



K1K9™ Protection K9 Standard

Mission fit. Control. Welfare. Evidence.

Proposed voluntary standard | PKS-001 | Version 0.1 | September 24, 2026

Prepared for Joseph Garcia / K1K9. Adapted from the supplied 22-page instructional-design outline, with proposed governance, assessment and evidence requirements added for owner and specialist review.

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT DRAFT. NOT AN ADOPTED OR ACCREDITED STANDARD. This document is not authorization to conduct protection exercises, issue certification or make public capability claims. The adoption gates at the end must be closed before formal conformity assessments begin.

The governing statement

A protection K9 claim shall be supported by documented suitability of the individual dog, demonstrated control by the named handler, humane preparation, and repeatable evidence against a declared mission profile. Price, pedigree, equipment, course attendance and membership shall not substitute for that evidence.

The purpose is to make expectations visible and decisions defensible. The standard addresses the dog, the handler, the environment, the provider and the continuing responsibilities after placement.

What this draft establishes

A common baseline: Twenty-four proposed requirements covering selection, safety, handler control, evidence, handover and continuing review.

A clear decision rule: Safety failures cannot be averaged away by strong performance elsewhere.

An honest boundary: Passing a classroom course or a foundation assessment does not establish protection-task capability.

A sustainable education model: Publish the baseline requirements through SIGNALS; offer structured education and continuing learning through a paid membership.

"Equipment is not a substitute for canine or handler preparation."

Authority, scope and terminology

Status and use

This is a proposed K1K9 program standard, not a claim of recognition by an accreditor, regulator, government agency or the wider industry. “Shall” identifies a proposed mandatory requirement; “should” identifies a recommendation; “may” identifies an option. None takes effect until formally adopted by the named standard owner.

The scope is civilian protection-dog suitability, responsible ownership and named dog-handler team assessment. Agency, security or other specialist use requires an additional applicable mission profile and professional review. This draft does not provide operational tactics, injury-target selection, weapons procedures or instructions for testing a dog through violence.

Working definitions

Mission profile: The intended role, named handlers, living and working environments, foreseeable restrictions, management responsibilities and explicit exclusions.

Foundation assessment: Evidence of ordinary management, welfare, neutrality and handler control. It is not a demonstration of protection-task capability.

Protection-task assessment: A separately authorized, specialist assessment of the claimed function under a fully specified, controlled protocol. It is not created or authorized by this draft.

Critical nonconformity: A safety, welfare, integrity or control failure that stops the assessment or blocks a positive decision.

Evidence: A traceable observation or record, with identity, date, method, conditions and limitations. A claim without supporting material is recorded as unverified, not automatically false.

Recovery: Observable return to the dog’s documented baseline after an approved, bounded activity or stimulus. The protocol must define what is measured and when the exercise stops.

Separate outcomes

Outcome	Meaning	Does not mean
Course completion	The learner met educational requirements	The dog or team is qualified
Foundation requirements met	Named team met the approved foundation protocol	Protection capability was demonstrated
Mission-specific conformity	Named team met all adopted applicable requirements and the approved specialist annex	Universal safety or guaranteed real-world success
Pilot observation record	Development evidence gathered under a separately approved pilot	Certification or current conformity

At version 0.1, only document review and separately approved pilot observation records are contemplated. No conformity certificate is authorized.

Mission definition and honest selection

These requirements establish what is being assessed before the dog enters an exercise. Selection is an individual decision, not a breed ranking or a reward for aggressive presentation.

PKS-01: Declare the mission. The provider and intended primary handler shall sign a mission profile identifying the intended role, household or working context, named handlers, routine management conditions and exclusions. "Family protection" alone is not sufficiently specific. Changes to the role shall trigger a suitability review.

PKS-02: Identify the individual and disclose history. The assessment file shall link the dog to a stable identifier and record known age, health information, training history, placements, significant incidents and behavioral concerns. Unknown history shall be labeled unknown. No record may imply completeness when the provider cannot substantiate it.

PKS-03: Select for suitability, not presentation. The provider shall document the individual dog's observed stability, responsiveness, recovery, ordinary handling, physical suitability and fit with the intended handler. Breed, pedigree, titles and production records may inform a review but shall not replace individual evidence. Young prospects shall not be represented as finished, qualified adult teams.

PKS-04: Report selection outcomes honestly. Programs shall define who enters the candidate pool, the evaluation period and the categories retained, deferred, redirected or excluded. They shall record the reason for each decision and the plan for the dog. Neither a high rejection rate nor a reported 100% pass rate shall, by itself, establish program quality or dishonesty.

Required evidence

The file shall contain a signed mission profile, identity record, relevant disclosed history, individual suitability observations and a selection decision with reasons. A missing material record produces an evidence hold, not an assumed pass.

Buyer-facing principle

The question is not "How impressive is the demonstration?" The question is "What has this dog, with this handler, demonstrated for this specific role, and what remains untested?"

Welfare and public safety

Welfare is a condition of assessment, not a score that can be traded against performance. Every person responsible for an exercise shall have clear authority to stop it.

PKS-05: Establish fitness and readiness. Before physical assessment, the file shall contain a veterinarian's fitness opinion relevant to the proposed activity, with any restrictions. A documented same-day check shall address current condition, pain or illness concerns, environmental suitability and readiness to participate. Doubt about fitness requires deferral and appropriate professional review.

PKS-06: Predefine welfare limits. The approved protocol shall state permitted activities, exposure limits, rest and recovery arrangements, environmental limits and observable stop signs. It shall prohibit intentional injury, choking, forced exhaustion, entrapment, denial of necessary water or rest, and continuation through distress. A withdrawn dog shall not be punished or repeatedly re-exposed to obtain a pass.

PKS-07: Protect uninvolved people and animals. Practical work shall use a controlled site, consented qualified adult participants, secure boundaries and an emergency plan. Children, uninvolved members of the public and unprotected people shall not act as test participants. Household suitability shall be assessed through records, adult interviews and controlled management observations, not provocation involving children.

PKS-08: Demonstrate safe ordinary behavior. The team shall demonstrate the approved routine-management requirements without unauthorized threatening behavior, redirected aggression, loss of containment or physical contact with uninvolved people or animals. Ordinary non-threatening activity shall not be deliberately escalated into a confrontation. Any uncertainty about discrimination shall narrow the permitted scope or stop the assessment.

Mandatory stop conditions

Suspected injury, significant distress, equipment or containment failure, unauthorized contact, dangerous redirection, loss of required control, unsafe participant behavior, or a stop instruction shall end the exercise. The team shall be secured using the approved safety plan, the event recorded, and any necessary care arranged.

A safety stop is not permission to restart the same challenge at higher intensity. The review must determine whether the exercise, environment, handler or dog requires a change before any future assessment.

Handler competence and team control

The unit of assessment is the named dog-handler combination. A result achieved with the trainer shall not automatically transfer to an owner, family member or replacement handler.

PKS-09: Demonstrate routine management. Each nominated handler shall demonstrate the approved containment, transport, entry and exit, routine movement, settling and separation requirements. The protocol shall specify the setting, equipment, cues and observable outcomes. Descriptions such as “leadership” shall be replaced in the score sheet by visible behavior, not inferred personality.

PKS-10: Demonstrate usable control. The handler shall demonstrate the declared recall, stationing, interruption and return-to-control functions in approved non-threatening conditions. The protocol shall define allowed cues, response windows, repetitions and distractions before testing. Physical rescue, concealed assistance or repeated prompting shall not be recorded as an unaided successful response.

PKS-11: Demonstrate judgment and non-action. The handler shall identify when not to proceed, when to create distance or secure the dog, when to stop an activity, and when professional assistance is required. The assessment shall include safe non-engagement decisions. A decision not to use the dog may be the correct outcome; unnecessary activation shall not receive credit.

PKS-12: Respond to error professionally. The handler shall recognize changes in the dog’s behavior, follow stop directions, preserve containment, and use the approved recovery process without retaliation or escalation. The evaluator shall record actions, not merely impressions. A handler who refuses a safety stop or takes frustration out on the dog shall not receive a passing result.

More than standing still

Composure during a short observation is useful evidence about that observation. It shall not be treated as proof of all-round readiness, unseen history, the handler’s character or the dog’s future behavior.

Household handover boundary

Adults expected to manage the dog shall have a documented role, appropriate instruction and demonstrated competence for that role. Children shall not carry the program’s responsibility for supervision, containment or protection-task control.

Protection-task claims and specialist boundaries

The foundation standard must not become a shortcut to claiming protection capability. Task-specific capability requires its own approved assessment, suitable personnel and explicit evidence limits.

PKS-13: Separate foundation from claimed function. No dog shall be described as conforming for a protection mission solely because it passed obedience, neutrality or classroom assessments. Any protection-task claim shall cite the adopted specialist annex, exact scope, test version, named dog-handler pair and evidence reviewed. If that annex is absent, incomplete or unapproved, the result shall be "Protection function not assessed."

PKS-14: Make safe cessation indispensable. The specialist annex shall require demonstrated interruption, disengagement and return to controlled management under its stated conditions. It shall define the cue, response window, successful end state and failure rule before assessment. Failure of a safety-critical stop or disengagement requirement shall block a positive task result; strength, persistence or enthusiasm cannot compensate.

PKS-15: Use qualified sparring partners and controlled simulations. Any authorized contact component shall use documented competent personnel, appropriate protective equipment and a reviewed site-specific safety plan. The evaluator shall verify partner competence and equipment readiness. KESP preparation belongs in the SCAD development pathway; realistic presentation shall never be used to justify actual injury or abusive treatment.

PKS-16: Keep weapons work outside this baseline. No live firearm, live ammunition or functioning weapon shall be introduced into a practical conducted under this draft. Any later armed-handler education or assessment requires a separate KINETIC governance and safety annex, applicable professional qualifications and legal review. Inert-only educational equipment does not make a learner or team operationally qualified.

What this document does not teach

It does not prescribe attack sequences, anatomical targets, methods of defeating an armed person, live-fire canine exercises or ways to test an animal by inflicting harm. It sets evidence, control and welfare boundaries for any future specialist protocol.

Provider demonstrations, sporting achievements and existing records may contribute evidence within their actual scope. They shall neither be dismissed automatically nor treated as universal proof of another function.

Evidence, measurement and assessor integrity

A useful standard makes its observations reproducible and its limitations visible. It does not turn proprietary vocabulary, impressive equipment or numerical output into proof by themselves.

PKS-17: Retain the complete assessment record. Each decision shall be traceable to the protocol version, team identity, date, context, assessor, observations, stops and deviations. Where recording is safe, permitted and consented, retain continuous exercise footage rather than only selected highlights. Where footage is unavailable, record why and use the preapproved alternative evidence procedure; missing essential evidence blocks the result.

PKS-18: Qualify every measurement. KAIR or other instrument output shall identify the device, configuration, units, checks, method, uncertainty or known limitations, and the person interpreting it. Estimates shall be labeled as estimates. No unsupported sensor threshold, bite-pressure number, survival claim or human-injury comparison shall be used as a passing requirement.

PKS-19: Use declared conditions and repeat observations. The protocol shall fix task definitions, sequence constraints, contexts, repetitions, recovery limits and decision thresholds before observing the candidate. All attempts and deviations shall be retained. A successful repeat shall not erase an earlier failure; the full evidence set and any remediation shall remain reviewable.

PKS-20: Separate assessment from sales incentives. A final conformity decision shall include an evaluator who is not the seller or primary trainer and has no outcome-contingent financial interest. Relevant relationships shall be disclosed. Evaluators shall have documented competence for the assessed scope, use calibrated scoring examples, and refer unresolved disagreements to an independent reviewer.

Evidence grades

Grade	Description	Permitted use
A	Direct observation under the approved protocol, traceable to the team	Primary conformity evidence
B	Authenticated records or recordings under described but different conditions	Supporting evidence; scope limits stated
C	Testimony, marketing, selected clips or unverified documents	A claim to investigate, not a passing result
Missing	No adequate evidence for the requirement	Not assessed; decision blocked where mandatory

These are proposed program categories, not externally validated scientific grades. A grade describes evidence quality and context, not an animal's guaranteed reliability.

Assessment decisions that cannot hide a failure

Proposed requirement scale

Rating	Meaning	Decision consequence
NE	Not evaluated, invalid exercise or inadequate evidence	No positive decision for the relevant scope
0	Critical safety, welfare or integrity nonconformity	Stop or suspend; independent review required
1	Applicable requirement not met	Not yet conforming; remediation required
2	Requirement met under every required approved condition	Eligible for an overall decision if all other gates pass
3	Requirement met with additional predeclared repeat evidence	No compensation for any other failed requirement

There shall be no averaged passing score. Every applicable mandatory requirement must achieve at least 2, with no unresolved critical nonconformity, no missing mandatory evidence and no missing approval.

Scope rules

The core PKS-01 through PKS-12 and PKS-17 through PKS-24 apply to a foundation assessment. PKS-13 through PKS-15 additionally govern any protection-task conformity claim; PKS-16 is a baseline safety restriction applicable to every practical. "Not applicable" may be used only where the adopted scope expressly permits it, with a written reason and reviewer approval.

A foundation report must explicitly state "Protection function not assessed." A protection-task result requires both a successful foundation assessment and all applicable requirements in a complete, adopted specialist annex; no scope exclusion may remove that prerequisite.

Disposition

Not yet assessed: Mandatory evidence, competence or protocol approval is missing.

Deferred: Current health, welfare, environment or other temporary conditions prevent valid assessment.

Not yet conforming: One or more applicable requirements were not met.

Requirements met for declared scope: Available only after formal adoption and approval of the full applicable protocol.

Suspended or withdrawn: A prior result is no longer supportable under the program's review rules.

Course marks, membership payments and commercial urgency shall have no influence on these decisions. While version 0.1 remains a development draft, the only field output is a properly authorized pilot observation record, not conformity.

Required assessment matrix

The following matrix links every clause to evidence. The evaluator's working record shall add rating, evidence reference, condition, date, limitation and reviewer initials for every applicable row.

ID	Requirement	Minimum evidence to review
PKS-01	Declared mission	Signed profile and exclusions
PKS-02	Identity and history	Stable ID, disclosed record and unknowns
PKS-03	Individual suitability	Observations linked to role and handler
PKS-04	Honest selection outcomes	Defined candidate pool and disposition reasons
PKS-05	Fitness and readiness	Relevant veterinary opinion and same-day check
PKS-06	Welfare limits	Approved limits, stop plan and welfare record
PKS-07	Participant/public safety	Site controls, consent and emergency arrangements
PKS-08	Ordinary behavior	Controlled neutrality and management observations
PKS-09	Routine management	Named-handler practical observations
PKS-10	Usable control	Declared cues, response records and end states
PKS-11	Judgment/non-action	Decisions and reasons in approved safe scenarios
PKS-12	Response to error	Stop compliance and humane handling observations
PKS-13	Function/scope distinction	Approved annex or explicit "not assessed" status
PKS-14	Cessation/disengagement	Specialist protocol and complete relevant evidence
PKS-15	Qualified partners	Competence, equipment and safety records
PKS-16	Weapons boundary	Practical-site exclusion controls
PKS-17	Complete record	Exercise record, deviations and evidence links
PKS-18	Qualified measurement	Device/method details or no-instrument declaration
PKS-19	Repeat observations	Prespecified conditions and all attempts
PKS-20	Assessor independence	Qualifications, conflicts and independent review
PKS-21	Placement/handover	Receiving-handler competence and signed handover
PKS-22	Maintenance/reassessment	Review schedule, triggers and scope status
PKS-23	Incident/appeal process	Reporting channel, review and appeal records
PKS-24	Truthful public claims	Scope-limited statements and verification record

No rating is entered merely because a document exists. The evaluator must determine whether the record satisfies the actual requirement and whether observed performance supports the stated conclusion.

Protocol approval before practical assessment

The protocol is not optional

Every assessment exercise shall have a completed, approved protocol sheet. Generic labels such as “under pressure,” “reliable out” or “real-world ready” are insufficient without observable criteria and declared limits.

Required field	What must be fixed before use
Scope and task	Requirement ID, role, named team and permitted activity
Entry conditions	Fitness, prerequisite competence, site and equipment checks
Context	Location, participants, barriers and permitted non-threatening distractions
Observation	Observable behavior; avoid claims about the dog's unobservable intentions
Response rule	Allowed cues, response window and required end state
Repeat rule	Number of trials, occasions and contexts, plus rest arrangements
Welfare limits	Exposure ceiling, recovery definition and stop signs
Failure rule	What blocks the row; what invalidates the exercise itself
Evidence method	Recording, timing, devices, record retention and privacy
Authorization	Named technical, welfare and safety approvals; version and date

Proposed pilot design

For ordinary non-contact foundation observations, the starting design is two separate assessment occasions and at least two approved context types. That is a proposed sampling control, not a validated sufficiency threshold or a guarantee of behavior elsewhere; the review group may change it before adoption and shall record why.

Response windows, repetitions, exposure limits, health restrictions and specialist-task parameters are deliberately not invented in this draft. The technical and veterinary reviewers must define and justify them, test scoring consistency, and approve the final sheet before use. No blank parameter may be filled after watching the candidate.

Invalid exercise versus candidate failure

Unsafe site conditions, a protocol deviation or equipment failure may invalidate an exercise rather than establish a canine deficiency. Any resulting safety event still requires recording and review. Evaluators shall preserve the distinction and shall not quietly discard unfavorable observations.

These sheets authorize nothing by themselves. A pilot requires separate competent approval, welfare controls and consent; a formal conformity assessment requires an adopted standard and complete applicable protocol set.

Handover, maintenance and accountability

Assessment is a dated statement about defined conditions. The program shall specify how that statement is maintained, narrowed, suspended or withdrawn when circumstances change.

PKS-21: Demonstrate receiving-handler competence. Before placement or transfer, the provider shall document suitability of the receiving environment, instruction of the adults responsible for management, and their competence for assigned duties. The receiving handler shall demonstrate the required foundation functions with the actual dog. A trainer's result, a weekend attendance record or a video alone shall not constitute successful handover.

PKS-22: Maintain and reassess the team. Every adopted result shall state issue date, expiry date, scope, exclusions and a scheduled review plan. The scheme owner shall approve the renewal interval before launch rather than invent a universal interval here. A new primary handler, significant health or behavioral change, serious incident, material training interruption or change of mission shall trigger review and, where relevant, suspension pending reassessment.

PKS-23: Preserve incident and appeal routes. Providers and handlers shall have a clear way to report bites, near misses, containment failures, welfare concerns and misleading claims. Immediate safety and care take priority. The program shall define notification deadlines, review responsibility, confidentiality, remediation and an appeal process involving a reviewer independent of the original disputed decision.

PKS-24: Limit public claims to the record. Any status statement shall name the standard version and assessed scope, distinguish dog from team and training from assessment, and identify expiry or suspension status. It shall not promise universal safety, immunity, public-access rights or guaranteed survival. Paying for education or assessment shall never purchase a passing decision.

Remediation and reassessment

The reviewer shall issue a written gap statement and identify evidence needed for reconsideration. Health or welfare concerns go to the appropriate professional; suitability may require a different role rather than more intensity. A retest shall use the approved procedure and retain prior results.

A program record shall distinguish refusal to proceed, temporary deferral, unsuccessful assessment and retirement from a role. Redirection to a suitable non-protection placement is not an excuse to conceal material history.

How the supplied course supports the standard

The course is the education pathway, not the standard itself. Its assignments can prepare a learner to recognize evidence and limitations, but a case-study brief cannot establish the performance of a real dog.

Course module	Place in the revised pathway	Standard connection
0: Orientation	Terms, evidence boundaries and outcome labels	Scope and definitions
1: Define protection	Mission-specific expectations without outcome guarantees	PKS-01, 03, 24
2: Evaluate claims	Evidence-seeking provider review and honest selection	PKS-02, 04, 17, 24
3: The team	Observable management, control and handler responsibility	PKS-08 to 12, 21
4: Pressure/threat review	Context, welfare and observed behavior; not assumed canine intent	PKS-06, 07, 11, 19
5: Continuing control	Safety and cessation principles; specialist work separately governed	PKS-10, 12 to 15
6: Armed-handler awareness	Restricted optional KINETIC pathway; outside baseline qualification	PKS-16 and future annex
7: Capstone	Evidence brief, limitations, gap plan and oral defense	PKS-17, 20 to 24

Proposed educational pass rule

Retain the source's 80% knowledge-check target for noncritical content and 100% vocabulary mastery. Require correct answers to every designated safety-critical item before progression, and at least "Proficient" on every applicable capstone row. Remediation and retakes belong in education; they do not erase practical safety events.

The source's "Proficient overall; no row below Developing" rule is not adopted for safety-critical competence. The learner must also distinguish an evidence-based conclusion from a claim that the available evidence cannot support.

Course-time correction

The module overview adds to 16.75 hours before the separately listed oral defense, rather than the displayed approximately 16.5 hours. Use an estimated 16 hours 45 minutes plus assessment time until the actual lesson, practice and cohort schedule is rebuilt. This is a correction to the source's arithmetic, not a validated course-duration promise.

No current course access, instructor credential or certificate is activated by this document.

Corrections made in converting an outline into a standard

The original source is an internal instructional-design draft. The following changes prevent advocacy, teaching examples and unverified generalizations from becoming mandatory scientific or safety claims.

Source locator	Issue	Treatment in this standard
Pages 2, 7–10	Broad market, loyalty and capability claims	Require observable individual evidence; do not claim a market-wide absence of all standards or guaranteed survival
Pages 9–10	A 100% pass rate treated as proof of no selection standard	Require denominator, cohort, criteria and records; do not infer dishonesty from the rate alone
Page 10, provider questions	Children, hidden protection equipment and drawn sidearm mixed into demonstration expectations	No children/unprotected people as test participants; no such demonstration demanded from a buyer
Pages 11–12	Brief stillness observation treated as extensive readiness knowledge	Retain it as one limited observation; require multiple defined contexts and evidence
Pages 13–15	Fixed conclusions about what a dog learned or intends	Record stimulus, response and limits; assess hypotheses rather than presenting inferred intent as fact
Pages 6 and 17	“No live firearm” followed by a live-fire exception	Remove the exception from this baseline; any later specialist pathway requires separate governance
Pages 4–5 and 18	Overall capstone score can conceal a weak row	Require every applicable row to meet the educational criterion; no averaging away safety failures
Pages 16–17	Specific speed/pressure figures and armed-integration claims	Exclude unverified numerical claims and weapons procedures from the baseline
Pages 18 and 22	Personal tribute and public credentials	Tribute remains optional, unassessed editorial material; credential claims require substantiation
Pages 21–22	Missing criteria, cases, qualifications and legal review	Convert to explicit adoption gates rather than treating the outline as release-ready

This is a substantive adaptation, not a claim that the supplied draft already contained all these controls. Original wording and this proposed standard shall remain separate until the owner approves the changes.

No independent external scientific, market, legal or accreditation review was completed in preparing this version. Such review is required where the future program relies on those claims.

SIGNALS placement and paid education

Recommended menu

SIGNALS → PSSK9 Education → Protection K9 Standard

The public landing page should explain the purpose, show the current adopted version when one exists, distinguish education from qualification, and offer two clear paths: “Read the standard” and “Explore the course.” During development, it should say “Proposed standard under review,” not imply adoption.

Recommended access model

Layer	Recommended access	What the reader receives
Public standard	Free	Baseline requirements, evidence expectations, scope limits and buyer checklist
Protection K9 Standard course	Paid PSSK9 Education membership within SIGNALS	Structured lessons, approved videos, guided exercises, knowledge checks and learning records
Continuing education	Membership, only when delivery is ready	New case discussions, updated learning material and scheduled education with a defined cadence
Practical development	Separately scoped and priced	SCAD for canine development/KESP; KINETIC for handler application
Formal assessment	Separate application and fee, after launch approval	Independent evidence-based assessment; no guaranteed pass

Why separate them

My recommendation is to make the requirements visible and charge for the depth of instruction, tools and continuing learning. That lets the public understand what K1K9 expects without confusing a subscription with permission to use a dog or proof that a team qualifies.

A finite course can also be sold as a one-time purchase. A recurring membership should be offered only with a realistic continuing-content commitment; if that commitment is not ready, begin with the course rather than promising an unfinished subscription.

Commercial boundaries

Pricing, billing period, cancellation, content cadence, instructor access, assessment fees and legal terms remain undecided. Do not promise live sessions, individual advice, credentials or new monthly material until the capacity and delivery plan exist. Canceling educational membership shall not, by itself, retroactively invalidate an independently earned assessment result; the assessment scheme’s stated validity rules govern that result.

The owner has approved the PSSK9 Education section within SIGNALS and the public-standard/paid-education distinction in principle. Commercial terms and delivery commitments still require decisions; no payment system, paywall, membership or website change has been made.

Adoption gates and sign-off

Required before public conformity claims

Owner approval: Confirm scope, terminology, exclusions, public wording and responsibility for maintaining PKS-001.

Technical review: Complete every exercise protocol, including observable criteria, response windows, repetitions, contexts and failure rules.

Veterinary/welfare review: Approve entry conditions, limits, recovery criteria, stop rules and incident response.

Legal and program review: Review intended uses, participant arrangements, claims, terms, privacy and any jurisdiction-dependent obligations.

Evaluator competence: Approve qualification requirements, independence rules, training examples and disagreement resolution.

Pilot evidence: Run separately approved safe pilots, compare independent scoring, examine consistency and adverse events, and justify the eventual thresholds and sampling plan.

Operational readiness: Establish records, evidence retention, verification, complaint handling, appeals, renewal, suspension and withdrawal procedures.

Publication control: Assign the adopted version, effective date, change log and owner approvals. Align the course, website, assessment sheets and any certificates only after adoption.

Approval record

Decision	Reviewer / signature	Date / evidence
Owner adopts scope and language	Pending	Pending
Technical protocol set accepted	Pending	Pending
Veterinary/welfare controls accepted	Pending	Pending
Legal/program review complete	Pending	Pending
Assessor calibration accepted	Pending	Pending
Pilot findings and limitations accepted	Pending	Pending
Issue of adopted version authorized	Pending	Pending

Current disposition

Draft complete for owner and specialist review. Adoption and formal assessment remain blocked. This draft may be displayed in the private Studio preview. The live website remains unchanged.

Source: the supplied 22-page "The Protection K9 Standard: From Loyalty to Kinetic Capability," instructional-design draft v1.0. This proposed derivative is not an author-approved replacement.