

FOI Life-Safety Platform Response Continuity Baseline

Reusable Onramp Mapping Payload - Platform-Neutral

Life-Safety first.

FOI already performs the workflow.

The host platform is a qualified doorway into that existing fulfillment.

Fuel Only Inc. dba FOI Laboratories

FOI-LS-PLATFORM-RCB-001

Platform-Neutral Baseline - September 2026

How to use this baseline

This document is the reusable holding payload for platform onramp mapping. It preserves FOI's settled Life-Safety, commercial, operating, technical, verification, AI, survivability and adoption responses so a new platform can be mapped to the same baseline without rewriting FOI for each diligence process.

Need is continuous. A governed event begins only after admission.	The host platform provides the space. FOI provides the fulfillment.
--	--

Platform questions may change. FOI's settled answers remain in continuity. Platform-specific facts - object names, APIs, authentication, sandbox, account overlap, timing, contacts and commercial mechanics - are variables to be mapped, not reasons to rewrite the canonical FOI response.

Review Status and Transparency

This platform-neutral baseline was established through a live 104-question platform-partnership diligence review. That review is evidence that FOI's response set is being tested for portability across a real host-platform qualification process; it is not, by itself, a claim that any platform has adopted FOI.

Availability can be established before adoption. Platform adoption is represented only when the applicable qualification and operating proof have occurred. The first proof remains: one consented customer -> one qualified doorway -> one admitted governed event -> one controlled return -> joint review.

Mapping rule: Do not rewrite a canonical FOI answer to accommodate a platform. Map the platform to the canonical answer. Where a platform-specific fact is unknown, preserve the FOI answer and mark the platform variable for qualification.

Company Profile

E1 Company legal name

Platform prompt: Exact name for the title slide and company overview.

FOI answer: Fuel Only Inc. dba FOI Laboratories. FOI Laboratories is an established U.S. fuel laboratory and the operator of the Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow described in this evaluation.

Basis: FOI publisher identity

E2 Product category

Platform prompt: The one label buyers use for your product.

FOI answer: Life-Safety Fuel Continuity Fulfillment - a cradle-to-grave workflow around fuel testing for fuel-dependent Life-Safety and mission-critical assets.

Basis: FOI public Life-Safety Protocol; FOI continuity architecture

E3 One-line platform value idea

Platform prompt: State the platform-neutral joint value proposition in one sentence.

FOI answer: FOI already performs the Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow; a qualified host-platform doorway gives customers access from the asset/work environment they already use into that existing fulfillment, with controlled evidence/status returned to the same host record.

Basis: FOI public Life-Safety Protocol; FOI system-boundary doctrine

E4 Company facts

Platform prompt: Founding year, HQ, employee count, ownership, funding stage.

FOI answer: Headquarters: 8014 NE 13th Ave., Suite 1000, Vancouver, WA 98665. Employee count: 10.

Ownership: privately held and founder-owned. Funding stage: no outside funding stage is being presented,

and no funding, M&A or ownership change is anticipated in the next 18 months. Founding year is not supplied in the current review record and should be inserted only from verified company records.

Basis: FOI ownership posture

E5 Business value

Platform prompt: The primary business outcome your product delivers, stated as the customer experiences it.

FOI answer: The customer gets a preserved cradle-to-grave Life-Safety fuel-continuity thread around testing: Identify -> Sample -> Custody -> Laboratory Performance -> Review -> Correct -> Verify -> Preserve -> Trend -> Next Event. Life-Safety is the intention; testing provides the evidence; continuity protects the chain. The operating outcomes follow in order: life first, liability risk, time, and cost.

Basis: FOI continuity interval doctrine

E6 Compliance

Platform prompt: Standards and regulations supported, certifications held.

FOI answer: FOI supports fuel-condition workflows used in NFPA 110, NFPA 99/101, NFPA 25/20 and applicable ASTM/ISO fuel-quality contexts. These are operating and evidence contexts, not separate FOI products. FOI does not certify code compliance, replace the AHJ, or replace the owner's responsibility. Current corporate certification posture is stated separately in T16.

Basis: FOI binder/standards architecture

E7 Scalability

Platform prompt: Deployment model and multi-site, enterprise readiness.

FOI answer: FOI already provides the workflow across America today. The same continuity logic can serve a single critical asset or a multi-site fleet. Availability can be broad, but a governed FOI event exists only after the defined doorway/admission conditions are met. The model is provider-open: qualified laboratories and service providers can participate without receiving FOI governance authority.

Basis: FOI adoption doctrine

E8 Ease of use

Platform prompt: Describe readiness and the amount of platform-specific work required.

FOI answer: The commercial capability is available now because FOI already performs the workflow. The customer can remain in the host platform for native asset and work activity; platform-specific work is limited to qualifying the doorway and controlled return. Transport can begin with the lightest technically acceptable pattern and deepen later without changing the governance boundary.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic v1.0 + doorway boundary

E9 Analytics

Platform prompt: Describe reporting, analytics and data-access boundaries.

FOI answer: FOI provides continuity analytics tied to the governed record: asset/sample identity, condition history, intervention-to-verification history, recurring trends and next-event position. The host platform can receive the controlled status/evidence references appropriate to its native asset/work record; it does not become the authority that writes FOI condition state.

Basis: FOI Continuity File + controlled return

E10 Daily operating role

Platform prompt: Explain what remains in the host platform and what FOI performs.

FOI answer: FOI's operating workflow is Identify -> Sample -> Custody -> Laboratory Performance -> Review -> Correct -> Verify -> Preserve -> Trend -> Next Event. Qualified participants perform their work at the appropriate stage; FOI preserves the continuity record. The host platform remains the customer's native asset/PM/work-order environment.

Basis: FOI fixed 10-stage rail

E11 Closed-loop processes

Platform prompt: The end-to-end process your product owns as system of record.

FOI answer: The closed loop is T0 condition evidence -> recorded intervention when needed -> T1 verification -> preserved history -> trend -> next event. Intervention or service completion is not verification. A post-correction condition is not promoted to verified without T1 evidence and review.

Basis: FOI category/object/unit doctrine

E12 Proof point

Platform prompt: State the operating evidence supporting the proposition without overstating platform adoption.

FOI answer: FOI brings an established fuel-laboratory brand and repeated operating experience in mission-critical and data-center engineering work. Platform-partnership diligence is actively being used to test the portability of the response set. Diligence or review is not represented as platform adoption. The first host-platform proof remains one consented host-platform governed event.

Basis: FOI operating record; public Life-Safety Protocol; platform-adoption doctrine

Commercial Data

C1 Total active customer count

Platform prompt: Active paying FOI accounts today.

FOI answer: FOI serves 500 active paying accounts across its current operating base. This figure describes FOI's active customer base; it does not imply that all 500 accounts have adopted the governed Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow or that they overlap with any particular host platform.

Basis: FOI current operating records

C2 Customers with asset-intensive operations

Platform prompt: Identify the portion of the FOI base relevant to asset-intensive host-platform workflows.

FOI answer: FOI's operating base is substantially asset-intensive: service providers, hospitals/critical facilities, generator and fuel-service organizations, engineering networks and other operators of mission-critical fuel assets. Exact host-platform overlap must be established through account/workflow matching rather than assumed from customer names alone.

Basis: FOI adoption-status rule

C3 Percent reachable with platform proposition

Platform prompt: Estimate the share of the asset-intensive base reachable through a specific host platform.

FOI answer: A platform-reachable percentage is platform-specific and should not be invented in the baseline. The qualifying population is host-platform customers operating fuel-dependent Life-Safety or mission-critical assets for which FOI's continuity fulfillment is relevant. Need can exist continuously across the fuel stream; a governed event still requires admission through the doorway. The correct sizing method is account/workflow matching.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic v1.0

C4 Average customer size

Platform prompt: Revenue band or employee range of a typical customer.

FOI answer: Best fit is driven by asset criticality and recurring continuity need, not company size. The workflow can serve one critical facility and gains leverage across multi-site operators, healthcare systems, data centers, service networks and fleets of emergency-power assets.

Basis: FOI rail ICP doctrine

C5 Install base by vertical

Platform prompt: Top 3 to 5 verticals with rough counts or percentages.

FOI answer: Current and target verticals include healthcare/EPSS, data centers, critical facilities, generator/service organizations, fire-protection fuel systems, utilities, telecom/911, municipal/public works

and other mission-critical stored-fuel environments. Exact installed counts by vertical should come from the current account export; relevance is not the same as governed adoption.

Basis: FOI binder/ICP architecture

C6 Install base by region

Platform prompt: State the current geographic operating posture.

FOI answer: FOI provides the workflow across the United States today. A host-platform proposition should be treated as U.S.-focused unless the parties later qualify additional residency, regulatory and operating requirements. A formal regional percentage split should come from current operating records when required.

Basis: FOI adoption-status rule

C7 Commercial unit

Platform prompt: State the commercial unit and how platform economics should be normalized.

FOI answer: FOI is not sold as SaaS ARR. Revenue is generated through testing, governed continuity events/programs and related services. Platform economics should therefore be normalized around qualified event/program value rather than software seats.

Basis: FOI unit-sold doctrine

C8 Typical qualification cycle

Platform prompt: Describe the cycle from qualified opportunity to first operating proof.

FOI answer: FOI fulfillment is available today through its existing operating workflow. The qualification cycle for a host-platform doorway is separate and depends on account fit, customer consent and the chosen technical transport. FOI should not manufacture a generic SaaS sales-cycle benchmark.

Basis: FOI public onramp + platform-specific qualification

C9 Existing host-platform or affiliate customers

Platform prompt: Identify known shared accounts.

FOI answer: Shared-account overlap is platform-specific and must be established through a consented account-matching process. FOI does not infer or claim platform usage from customer identity alone.

Basis: FOI adoption-status and customer-consent rules

C10 Shared-account matching method

Platform prompt: Explain how a shared-account list should be established.

FOI answer: Use a permissioned account/workflow match between FOI and the host platform, then qualify the actual Life-Safety asset/workflow context. Customer name alone does not establish fit, adoption or authority.

Basis: FOI platform qualification doctrine

Market & Customer

M1 Market timing force

Platform prompt: The customer-side shift creating demand for the joint proposition now.

FOI answer: The need is already present wherever fuel-dependent Life-Safety and mission-critical assets rely on work that crosses delivery, sampling, custody, laboratory evidence, service, correction and verification. Maintenance systems organize the asset and work; FOI preserves the fuel-continuity thread around testing. The partnership does not depend on a new market trend to make the need real.

Basis: FOI problem architecture

M2 Competitive consolidation force

Platform prompt: Which platform vendors are building or buying across the seam between your category and CMMS/EAM, and how fast.

FOI answer: As maintenance platforms add inspections, condition monitoring and AI-assisted workflows, the important distinction is not feature breadth but authority separation. The host platform can identify, host and route work without becoming the independent authority that writes FOI fuel-condition state. The opportunity is to connect the seam, not duplicate either company's core role.

Basis: FOI anti-capture + AI boundary

M3 Regulatory or audit force

Platform prompt: Standards or auditor expectations that make the connected proposition necessary.

FOI answer: Fuel-dependent Life-Safety systems operate under recurring code, owner, OEM, insurer and evidence expectations. NFPA 110 and related NFPA 99/101 contexts are especially relevant to EPSS/healthcare; ASTM/ISO methods provide technical evidence. FOI preserves continuity across those obligations but does not replace the code, AHJ or owner.

Basis: FOI Life-Safety Protocol; NFPA-context mapping; ASTM/ISO evidence framework

M4 Problem 1: operational failure

Platform prompt: The operational failure the disconnect between your domain and maintenance creates today.

FOI answer: A work order can be mechanically complete while the fuel condition remains unknown or unverified. The failure is not that host platform cannot manage maintenance; it is that evidence, intervention and verification can end in separate threads unless continuity is deliberately preserved.

Basis: FCU-THREE-TICKETS-001 + Close Check boundary

M5 Problem 2: traceability gap

Platform prompt: The traceability or compliance gap between the two domains.

FOI answer: A test report, fuel delivery, service ticket and resample can each exist and still fail to preserve one identity thread from the asset and physical sample through intervention and T1 verification. FOI's Continuity File preserves that thread across participants and platform changes.

Basis: FOI identity spine + continuity interval

M6 Problem 3: the silo

Platform prompt: Which teams cannot see or trigger each other's work.

FOI answer: Facilities, engineering, maintenance, fuel suppliers, service companies and laboratories can each perform their own part correctly while the customer still lacks one preserved continuity record. FOI connects those independent contributions without taking over their professional roles.

Basis: FOI continuity problem statement

M7 Who feels it and what it costs

Platform prompt: The personas affected and the measurable cost: downtime, rework, audit findings.

FOI answer: The gap is felt by maintenance/reliability, facilities/EPSS owners, engineering, compliance, service providers and leadership responsible for readiness. Costs show up as repeat work, manual reconciliation, delayed decisions, unresolved verification and difficulty defending the asset history. FOI does not claim a universal dollar impact without customer-specific evidence.

Basis: FOI workflow analysis

M8 Additional market forces

Platform prompt: Workforce, technology, or other forces we should pick from, with citations.

FOI answer: AI and API maturity make the doorway easier to use, but they do not change authority. AI may interpret, discover and route; it may not write FOI governed state or promote an intervention to verified without T1 evidence. The rail does not adapt to AI; AI adapts to the rail.

Basis: FCU-AI-LIFE-SAFETY-INHERITANCE-001

Use Cases

U1.1 Use case name and scenario

Platform prompt: A short name plus the scenario in one or two sentences, naming the personas involved.

FOI answer: Life-Safety fuel-condition event - a host-platform user is working against an existing generator, tank or other critical fuel asset and needs current fuel condition established or preserved through testing. The host platform keeps the asset/work order; FOI fulfills the admitted continuity event.

Basis: FCU-THREE-TICKETS-001 Ticket B

U1.2 Without the integration

Platform prompt: What happens today: where the issue is logged, what gets lost, the dead end.

FOI answer: Without the FOI doorway, the host platform work order can record maintenance activity while sampling, custody, laboratory evidence and later correction/verification remain separate documents or vendor threads. The asset can therefore have completed work without a preserved condition chain.

Basis: FOI Close Check problem

U1.3 With the integration

Platform prompt: What happens with the integration: the trigger, what is pre-filled, the traceable outcome.

FOI answer: With the doorway, host platform passes the stable asset/work-order identity and permitted context to FOI. If the event is admitted, FOI carries the continuity workflow around testing and returns controlled status/evidence references to the same host-platform asset/work record. Existing qualified laboratories/service providers may participate.

Basis: Doorway Request Envelope + controlled return

U1.4 Trigger event

Platform prompt: The real-world event that starts the flow: who observes what, where.

FOI answer: The broad Life-Safety need exists wherever a fuel-dependent critical asset requires condition continuity. A specific governed event starts only when the authorized host/user invokes the FOI doorway for a qualifying sampling/testing/condition event and admission requirements are met. Need is continuous; governed-event status is not automatic.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic + Three Tickets

U1.5 Personas and actions in each system

Platform prompt: Step by step: which persona does what, in which product.

FOI answer: 1. The user works in host platform against the existing asset/work order. 2. A

qualifying fuel-condition/testing need is identified. 3. The host platform supplies the host identity and permitted context through the FOI doorway. 4. FOI admits the event and governs Identify -> Sample -> Custody -> Laboratory Performance -> Review. 5. If correction is required, the same file remains open through T1 verification. 6. Controlled status/evidence returns to host platform. 7. The FOI Continuity File persists into the next event.

Basis: FOI 10-stage rail + boundary architecture

U1.6 Data that crosses the integration

Platform prompt: Objects and fields that move, direction, and what is pre-filled on arrival.

FOI answer: The host platform -> FOI: platform asset/object ID, work-order/request ID and the minimum permitted context required for the doorway. FOI internal: FCU event ID, physical sample/custody identity and protected evidence/state. FOI -> host platform: controlled continuity status and evidence/certificate references. Governance logic and protected FOI state do not cross back into host platform.

Basis: PLATFORM_OBJECT_ID <-> FCU_EVENT_ID <-> PHYSICAL_SAMPLE_ID

U1.7 Measurable outcome

Platform prompt: The metric improved and expected magnitude. Label estimates as estimates.

FOI answer: Pilot measures: correct host-to-FOI identity preservation; percentage of admitted events that return controlled status/evidence to the correct asset; chain-of-custody completeness; and time from doorway invocation to usable reviewed evidence. Baseline and targets are measured in the first operating proof rather than invented in advance.

Basis: FOI first-proof target

U2.1 Use case name and scenario

Platform prompt: A short name plus the scenario in one or two sentences, naming the personas involved.

FOI answer: Corrective intervention to verified condition - host platform records the work; FOI preserves T0 evidence, the intervention reference and the T1 verification needed to establish the resulting fuel condition.

Basis: FOI interval doctrine + conformance Case B

U2.2 Without the integration

Platform prompt: What happens today: where the issue is logged, what gets lost, the dead end.

FOI answer: Without continuity, polishing, cleaning, repair or other intervention can be recorded as complete and then mistaken for resolution even when no post-intervention sample/evidence has established the resulting condition.

Basis: FOI state-writing rule

U2.3 With the integration

Platform prompt: What happens with the integration: the trigger, what is pre-filled, the traceable outcome.

FOI answer: The host platform records the corrective work event. FOI associates that intervention with the existing Continuity File, receives or initiates the T1 sample/evidence, reviews the resulting condition and returns the controlled verification position to host platform. The correcting vendor and verifying laboratory do not have to be FOI.

Basis: FOI event/state boundary

U2.4 Trigger event

Platform prompt: The real-world event that starts the flow: who observes what, where.

FOI answer: Adverse or unresolved fuel-condition evidence has led to corrective work. The host platform work may be complete, but the FOI condition remains unverified until T1 evidence is collected, admitted and reviewed.

Basis: FCU-AI conformance Case B

U2.5 Personas and actions in each system

Platform prompt: Step by step: which persona does what, in which product.

FOI answer: 1. FOI preserves T0 evidence. 2. Maintenance/service work is assigned and executed in host platform or by the customer's provider. 3. The intervention is associated to the same FOI Continuity File. 4. T1 sampling/testing occurs. 5. FOI reviews T1 evidence and may advance the governed state only if supported. 6. The host platform receives the controlled verification status/evidence reference.

Basis: FOI event writing vs state writing

U2.6 Data that crosses the integration

Platform prompt: Objects and fields that move, direction, and what is pre-filled on arrival.

FOI answer: The host platform -> FOI: asset/work-order identity, intervention completion reference and permitted event metadata. FOI -> host platform: continuity-file/event reference, verification position and evidence reference. Work-order completion cannot directly write FOI 'verified' state.

Basis: FOI anti-capture/state authority rule

U2.7 Measurable outcome

Platform prompt: The metric improved and expected magnitude. Label estimates as estimates.

FOI answer: Pilot measure: percentage of admitted corrective events that achieve linked T1 verification, plus time from intervention completion to verified/not-verified determination and controlled return. Baseline and targets are established from the pilot.

Basis: FOI interval KPI logic

U3.1 Use case name and scenario

Platform prompt: A short name plus the scenario in one or two sentences, naming the personas involved.

FOI answer: Commissioning or handoff baseline - a new or transferred fuel-dependent Life-Safety asset enters operations without a preserved fuel-condition baseline. FOI establishes the baseline event so subsequent maintenance, delivery, service and testing inherit a known position.

Basis: FCU-THREE-TICKETS-001 Ticket C

U3.2 Without the integration

Platform prompt: What happens today: where the issue is logged, what gets lost, the dead end.

FOI answer: Without the doorway, the asset can be accepted into the maintenance system with equipment identity and commissioning work complete while no preserved fuel-condition baseline exists for future continuity.

Basis: Three Tickets commissioning scenario

U3.3 With the integration

Platform prompt: What happens with the integration: the trigger, what is pre-filled, the traceable outcome.

FOI answer: The host platform remains the commissioning/asset record. The host-platform identity is carried through the FOI doorway; FOI establishes the baseline fuel-continuity event and returns the starting status/evidence reference so the next event inherits a preserved reference point.

Basis: FOI doorway + preserve/next-event stages

U3.4 Trigger event

Platform prompt: The real-world event that starts the flow: who observes what, where.

FOI answer: A fuel-dependent Life-Safety or mission-critical asset is being commissioned or handed to operations and no prior governed fuel-condition baseline is available for that asset/tank.

Basis: FCU-AI conformance Case C

U3.5 Personas and actions in each system

Platform prompt: Step by step: which persona does what, in which product.

FOI answer: 1. Project/commissioning establishes the asset in host platform. 2. The need for a fuel-condition baseline is identified. 3. The host platform sends the existing asset identity and permitted context to FOI. 4. FOI admits the event and governs sampling/custody/laboratory review. 5. FOI establishes the baseline condition position. 6. Controlled status/evidence returns to host platform. 7. The Continuity File persists for the next event.

Basis: FOI commissioning rail

U3.6 Data that crosses the integration

Platform prompt: Objects and fields that move, direction, and what is pre-filled on arrival.

FOI answer: The host platform -> FOI: commissioned asset/object ID, relevant work-order/handoff ID and known tank/fuel context. FOI internal: event ID, physical sample ID, evidence and governed state. FOI -> host platform: baseline continuity status and evidence/file reference. FOI does not create a competing host-platform asset master.

Basis: FOI identity spine

U3.7 Measurable outcome

Platform prompt: The metric improved and expected magnitude. Label estimates as estimates.

FOI answer: Pilot measure: percentage of qualified commissioning handoffs that establish a linked FOI baseline before the next operating event. Baseline and target should be measured rather than assumed.

Basis: FOI preserve → next-event logic

U4 Outcome statement

Platform prompt: One sentence that sums up all three use cases.

FOI answer: The host platform remains the customer's asset, PM and work-order environment. FOI already performs the cradle-to-grave Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow around testing; the partnership provides a qualified doorway into that fulfillment, and the Continuity File survives the handoffs among independent participants.

Basis: FOI boundary sentence

ICP & Buyers

I1 Industry verticals where you win

Platform prompt: Verticals where you win today, with evidence.

FOI answer: Strongest fit: healthcare/EPSS, data centers, critical facilities, emergency-power fleets, generator/service organizations, fire-protection fuel systems, utilities, telecom/911, municipal/public works and other environments where stored-fuel condition affects Life-Safety or mission-critical readiness.

Basis: FOI binder/ICP architecture

I2 Company size and footprint

Platform prompt: Revenue band, employee range, site count, geography of your best-fit accounts.

FOI answer: Best fit is defined by asset criticality and recurring continuity need more than company size. Multi-site operators and service networks gain leverage from repeated events, but a single critical facility can qualify when the Life-Safety fuel-condition need is real.

Basis: FOI rail ICP rule

I3 Regulatory environment

Platform prompt: The standards regimes your best accounts operate under.

FOI answer: Common operating contexts include NFPA 110, NFPA 99/101, NFPA 25/20 and applicable ASTM/ISO fuel-quality methods. The governing context follows the asset/event obligation; ASTM/ISO methods provide evidence and do not themselves become FOI governance products.

Basis: FOI binder architecture

I4 Readiness signals

Platform prompt: Observable signals an account is ready for you.

FOI answer: Readiness signals include: fuel-dependent critical assets already managed in host platform; recurring fuel delivery/sampling/testing/service; multiple parties touching the fuel; evidence arriving from outside the CMMS; correction requiring post-action verification; or a need for one defensible readiness history.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic + FOI ICP

I5 Disqualifiers

Platform prompt: Account traits that make your product a bad fit.

FOI answer: Work remains outside a governed FOI event when there is no fuel-condition/evidence-continuity requirement - for example, a price-only transaction, inventory-only activity, unrelated mechanical repair, or a host ticket with no qualifying fuel-condition/testing event. These activities can remain in host platform or the vendor workflow. Availability is broad; invocation is specific.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic v1.0 Remain criteria

I6 Qualification questions

Platform prompt: Two or three yes/no questions your reps use to qualify.

FOI answer: 1. Is the asset fuel-dependent and Life-Safety or mission-critical? 2. Does the event require fuel condition/evidence to remain tied to the correct asset through testing, intervention or verification? 3. Is a preserved continuity record required beyond a single vendor/work-order handoff? If yes, the FOI doorway is relevant; the event is governed only after admission.

Basis: FOI binary pre-envelope routing

I7 Primary champion

Platform prompt: The role that owns the day-to-day problem your product solves, and the outcome owner if different.

FOI answer: Primary champion: the maintenance, reliability, facilities/EPSS or service owner responsible for fuel readiness in the host workflow. Outcome owner may be engineering, Life-Safety/compliance or operations leadership accountable for readiness.

Basis: FOI doorway operating model

I8 Economic buyer by segment

Platform prompt: Who signs, by segment: SMB, midmarket, enterprise.

FOI answer: The economic buyer is the owner accountable for facility/EPSS readiness, reliability or the recurring fuel program - often Facilities, Engineering, Operations or Reliability leadership, with Procurement/Finance involved at larger organizations. Exact signing authority varies by account.

Basis: FOI rail buying logic

I9 Buying committee

Platform prompt: Functions that must be satisfied and what each needs to see.

FOI answer: The buying/qualification group may include Maintenance/Facilities or Reliability (host workflow), Engineering/Life-Safety/Compliance (condition/evidence outcome), IT/Security (doorway boundary) and Procurement/Finance (commercial access). Each retains its existing role; none receives FOI state authority.

Basis: FOI distributed-adoption boundary

I10 Stakeholders shared with host platform

Platform prompt: Which of your stakeholders host platform also sells to (IT, Quality, Ops leadership, others).

FOI answer: Shared stakeholders are Maintenance, Reliability, Facilities/Operations, Engineering and IT. The host platform reaches them through the asset/work-order environment; FOI reaches them where Life-Safety fuel-condition continuity around testing is relevant.

Basis: FOI/host platform role mapping

I11 Where conflict could concentrate

Platform prompt: For each shared stakeholder: whose budget line, whose incumbent relationship, who should lead.

FOI answer: Conflict is minimized by role separation. The host platform owns the maintenance-platform relationship and asset/work-order record. FOI governs the admitted fuel-continuity interval. Qualified laboratories and service providers retain their operating roles. The relationship is nonexclusive.

Basis: FOI system-of-record boundary

I12 Where joint value concentrates

Platform prompt: For each shared stakeholder: the outcome only the combined proposition delivers, in their KPI language.

FOI answer: Maintenance/Facilities gets a traceable path from host work to controlled fuel evidence; Engineering/Life-Safety gets preserved T0 -> intervention -> T1 continuity; IT gets a bounded doorway rather than a broad new system; leadership gets repeatable readiness evidence without replacing the CMMS or building a fuel laboratory/continuity function inside host platform.

Basis: FOI joint-value map

Product & Technical

T1 System of record for what

Platform prompt: State it in the same structure as host platform's: host platform is the system of record for assets and asset performance. You are the system of record for what?

FOI answer: The host platform is the system of record for the asset, PM and work order. FOI is the system of record for the admitted fuel-condition continuity event: the FOI Continuity File, its event/sample identity, protected evidence references, review/condition state, intervention-to-verification continuity and preserved next-event history.

Basis: FOI continuity architecture + FOI technical diligence baseline

T2 Objects and workflows you own

Platform prompt: The objects, workflows, and records your product owns end to end.

FOI answer: FOI owns the continuity objects and governed relationships: Doorway Request/admission outcome; FCU event identity; physical sample/custody identity; laboratory evidence; review/condition-state interpretation; intervention reference; T1 verification; preserved history; trending; and next-event continuity. The host platform keeps the master asset/work-order objects.

Basis: FOI continuity architecture + FOI technical diligence baseline

T3 What your system executes and records

Platform prompt: The work your system executes and records.

FOI answer: FOI executes governance of the admitted continuity event and records its evidence/state progression. Qualified participants execute the physical work. When FOI Lab is used, FOI also performs the laboratory process; when another qualified lab is used, its evidence can enter the same continuity record without transferring governance authority.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; FOI LIMS workflow

T4 What crosses the boundary

Platform prompt: The events, objects, and data that should cross between your product and host platform.

FOI answer: The real boundary is increased Life-Safety risk tied to an identified asset/event. The host platform -> FOI: host asset/object ID, work-order/request ID and minimum permitted context. FOI -> host platform: controlled continuity status and released evidence/certificate references. Method results may be returned as evidence, but host platform does not independently write FOI condition state. Identity crosses the doorway. Governance does not. Evidence returns across the doorway.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; FOI integration design

T5 Your CFO test answer

Platform prompt: Two sentences: why a customer needs both products, and what breaks if either is removed.

FOI answer: The host platform already has the asset/work-order environment; FOI already has the Life-Safety fuel-continuity fulfillment. Together, host platform can make that existing capability available without building a new Life-Safety product, laboratory network or continuity-governance function. The customer gains one path that protects life first, then reduces liability risk, time and cost.

Basis: host-platform/FOI joint-value framing; FOI technical diligence baseline

T6 Stage 1 scope you can commit

Platform prompt: The minimum viable integration you can deliver first, and roughly when.

FOI answer: Stage 1 is one bounded doorway, not a new product build: host platform supplies the existing asset/work-order identity and permitted context to FOI; FOI performs the existing admitted workflow; controlled status/evidence returns to the matching host platform record. The transport implementation (direct API, supported link/deep link, or approved middleware) is subordinate to this boundary and is selected after host-platform API/security qualification. No host platform auto-close authority and no FOI governance transfer.

T7 Stage 2 and 3 candidates

Platform prompt: Deeper execution and governance scope you see as feasible later.

FOI answer: Later stages may automate more of the same doorway: structured adverse-condition routing, work-order creation where customer rules authorize it, and return of completed intervention references to support the FOI verification loop. Deeper automation expands convenience and scale; it does not transfer state authority or change the underlying workflow.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline

T8 API and integration surface

Platform prompt: REST/GraphQL, webhooks, event streams, rate limits, and a link to public API docs.

FOI answer: FOI does not publish a public API or public API documentation today. Existing FOI systems use authenticated HTTPS/JSON endpoints, short-lived file-upload patterns for certificates and CSV export. For host platform, expose only the narrow endpoints/fields required for Stage 1 and qualify the exact endpoint behavior, rate limits and security requirements jointly.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; FOI portal/API routes

T9 Preferred integration pattern

Platform prompt: Pick one and say why.

FOI answer: Preferred transport is direct structured API exchange because the doorway is narrow and identity-bound. iPaaS/middleware or another middleware pattern is acceptable if host platform prefers it and it preserves the same identity, acknowledgement/retry behavior and authority split. Transport is a mechanism; it is not the Life-Safety product.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; platform direct-API/middleware options

T10 Authentication

Platform prompt: Pick your supported auth approach.

FOI answer: Current FOI system-to-system authentication uses a long random API key/bearer token over TLS with rotation support and no secret logging. If host platform requires OAuth 2.0 client credentials, FOI can support/build that pattern for the integration. FOI does not currently operate its own OAuth authorization server.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; FOI portal authentication code

T11 SSO and identity mapping

Platform prompt: How user identity maps across systems.

FOI answer: Human SSO is secondary to the rail identity. The critical join is PLATFORM_OBJECT_ID <-> FCU_EVENT_ID <-> PHYSICAL_SAMPLE_ID. If host platform requires user-level SSO or provisioning for deep links/embedded access, that can be qualified separately without becoming the governing identity spine.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; hosted identity provider + asset-key design

T12 Key objects to map

Platform prompt: The 3 to 6 objects on your side that would map to host platform work orders, assets, and requests.

FOI answer: Host-side objects: Asset/Equipment, Work Order/Request, Site/Location and permitted event context. FOI-side objects: Doorway Request, FOI Continuity File/FCU Event, Physical Sample/Custody identity, laboratory evidence and controlled return. Do not map a physical sample to an host platform inspection reading as though the two objects were equivalent; the sample remains a distinct FOI continuity object tied back to the host asset/event identity.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; FOI unit register/export fields

T13 Sync direction and frequency

Platform prompt: Per object: real-time webhook, scheduled, or batch.

FOI answer: Current FOI lab-to-cloud records queue when a certificate is released and sync on a roughly five-minute cycle with batching, duplicate protection and the same correction/withdrawal path. For host platform, exact webhook/polling/event cadence remains a joint technical choice. No

broad master-data replication is required.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; sync code

T14 Error handling ownership

Platform prompt: Who on your side detects and triages integration failures; escalation path and hours.

FOI answer: FOI-side rejected records are held and listed rather than silently dropped. Temporary failures retry with backoff from approximately one minute up to six hours; certificate checksum mismatches are held unpublished; independent monitoring checks the feed. Kyle is the technical escalation contact during normal Pacific business hours with direct-cell escalation for serious integration issues. FOI does not promise guaranteed 24x7 coverage it does not staff.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; sync/watchdog code; internal coverage agreement

T15 Environments and data residency

Platform prompt: State FOI environment readiness and host-platform dependencies.

FOI answer: FOI has development and production lab systems on FOI-controlled U.S. hardware with offsite backup; development can send test data without touching real customer data. Relevant FOI portal hosting is U.S.-based. FOI has no EU residency option today. The host platform must provide the test/sandbox capability required for qualification; data written into the host platform follows that platform's residency posture.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; deployment/hosting configuration

T16 Security and compliance posture

Platform prompt: Certifications, pen test cadence, data processing terms.

FOI answer: Current posture must be stated plainly: FOI does not currently hold SOC 2 or ISO 27001 and is not currently ISO 17025 accredited. FOI uses published ASTM/ISO methods where applicable, signed human release, permanent/versioned certificates, SHA-256 file digests, QC controls tied to results/instruments, analyst training records and version-controlled procedures. Hosting-provider certifications are their certifications, not FOI's. FOI has not completed a third-party penetration test. A September 4, 2026 portal access-control audit found no cross-customer data leak; identified same-customer read-only issues were remediated/tested.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline; portal audit 2026-09-04; LIMS QC/release records

T17 Standard open technical questions

Platform prompt: Resolve the platform variables required for Stage 1.

FOI answer: For each host platform, qualify: 1) work-order create + attachment behavior; 2) asset field for FOI external customer/unit ID; 3) event push versus FOI polling; 4) API key versus OAuth 2.0 client credentials; 5) partner sandbox/test environment; 6) rate/batch limits; 7) FOI credentials versus customer-scoped credentials; 8) customer permission model; 9) controlled status/evidence display; 10) which customer-defined conditions may trigger host work. FOI provides

evidence/status and does not invent severity or customer work-order policy.

Basis: FOI technical diligence baseline

Strategy & Risk

S1 Data the integration adds

Platform prompt: What structured data the integration adds to each platform, and the analytics or AI capability that unlocks.

FOI answer: The host platform gains asset-linked FOI continuity status and evidence/file references; FOI gains the stable host asset/work-order identity and permitted context needed to preserve the event against the correct asset. That linkage supports longitudinal trending and AI-assisted discovery. AI may interpret or route, but it cannot write FOI governed state or promote treated/corrected to verified without T1 evidence.

Basis: FOI identity spine + AI boundary

S2 Reach you gain, reach you give

Platform prompt: Personas or functions each company reaches through the other that it does not reach today.

FOI answer: FOI gains lawful reach into host platform maintenance/reliability workflows where the customer already manages the asset. The host platform gains a bounded doorway to existing Life-Safety fuel-continuity fulfillment without building or owning the laboratory/state-governance layer. Neither party acquires ownership of the other's customers.

Basis: FOI distributed-adoption model

S3 Why this pairing is defensible

Platform prompt: Why no single vendor or alternative pairing can replicate the connected proposition. Name alternatives you considered.

FOI answer: The pairing is defensible because the roles remain separate: host platform is the maintenance host; FOI governs the admitted fuel-continuity interval; qualified providers execute their work. A generic connector can move data, but it does not recreate the FOI Continuity File, state-writing rule, verification discipline or anti-capture boundary. The value is structural, not exclusive.

Basis: FOI anti-capture + system boundary

S4 Alternative partners you evaluated

Platform prompt: CMMS/EAM vendors you considered or currently partner with, and where those stand.

FOI answer: FOI is intentionally not designed around one software platform. It has evaluated

pathways with Facilio, FMX, UpKeep, IFS Ultimo, MaintainX, Limble and other CMMS/EAM environments. The Life-Safety continuity architecture is available for qualified platform adaptations; none receives FOI governance authority. host platform's opportunity is to become one qualified access environment, not an exclusive owner of the workflow.

Basis: FOI platform-adoption landscape

S5 Dependency risks you see

Platform prompt: What you would come to depend on host platform for, and what concerns that raises.

FOI answer: FOI does not want structural capture. The acceptable technical dependency is limited to access/transport, stable host identity and the ability to return controlled information. Healthy operational co-dependency can mature organically as customers repeatedly use the continuity workflow: the doorway creates access, repeated use creates trust, and continuity creates value. FOI governance and Continuity File integrity remain independent of host platform.

Basis: FOI one-way boundary/invariants

S6 Roadmap divergence scenarios

Platform prompt: Scenarios where product strategies could pull apart: acquisition, category pivot, competing feature build.

FOI answer: If host platform later expands native fuel inspections or adjacent features, those can contribute events/context without becoming FOI governed state. FOI will not become a CMMS. The architecture remains portable across qualified platforms. Product roadmaps can diverge while the customer continuity record survives.

Basis: FOI common governance / distributed adoption

S7 Corporate events on the horizon

Platform prompt: Funding, M&A, or ownership changes in the next 18 months that could affect the partnership. Mark Confidential as needed.

FOI answer: No funding, M&A, ownership change or other corporate event is anticipated in the next 18 months that is expected to affect the partnership. FOI is privately held and founder-owned.

Basis: FOI rail-only scope

S8 Unwind position

Platform prompt: What you would need contractually if the partnership ends: data portability, customer communication, wind-down terms.

FOI answer: The partnership should be nonexclusive and easy to enter or exit, including a 30-day termination path for either party. If the relationship ends, the host platform doorway can be disabled after orderly transition, but the FOI workflow, chain of custody, Continuity Files, protected evidence and state history remain intact and customer-accessible. Active

custody/evidence work is not abandoned. The platform can change. The participant can change.
The Continuity File persists.

Basis: FOI continuity invariants + unwind boundary

GTM & Commitments

G1 Your lead narrative

Platform prompt: How your reps open: the domain problem and workflow you lead with for the joint ICP.

FOI answer: Life-Safety first. FOI provides a cradle-to-grave Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow around fuel testing: Identify -> Sample -> Custody -> Laboratory Performance -> Review -> Correct -> Verify -> Preserve -> Trend -> Next Event. Testing establishes physical evidence; chain of custody preserves its relationship to the correct asset/event; review establishes what it means; correction is recorded; verification establishes the resulting condition; preservation/trending carry that known position forward. The outcome hierarchy is life first, liability risk, time, cost. The host platform provides the space; FOI provides the fulfillment.

Basis: FOI Close Check + adoption-first posture

G2 Signal that surfaces the maintenance need

Platform prompt: The qualifying signal in your sales motion where host platform becomes relevant, and how the handoff should work.

FOI answer: The host platform signal is simple: the customer already manages the affected fuel-dependent Life-Safety/mission-critical asset and its work in host platform and wants the FOI continuity workflow available from that environment. The handoff is the existing asset/work-order identity plus permitted context into the FOI doorway, followed by controlled evidence/status back to the same host record.

Basis: FOI platform-adoption posture

G3 Signal for host platform reps to bring you in

Platform prompt: From your experience: the moment in a maintenance-led deal where your product becomes relevant.

FOI answer: The need is immediate across the fuel stream wherever fuel supports a Life-Safety or mission-critical asset. An host platform rep does not need to wait for a failure signal. Qualify the doorway when the customer operates that asset and has testing/evidence continuity that crosses delivery, sampling, custody, laboratory review, correction, verification or next-event history. Need is continuous; a governed FOI event begins only after admission.

Basis: Admission-Check Logic + Three Tickets

G4 Joint value proposition draft

Platform prompt: One paragraph: the closed-loop outcome the combined solution delivers, in customer KPI language.

FOI answer: FOI already performs the cradle-to-grave Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow around testing. The host platform provides the established asset/work-order space through which customers can access that fulfillment. The result is a preserved chain from asset identity and

sampling through evidence, correction, verification and next event - protecting life first, then reducing liability risk, time and cost - without requiring host platform to become a laboratory or continuity authority.

Basis: FOI boundary + joint rail

G5 Deal registration capability

Platform prompt: Whether you run deal registration today and in what system.

FOI answer: FOI does not need a heavy software-channel deal-registration system for the initial motion. A simple named customer / named workflow record with clear ownership and customer consent is enough. The broader partnership can remain nonexclusive and commercially simple, with a 30-day termination path that does not impair customer continuity.

Basis: FOI adoption-first GTM

G6 Concerns your team will raise

Platform prompt: Concerns your sales, product, or exec team will raise about this partnership, so the deck addresses them honestly.

FOI answer: FOI's primary concern is keeping the Life-Safety workflow intact, including holding itself accountable to the same governance. FOI cannot bypass chain of custody for commercial convenience, rewrite protected history, or call an intervention verified without T1 evidence. The workflow governs the relationship - including FOI.

Basis: FOI governance/adoption guardrails

G7 Starting tier you propose

Platform prompt: Refer, co-sell, or resell/embed, and why.

FOI answer: Start with a direct co-sell/qualified-access motion around one real customer event, not resale, exclusivity or a branded product launch. The host platform identifies a qualifying Life-Safety workflow; the customer enters the FOI doorway; FOI fulfills the governed event; controlled information returns. Deeper commercial alignment can mature organically after repeated operating proof.

Basis: FOI platform strategy; proposed co-branded operating path

G8 Enablement capacity

Platform prompt: Reps and SEs you can certify on the joint story, and when.

FOI answer: FOI is enablement-ready today because the workflow, product/service fulfillment and operating story already exist. Selected platform partnership, sales, SE and technical teams need only understand the Life-Safety purpose, the full-fuel-stream applicability, and the doorway/boundary. Technical connector qualification is separate from commercial enablement. The workflow is built. The fulfillment is available. The doorway is what gets qualified.

Basis: FOI adoption-first operating model

G9 KPIs you propose to share

Platform prompt: The joint metrics you would sign up to review quarterly.

FOI answer: Quarterly KPIs should measure Life-Safety continuity adoption/performance, not connector installs: qualified Life-Safety opportunities; customers where the doorway is available; admitted governed events; successful controlled returns; identity/chain-of-custody preservation; T1 verification completion where applicable; repeat next-event continuity; customer-approved operating proofs; and expansion across assets/sites. First operating KPI: Did we preserve Life-Safety Fuel Continuity as intended? Outcomes follow: life first, liability risk, time, cost.

Basis: FOI adoption status + rail KPIs

G10 Executive sponsor

Platform prompt: Name and title of your exec sponsor for this partnership.

FOI answer: Larry D. Steckman, CEO / Owner, FOI Laboratories. Executive sponsorship carries direct accountability for the Life-Safety purpose, continuity boundary and material partnership decisions.

Basis: FOI leadership

G11 Partnership owner

Platform prompt: Name and title of the day-to-day partnership owner.

FOI answer: Larry D. Steckman, CEO / Owner, will serve as the initial day-to-day partnership owner. FOI does not require board or shareholder approval to decide whether Life-Safety Fuel Continuity should be made available; that decision has already been made in favor of Life-Safety. Operational responsibilities can be delegated as adoption matures without changing the continuity obligation.

Basis: Current FOI operating posture

G12 Engineering commitment

Platform prompt: State the FOI engineering posture for a Stage 1 doorway.

FOI answer: FOI is prepared to commit the engineering support necessary to qualify and activate the Stage 1 doorway. Kyle is the technical lead, supported by FOI's existing LIMS/API development resources as required. The workflow is already built; engineering work is limited to doorway/interface qualification, mapping, authentication/security, sandbox testing, controlled exchange, error/acknowledgement behavior and first-event support. Exact staffing allocation follows the host platform's confirmed API/security/sandbox scope rather than an invented engineer count.

Basis: FOI Stage 1 scope

G13 Pilot customer candidates

Platform prompt: One to three shared or near-shared customers who could pilot. Confirm you have or can get their consent.

FOI answer: No customer should be represented as an host-platform pilot until shared-account overlap and customer consent are confirmed. Terracon is a strong operating reference for the

underlying FOI workflow, not an assumed host-platform pilot. The first host-platform proof should be one consented customer, one qualified doorway, one admitted governed event, one controlled return, then a joint review.

Basis: Terracon operating reference; shared-account match required

G14 Co-marketing commitment

Platform prompt: What you can commit for the joint reference story: case study, webinar, event presence, MDF.

FOI answer: FOI does not require a traditional SEO-driven co-marketing program to establish the opportunity. FOI already brings an established fuel-laboratory brand, customer relationships, the public Life-Safety workflow and the governed Fuel Continuity Utility. Customer-approved case studies, webinars or reference stories may document real performance after proof, but promotion is optional evidence of performance - not the foundation of the partnership. Prove continuity first; tell the story where useful.

Basis: FOI evidence-first adoption posture

G15 Constraints on the initial qualification plan

Platform prompt: Identify FOI-side constraints that could block first proof.

FOI answer: FOI has no internal readiness constraint preventing a qualified platform relationship from moving forward. FOI already provides this Life-Safety Fuel Continuity workflow across America every day and is prepared today to provide the fulfillment behind a qualified host-platform doorway. The practical work is platform qualification: API/authentication/sandbox/security, asset/event mapping, controlled return, one consented customer path and one governed operating proof. There is no FOI board, shareholder, funding, new-product or marketing-launch dependency.

Basis: FOI public Life-Safety Protocol; FOI current operating posture

Operating close

The next action is not a branding decision. It is an operating proof: one consented host-platform customer, one qualified doorway, one admitted governed event, one controlled return, then a joint review. FOI is prepared today to provide the Life-Safety fulfillment behind that doorway.