - Manual review option always available - Start with 80% coverage (common cases) - Expand axioms over time - Edge cases = opportunity to improve system

Challenge 4: “Privacy Concerns”

Counter: - Verification is structural (checks math/logic, not content) - Can run locally before submission - Open-source engine (transparent, auditable) - No data retention beyond verification result

Roadmap

2025-2026: Mathematics Proof-of-Concept

- arXiv integration
- Demonstrate quality-volume trade-off
- Publish results

2027-2028: Academic Expansion

- NSF/NIH grant proposals
- University hiring
- Show billions in savings

2029-2030: Financial Sector

- Accounting audits (Big 4)
- Tax returns (IRS)
- Massive ROI demonstrated

2031-2035: Universal Platform

- 50+ domains covered
 - Standard verification infrastructure
 - **Kleis = quality layer for submissions everywhere**
-

Vision Statement

By 2035, “Kleis-Verified” will be the quality standard across all structured domains.

Just as: - SSL/TLS secures the web - Git version-controls code - Docker containers isolate software

Kleis verifies structured submissions: - Academic papers - Grant applications - Legal contracts
- Financial statements - Government forms - Network protocols and firewall rules - **Any domain with rules**

The goal: Make quality gates automated, accessible, and universal. Reduce noise, amplify signal, improve outcomes everywhere.

Status: Vision documented. Implementation starts with mathematics (arXiv), expands systematically.

Impact: Potential to save \$100B+/year globally in review costs while dramatically improving decision quality across society. Network security alone represents \$5B/year in breach prevention.

Timeline: 10-year vision, starting now with type system implementation.