EXOPOLITICS FIELD FRAMEWORK 1.0

Taxonomy, Ontology & Knowledge Graph Module

A multidimensional classification and analytical architecture for phenomena, evidence, intelligence, claims, source dependencies, adversarial manipulation, and epistemic uncertainty.

Framework	EFF 1.0
Module	Taxonomy & Ontology
Status	Draft Standard
Purpose	Research, intelligence collection, case analysis, publication, and knowledge governance

Core doctrine: Classification is not validation. A taxonomy records what is claimed, observed, measured, inferred, or hypothesized without converting the classification itself into proof.

Contents

1 Phenomena Taxonomy

2 Evidence & Epistemology Taxonomy

3 Exopolitical Intelligence Taxonomy

4 EFF Ontology & Knowledge Graph

5 Relationship & Dependency Standard

6 Canonical Case Record Schema

7 Claim Graph Standard

8 Worked Ontology Example

This reference edition consolidates the current Mintlify taxonomy and ontology module. The controlled vocabulary is designed to evolve under version control as EFF 1.0 is expanded.

1. Phenomena Taxonomy

Standard: EFF-TAX-PHEN-1

Status: Draft

Framework: ExoPolitics Field Framework 1.0

The Phenomena Taxonomy answers a narrow question: **what is being reported, observed, experienced, recorded, recovered, or claimed?** It does not determine whether the report is true.

Core rule

EFF classifies the observation before the explanation. A case may carry multiple simultaneous tags across domain, modality, entity, morphology, origin, interaction, and manifestation.

Phenomenon domains

- PD-OBS - Observation
- PD-ART - Artifact or material
- PD-HIS - Historical or ancient evidence
- PD-TS - Testimony
- PD-DOC - Documentary evidence
- PD-LIT - Literature or published material
- PD-MED - Imaging, audio, or sensor record
- PD-CT - Contact or interaction
- PD-CH - Channeling
- PD-RV - Remote viewing or anomalous cognition
- PD-OB - Out-of-body, astral, NDE, or lucid-state phenomenon
- PD-TECH - Technology claim
- PD-XP - Exopolitical activity

Historical and ancient classes

- HA-TXT - Ancient text
- HA-ART - Ancient artifact
- HA-ARC - Archaeological site
- HA-ICO - Iconography
- HA-ORL - Oral tradition
- HA-MYT - Mythological narrative
- HA-AST - Archaeoastronomical evidence

Ancient material must be interpreted with period-appropriate historical, linguistic, archaeological, and cultural controls before modern technological interpretations are applied.

Testimony classes

- TS-DIR - Direct witness
- TS-PAR - Participant
- TS-INS - Insider

- TS-WHB - Whistleblower
- TS-SEC - Second-hand witness
- TS-DER - Derivative testimony
- TS-EXP - Experiencer
- TS-CON - Contactee
- TS-ANON - Anonymous source

Identity, credentials, access, and claim reliability are scored separately.

Contact and interaction

- CT-VIS - Visual contact
- CT-PHY - Physical interaction
- CT-COM - Communication
- CT-TEL - Alleged telepathic communication
- CT-DRE - Dream-state contact
- CT-ALT - Altered-state contact
- CT-REP - Repeated contact
- CT-GRP - Group contact
- CT-TEC - Technology-mediated contact
- CT-SIG - Signal-based contact
- CT-CE5 - Intentionally initiated contact protocol
- CT-ABD - Alleged abduction
- CT-MED - Alleged medical interaction
- CT-MIL - Military interaction
- CT-DIP - Claimed diplomatic interaction

Channeling

- CH-CON - Conscious channeling
- CH-TRN - Trance channeling
- CH-AUT - Automatic writing
- CH-VOI - Vocal channeling
- CH-VIS - Visionary
- CH-MED - Mediumistic
- CH-UNK - Unspecified

Channeling is evaluated at two separate levels: **experience occurrence** and **external attribution validity**.

Remote viewing and anomalous cognition

- RV-CRV - Controlled remote viewing
- RV-ERV - Extended remote viewing
- RV-ARV - Associative remote viewing
- RV-FRV - Free-form remote viewing
- RV-PRE - Precognitive
- RV-RET - Retrocognitive
- RV-LOC - Location target

- RV-ENT - Entity target
- RV-EVT - Event target
- RV-OBJ - Object target

Session tasking, target identifiers, feedback timing, monitor contact, raw notes, drawings, target pools, and judging method should be retained.

Out-of-body and astral classes

- OB-OBE - Out-of-body experience
- OB-AST - Astral travel
- OB-NDE - Near-death experience
- OB-LUC - Lucid-dream exploration
- OB-LOC - Perceived remote location
- OB-NPH - Nonphysical environment
- OB-ENT - Entity encounter

Claimed intelligence and entity type

- EI-NHI - Non-human intelligence, origin unresolved
- EI-ETB - Extraterrestrial biological intelligence
- EI-ID - Interdimensional intelligence
- EI-NPB - Nonphysical or spirit-type intelligence
- EI-NEH - Non-Earth human
- EI-IE - Inner-Earth intelligence
- EI-OC - Oceanic or subterranean terrestrial intelligence
- EI-TH - Temporal or future-human intelligence
- EI-EXD - Extradimensional human
- EI-AI - Artificial intelligence
- EI-PAI - Post-biological intelligence
- EI-HYB - Hybrid intelligence
- EI-COL - Collective intelligence
- EI-UNK - Unknown intelligence

These are claimed or hypothesized ontologies, not validated species.

Morphology

- MOR-HUM - Human appearing
- MOR-HMD - Humanoid
- MOR-GRY - Grey-type description
- MOR-REP - Reptilian or reptiloid description
- MOR-INS - Insectoid or mantid description
- MOR-AVI - Avian description
- MOR-AQU - Aquatic description
- MOR-ENE - Energetic or light form
- MOR-SHD - Shadow or dark form
- MOR-ORB - Orb or spherical manifestation
- MOR-AME - Amorphous

- MOR-MCH - Mechanical
- MOR-VAR - Variable or form-changing
- MOR-UNK - Unknown

Morphology must never determine origin by itself.

Origin and ontology claim

- OR-EXT - Extraterrestrial
- OR-TER - Terrestrial
- OR-SUB - Subterranean
- OR-OCE - Oceanic
- OR-IDM - Interdimensional
- OR-TMP - Temporal
- OR-NPH - Nonphysical
- OR-ART - Artificially created
- OR-SIM - Simulation-related
- OR-MUL - Multiple or hybrid origin
- OR-UNK - Unknown

Manifestation mode

- MM-PHY - Physical
- MM-SEN - Sensor-detectable
- MM-VIS - Visually observable
- MM-COG - Cognitive
- MM-DRE - Dream-state
- MM-ALT - Altered consciousness
- MM-PSI - Psi-mediated
- MM-TMP - Temporally anomalous
- MM-ENV - Environmental effects
- MM-MIX - Mixed manifestation
- MM-UNK - Unknown

Identification level

- ID-0 - Unidentified
- ID-1 - Descriptively classified
- ID-2 - Probable identification
- ID-3 - Strong identification
- ID-4 - Established identification

Identification is dimension-specific. Strong morphology identification does not establish origin.

2. Evidence & Epistemology Taxonomy

Standard: EFF-TAX-EPI-1

Status: Draft

Framework: ExoPolitics Field Framework 1.0

This taxonomy answers: **how do we know, how could we be wrong, and how could the evidentiary environment have been manipulated?**

Evidence classes

- EV-PHY - Physical evidence
- EV-INS - Instrumental or sensor evidence
- EV-DOC - Documentary evidence
- EV-TS - Direct testimony
- EV-WHB - Insider or whistleblower evidence
- EV-SEC - Secondary source
- EV-EXP - Experiential evidence
- EV-PSI - Psi-derived information
- EV-HIS - Historical or archival evidence
- EV-STA - Statistical or aggregate evidence
- EV-MET - Metadata or technical provenance evidence

Provenance state

- PV-0 - Unknown provenance
- PV-1 - Claimed origin only
- PV-2 - Partially documented provenance
- PV-3 - Strong provenance
- PV-4 - Continuous documented chain
- PV-5 - Independently authenticated provenance

Source reliability

- SR-A - Highly reliable
- SR-B - Generally reliable
- SR-C - Mixed or unknown
- SR-D - Questionable
- SR-E - Unreliable
- SR-U - Unrated

Source reliability never substitutes for evidence quality.

Evidence strength

- ES-0 - Unknown
- ES-1 - Anecdotal
- ES-2 - Weak
- ES-3 - Moderate

- ES-4 - Strong
- ES-5 - Exceptional

Corroboration structure

- CO-0 - Uncorroborated
- CO-1 - Single supporting channel
- CO-2 - Multiple derivative sources
- CO-3 - Multiple apparently independent sources
- CO-4 - Independently verified cross-domain corroboration
- CO-5 - Multiple independent high-quality evidence streams

Independence status

- IN-0 - Unknown dependency
- IN-1 - Known dependent
- IN-2 - Probable shared upstream source
- IN-3 - Partial independence
- IN-4 - Strong independence
- IN-5 - Independently verified separation

Contamination and taint

- ET-0 - No identified taint
- ET-1 - Minor contextual contamination
- ET-2 - Material source contamination
- ET-3 - Significant narrative contamination
- ET-4 - Severe evidentiary contamination
- ET-5 - Evidentiary environment compromised

Evidence authenticity, public reputation, interpretive reliability, and taint are separate dimensions.

Information-operation and manipulation classes

- IO-MIS - Misinformation
- IO-DIS - Disinformation
- IO-MAL - Malinformation
- IO-FAB - Fabricated evidence
- IO-ALT - Altered authentic evidence
- IO-CTX - Context manipulation
- IO-LAU - Information laundering
- IO-SYN - Synthetic corroboration
- IO-POI - Evidence poisoning
- IO-TAI - Reputational taint operation
- IO-FLO - Information flooding
- IO-DIV - Diversion
- IO-IMP - Impersonation or identity manipulation
- IO-DOC - Synthetic or planted documentary trail

- IO-SEN - Sensor or telemetry manipulation
- IO-WIT - Witness cultivation or scripted testimony
- IO-UNK - Suspected manipulation, mechanism unknown

Adversary capability

- AC-0 - No adversary assumed
- AC-1 - Simple deception capability
- AC-2 - Moderate coordinated capability
- AC-3 - Advanced technical and social capability
- AC-4 - State-level or institutional capability
- AC-5 - Beyond publicly demonstrated capability

AC-5 does not validate an extraordinary claim. It indicates that the evidentiary controls may be insufficient if the hypothesized actor can outperform them.

Incentive and conflict classes

- CI-COM - Commercial incentive
- CI-POL - Political incentive
- CI-REL - Religious or ideological incentive
- CI-ORG - Institutional incentive
- CI-REP - Reputational incentive
- CI-LEG - Legal incentive
- CI-SEC - Security or classification incentive
- CI-NON - No material conflict identified
- CI-UNK - Unknown

Falsifiability state

- FA-0 - Not presently falsifiable
- FA-1 - Weakly falsifiable
- FA-2 - Partially falsifiable
- FA-3 - Clearly falsifiable
- FA-4 - Registered prediction or predefined failure condition

Reproducibility state

- RP-0 - Not reproducible
- RP-1 - Insufficient information
- RP-2 - Reanalysis possible
- RP-3 - Independent replication attempted
- RP-4 - Independently replicated

Alternative-hypothesis status

- AH-0 - Alternatives not evaluated
- AH-1 - Informal alternatives considered
- AH-2 - Structured alternatives documented
- AH-3 - Competing hypotheses actively tested

- AH-4 - Red-team review completed

Analytical confidence

Confidence is attached to a proposition, not to a case globally.

- CF-0 - No assessment
- CF-1 - Low
- CF-2 - Low-to-moderate
- CF-3 - Moderate
- CF-4 - High
- CF-5 - Very high

Epistemic doctrine

A sophisticated fake may possess excellent provenance, multiple witnesses, technical media, authentic institutional records, and apparent independence. Therefore EFF never permits any one evidentiary dimension to dominate the assessment.

Conversely, authentic evidence may become reputationally damaged through association with hoaxes, commercial exploitation, sensational claims, source misconduct, or deliberate taint. EFF therefore distinguishes **evidence validity** from **social credibility**.

3. Exopolitical Intelligence Taxonomy

Standard: EFF-TAX-INT-1

Status: Draft

Framework: ExoPolitics Field Framework 1.0

This taxonomy answers: **who are the alleged actors, what are they doing, what relationships are claimed, what capabilities or motives are attributed to them, and what institutional or policy consequences follow?**

Actor classes

- ACT-HUM - Human individual
- ACT-ORG - Human organization
- ACT-GOV - Government
- ACT-MIL - Military body
- ACT-INT - Intelligence body
- ACT-COR - Corporation
- ACT-SCI - Scientific institution
- ACT-REL - Religious institution
- ACT-MED - Media organization
- ACT-ADV - Advocacy group
- ACT-NHI - Alleged non-human intelligence
- ACT-MIX - Alleged mixed human/NHI structure
- ACT-UNK - Unknown actor

Institutional activity

- XP-GOV - Government activity
- XP-MIL - Military activity
- XP-INT - Intelligence activity
- XP-COR - Corporate activity
- XP-SCI - Scientific activity
- XP-DIP - Diplomacy
- XP-CON - Contact program
- XP-SEC - Secrecy or classification
- XP-DIS - Disclosure
- XP-DES - Alleged disinformation
- XP-TEC - Technology transfer claim
- XP-AGR - Agreement or treaty claim
- XP-CUL - Cultural influence
- XP-REL - Religious interaction
- XP-ECO - Economic implication
- XP-LAW - Legal implication

Relationship classes

- REL-OBS - Observation only
- REL-CON - Contact
- REL-COM - Communication
- REL-COO - Cooperation
- REL-EXC - Exchange
- REL-TEC - Alleged technology transfer
- REL-INF - Influence
- REL-CTL - Alleged control
- REL-CONF - Conflict
- REL-AGR - Agreement or treaty
- REL-COV - Covert relationship
- REL-UNK - Unknown relationship

Capability classes

- CAP-AER - Aerospace
- CAP-ENE - Energy
- CAP-MAT - Materials
- CAP-BIO - Biological
- CAP-MED - Medical
- CAP-COG - Cognitive or consciousness-related
- CAP-COM - Communication
- CAP-PSI - Psi-related
- CAP-INF - Information operations
- CAP-STE - Stealth or concealment
- CAP-TMP - Temporal manipulation
- CAP-DIM - Dimensional manipulation
- CAP-AI - Artificial intelligence
- CAP-MFG - Manufacturing
- CAP-WPN - Weapon capability
- CAP-UNK - Unknown

Capabilities are claims until independently established.

Motive and objective classes

- MOT-OBS - Observation or study
- MOT-CON - Contact
- MOT-COO - Cooperation
- MOT-RES - Resource acquisition
- MOT-GEN - Genetic or biological interest
- MOT-INF - Influence
- MOT-CTL - Control
- MOT-SEC - Security
- MOT-EXP - Exploration

- MOT-DIP - Diplomacy
- MOT-CUL - Cultural interaction
- MOT-UNK - Unknown

Program classes

- PRG-RSH - Research program
- PRG-MIL - Military program
- PRG-INT - Intelligence program
- PRG-REC - Recovery program
- PRG-REV - Reverse-engineering claim
- PRG-CON - Contact program
- PRG-DIP - Diplomatic program
- PRG-PSI - Psi or consciousness program
- PRG-DIS - Disclosure program
- PRG-DES - Disinformation program
- PRG-UNK - Unknown program

Policy consequence classes

- POL-SEC - National security
- POL-SCI - Science policy
- POL-INT - International relations
- POL-DIP - Diplomacy
- POL-LEG - Law and regulation
- POL-ECO - Economics
- POL-REL - Religion
- POL-CUL - Culture
- POL-EDU - Education
- POL-TEC - Technology
- POL-PUB - Public communication
- POL-ETH - Ethics

Intelligence requirement classes

- PIR-EXI - Does the actor/program/event exist?
- PIR-ACC - Did the source possess claimed access?
- PIR-IND - Are corroborating sources genuinely independent?
- PIR-CAP - Is the claimed capability demonstrated?
- PIR-REL - What relationship exists between actors?
- PIR-MOT - What motives are supported?
- PIR-ORG - Which institutions are involved?
- PIR-DOC - What documents exist and what do they establish?
- PIR-TEC - Is technology independently testable?
- PIR-CON - Is alleged contact independently verifiable?

Intelligence-gap classes

- GAP-SRC - Missing source
- GAP-DOC - Missing document
- GAP-DAT - Missing raw data
- GAP-ID - Identity unverified
- GAP-ACC - Access unverified
- GAP-IND - Independence unresolved
- GAP-PROV - Provenance incomplete
- GAP-LAB - Independent testing absent
- GAP-TIM - Timeline uncertainty
- GAP-LOC - Location uncertainty
- GAP-MOT - Motive unknown
- GAP-CAP - Capability unknown

Analytical doctrine

Exopolitical analysis must distinguish between **reported actor**, **reported relationship**, **reported capability**, and **reported motive**. One does not establish the others.

4. EFF Ontology & Knowledge Graph

Standard: EFF-ONT-1

Status: Draft

The EFF ontology is the canonical information model beneath research, intelligence, publication, Exopaedia-style reference systems, case investigations, and future machine-assisted analysis.

Core objects

EFF uses distinct object types rather than storing research as articles.

- **Claim** - A specific proposition capable of support, contradiction, or revision.
- **Case** - A bounded investigative container containing one or more claims.
- **Event** - A claimed occurrence anchored to time and, where possible, location.
- **Observation** - A reported or measured observation associated with an event.
- **Evidence Item** - A discrete item offered in support or contradiction of a claim.
- **Source** - The person, institution, system, document, sensor, or publication from which information originates.
- **Actor** - A person, institution, organization, or alleged intelligence capable of agency.
- **Entity Report** - A report describing an alleged non-human, human-like, anomalous, or unknown entity.
- **Artifact** - A physical or documentary object preserved as a research object.
- **Program** - A claimed or established organized activity.
- **Location** - Geographic, astronomical, subterranean, virtual, or claimed nonordinary location.
- **Publication** - A journal article, book, news article, video, paper, transcript, or other published work.
- **Hypothesis** - A candidate explanation for one or more claims.
- **Assessment** - A dated analytical judgment attached to a specific proposition.
- **Intelligence Gap** - A missing fact or evidence item whose resolution would materially affect analysis.
- **Taxonomy Term** - A controlled classification label.

Relationship model

Relationships are first-class records and may themselves carry evidence, confidence, dates, and dispute status.

Examples:

- SOURCE_MADE_CLAIM
- EVIDENCE_SUPPORTS_CLAIM
- EVIDENCE_CONTRADICTS_CLAIM
- EVIDENCE_DERIVED_FROM_SOURCE
- CLAIM_REFERS_TO_EVENT
- OBSERVATION_OCCURRED_AT_EVENT
- ACTOR_PARTICIPATED_IN_EVENT
- ACTOR_MEMBER_OF_ORGANIZATION
- ACTOR_ASSOCIATED_WITH_PROGRAM

- PROGRAM_RUN_BY_ORGANIZATION
- ENTITY_REPORTED_IN_EVENT
- ENTITY_HAS_MORPHOLOGY
- ENTITY_HAS_CLAIMED_ORIGIN
- EVENT_OCCURRED_AT_LOCATION
- PUBLICATION_CITES_SOURCE
- PUBLICATION_REPEATS_CLAIM
- SOURCE_EXPOSED_TO_PUBLICATION
- CLAIM_CORROBORATES_CLAIM
- CLAIM_CONTRADICTS_CLAIM
- HYPOTHESIS_EXPLAINS_CLAIM
- ASSESSMENT_EVALUATES_CLAIM
- GAP_LIMITS_ASSESSMENT

Why relationships need their own evidence

A claim that two actors cooperated is not the same as evidence that either actor exists. The relationship itself must be supportable, contestable, and revisable.

Claim-centric architecture

Articles, books, videos, interviews, and courses are presentation layers. The canonical research object is the claim.

A claim record should answer:

- What exactly is being asserted?
- Who first asserted it?
- What evidence supports it?
- What evidence contradicts it?
- Which sources are independent?
- What contamination or adversarial risks exist?
- Which hypotheses compete to explain it?
- What is the current assessment?
- What information would change the assessment?

Multiple ontologies may coexist

EFF does not require a single global explanation. A single entity report may carry multiple candidate origin hypotheses with separate confidence values.

Temporal versioning

Objects are persistent; assessments are versioned. The system preserves previous analytical states so researchers can see how conclusions changed over time.

5. Relationship & Dependency Standard

Standard: EFF-ONT-REL-1

EFF treats dependency analysis as essential because apparent corroboration can be manufactured or culturally propagated.

Relationship record fields

Every material relationship should support:

- relationship ID
- source object ID
- target object ID
- relationship type
- first known date
- last known date
- direction
- evidence supporting the relationship
- evidence contradicting the relationship
- provenance state
- confidence
- dispute state
- reviewer
- last review date

Dependency relationships

Key dependency types include:

- DERIVED_FROM
- COPIED_FROM
- CITED_FROM
- EXPOSED_TO
- POSSIBLY_EXPOSED_TO
- SHARED_UPSTREAM_SOURCE
- COORDINATED_WITH
- INDEPENDENT_OF
- INDEPENDENCE_UNRESOLVED

Corroboration rule

Source count is never used as a proxy for independence.

Three witnesses who discussed an event together may represent one evidentiary cluster. One witness plus radar plus a contemporaneous government log may represent three stronger independent channels.

Synthetic corroboration detection

EFF should flag networks in which apparently independent sources converge through hidden or common upstream nodes.

Indicators include:

- identical unusual wording;
- shared intermediary contacts;
- common conference, course, book, or media exposure;
- synchronized publication;
- repeated unique factual errors;
- common metadata or file origin;
- unexplained narrative convergence after contact with the same investigator.

6. Canonical Case Record Schema

Standard: EFF-SCHEMA-CASE-1

The case record is the operational container for investigations.

Case fields

- case_id
- title
- summary
- status
- opened_at
- closed_at
- lead_researcher
- jurisdiction
- locations[]
- events[]
- claims[]
- actors[]
- entity_reports[]
- evidence_items[]
- sources[]
- hypotheses[]
- assessments[]
- intelligence_gaps[]
- taxonomy_tags[]
- conflicts[]
- taint_status
- adversary_capability_assessment
- last_reviewed_at
- version

Claim fields

- claim_id
- claim_text
- claim_type
- originating_source_id
- first_known_date
- claim_status
- evidence_supporting[]
- evidence_contradicting[]
- dependency_cluster_id
- corroboration_status
- falsifiability_state
- alternative_hypotheses[]
- current_assessment_id

Evidence item fields

- evidence_id
- evidence_class
- title
- description
- source_id
- created_at
- acquired_at
- original_available
- hash
- metadata_preserved
- chain_of_custody
- provenance_state
- evidence_strength
- taint_status
- manipulation_flags[]
- supports_claims[]
- contradicts_claims[]

Source fields

- source_id
- source_type
- name_or_alias
- identity_verified
- credentials_verified
- access_verified
- source_reliability
- conflicts[]
- known_exposures[]
- known_dependencies[]
- publication_history[]

Assessment fields

- assessment_id
- claim_id
- assessor
- assessment_date
- confidence_level
- reasoning_summary
- strongest_support
- strongest_contradiction
- alternative_hypotheses
- red_team_status
- major_gaps[]
- conditions_that_would_change_assessment[]
- supersedes_assessment_id

7. Claim Graph Standard

Standard: EFF-GRAPH-1

The Claim Graph records how propositions enter, spread through, and evolve inside the information environment.

Claim genealogy

Every significant claim should attempt to identify:

1. first known appearance;
2. originating source;
3. original evidence;
4. early derivative repetitions;
5. major publications;
6. later witnesses;
7. social and cultural propagation;
8. contradiction history;
9. retractions or revisions;
10. present assessment.

Phenomenon genealogy

EFF separately tracks how recurring motifs evolve, including:

- morphology descriptions;
- named civilizations;
- star-system claims;
- alleged technologies;
- recurring symbols;
- contact narratives;
- terminology;
- political narratives.

This permits researchers to distinguish independent recurrence from cultural contamination.

Graph alerts

A future EFF system should automatically flag:

- circular citation;
- derivative-source inflation;
- shared upstream evidence;
- hidden source convergence;
- unsupported ontology escalation;
- morphology-to-origin inference errors;
- authentic-document/content-truth conflation;
- reputational taint pathways;
- anomalous prediction success or failure clusters.

8. Worked Ontology Example

Consider a hypothetical case in which two witnesses report a humanoid entity near an unidentified aerial object. One witness records video, a local radar operator records an anomalous return, and a later book claims the entity was extraterrestrial.

Objects

Case: CASE-1042

Event: EVT-1042-A

Witnesses: SRC-W1, SRC-W2

Evidence: EVID-VIDEO-1, EVID-RADAR-1, EVID-TEST-1, EVID-TEST-2

Entity Report: ENT-1042-A

Publication: PUB-BOOK-77

Phenomena classification

- PD-OBS-ENT
- CT-VIS
- MOR-HMD
- EI-NHI
- OR-UNK
- MM-PHY

Claims

CLAIM-1: A humanoid-appearing entity was observed.

CLAIM-2: An anomalous aerial object was present.

CLAIM-3: The entity was extraterrestrial.

Claims 1 and 2 may have direct evidentiary support. Claim 3 is an ontological interpretation and requires separate evidence.

Dependency analysis

If Witness 2 heard Witness 1's account before being interviewed, their morphology descriptions may be partially dependent. If the radar operator had no contact with either witness and recorded the return contemporaneously, the radar evidence may represent a more independent evidentiary channel.

Publication contamination

If a later book labels the entity "extraterrestrial" and subsequent retellings repeat that label, the system should record those sources as derivative from the book rather than as independent origin evidence.

Analytical result

A valid assessment might be:

- Humanoid observation: CF-4 High
- Aerial anomaly presence: CF-4 High
- Physical entity manifestation: CF-3 Moderate
- Extraterrestrial origin: CF-1 Low

This is the behavior EFF is designed to enforce.

Framework Note

EFF 1.0 is designed as a revisable field framework. Taxonomy terms describe reported or hypothesized phenomena; they do not, by themselves, authenticate the phenomenon or establish ontology. Evidence quality, provenance, independence, contamination, adversarial capability, and analytical confidence remain separate dimensions throughout the system.

Future revisions should preserve backward compatibility where practical, maintain explicit version histories, and record deprecated classifications rather than silently rewriting prior case records.