SKYWATCHER

Skywatcher Discovery Framework

Jacob Barber, Joe DiNoto Ph.D., Erica Cook, James Fowler, Jordan Jozak

Alex Klokus, Brian Lord Ph.D., Garry Nolan Ph.D., Matthew Pines

April 2025

Executive Summary

The Skywatcher Discovery Framework is a structured six-level methodology designed to systematically investigate UAP with scientific rigor and transparency. Developed by the Skywatcher team, it bridges the gap between anecdotal UAP sightings and credible, scientifically validated discoveries.

This Framework responds to the challenge highlighted in official investigations: many UAP cases remain unresolved due to poor data quality, yet with rigorous collection and analysis, most could be explained conventionally. By emphasizing a stepwise progression rooted in the scientific method, the Framework ensures measurable progress, filters out misidentifications early, and builds a process for credibly identifying and understanding unidentified phenomena.

The Framework is organized into six sequential levels, each escalating the quality of evidence, scientific scrutiny, and public disclosure. Progression between levels hinges on specific Transition criteria, ensuring no shortcuts compromise rigor. Below is a summary of each Framework Level:

Level 1: Preliminary Observation

- **Focus:** Initial, often anecdotal reports (e.g., eyewitness accounts, blurry photos, radar blips).
- **Activities:** Collect and document reports, perform basic credibility checks (e.g., rule out hoaxes, planets, satellites, aircraft using public databases).
- **Transition Criteria**: Multiple credible, unexplained indications warrant further investigation.
- **Purpose:** Acts as a triage, filtering out easily explained cases while identifying those deserving deeper study.

Level 2: Structured Data Collection

- **Focus:** Deliberate, systematic data gathering with instruments (e.g., cameras, radar) and standardized reporting.
- **Activities:** Deploy sensors, log data with timestamps and geotags, validate authenticity (e.g., metadata checks), and rule out known objects.
- **Transition Criteria:** Tangible, high-quality evidence (videos, sensor readings) remains unexplained, justifying detailed analysis.
- **Purpose:** Elevates anecdotal reports into a robust dataset for scientific scrutiny.

Level 3: Analysis & Hypothesis Testing

- **Focus:** In-depth scientific analysis to test explanations.
- **Activities:** Measure characteristics (speed, spectra), test hypotheses (e.g., drones, natural phenomena), use tools like simulations and statistical analysis.
- **Transition Criteria:** Conventional explanations exhausted; anomalous traits confirmed, meriting external review.
- **Purpose:** Determines if the phenomenon is a known entity or a true mystery, critical for advancing or resolving cases.

Level 4: Independent Verification & Peer Review

- **Focus:** External validation by independent experts.
- **Activities:** Share data and preliminary paper drafts for re-analysis, pursue peer review, consult specialists (e.g., radar experts), ensure transparency.
- **Transition Criteria:** Independent corroboration confirms the anomaly; findings gain scientific credibility.
- **Purpose:** Bolsters credibility, aligning with mainstream scientific processes, as seen in NASA's UAP efforts.

Level 5: Public Disclosure & Review

- **Focus:** Open release and broad scrutiny of findings.
- **Activities:** Publish rigorous papers containing validated data and findings on public Arxiv servers, respond to peer review critique, engage public and officials, encourage crowdsourced analysis.
- **Transition Criteria:** Findings withstand scrutiny; official acknowledgment may occur, shifting focus to implications.
- **Purpose:** Transitions the phenomenon into public discourse, destigmatizing study and inviting global input.

Level 6: Full Disclosure & Integration

- **Focus:** Full acceptance and integration into knowledge and policy.
- **Activities:** Official recognition, ongoing research as "normal science," public education, policy responses if needed.
- **Transition Criteria:** Conclusive evidence accepted; secrecy lifted, focus shifts to understanding details.
- **Purpose:** Marks the phenomenon as established reality, opening new research avenues (e.g., propulsion studies if technological).

Our Framework operates on several core principles:

- **Scientific Rigor**: Each Level employs observation, hypothesis testing, and validation, mirroring the scientific method to avoid speculation.
- **Data Quality:** Emphasis on high-quality, multi-source data (e.g., cross-verified radar and visuals) addresses historical UAP data deficiencies.
- **Transparency:** From peer review (Level 4) to public disclosure (Level 5), openness builds trust and leverages collective expertise.
- **Flexibility:** Iterative loops (e.g., revisiting analysis based on feedback) ensure adaptability without sacrificing progression.

Application and Implications

In practice, a case begins with a sighting (Level 1), progresses through structured evidence collection (Level 2), and undergoes rigorous analysis (Level 3). If unexplained, it is verified independently (Level 4), disclosed publicly (Level 5), and, if conclusive, integrated into accepted knowledge (Level 6). For example, a recurring fast-moving object captured on video might escalate from a field report to recovery of physical material, potentially revealing new physics or technology.

The Framework's filtering mechanism ensures resources are well-deployed, while its transparency counters historical secrecy and stigma around UAP. It serves as a public tool: claims that fail to progress through these levels warrant skepticism, while those advancing methodically gain trust.

While tailored for UAP, the Framework's evidence-based approach could be applied to any significant claim—be it scientific breakthroughs or novel phenomena—offering a universal model for responsible disclosure. Its emphasis on validation and peer involvement aligns with initiatives like NASA's call for systematic UAP study, enhancing its relevance in contemporary science.

Our Current Assessment

To accelerate progress in UAP research, Skywatcher is actively applying the Discovery Framework to two specific techniques which we have reason to believe are potentially effective: Electromechanical Signaling and Neuromeditative Interaction.

Our objective is to rigorously test whether these methods can induce or correlate with UAP events, using structured, evidence-based analysis. **By following the Framework's six levels, we will either validate or definitively rule out these techniques, reaching a conclusive determination by the end of 2025.**

Given the complexity of this challenge, we are calling on the scientific and research community to contribute expertise in data collection, signal processing, experimental design, and statistical validation to ensure all findings are transparent, repeatable, and free from bias.

Our near-term goal is to establish a repeatable, falsifiable process that can be tested independently. If these techniques withstand scrutiny, they could represent a breakthrough in UAP research. If they do not, we will document that end with equal rigor. Either way, by the end of 2025, we will aim to deliver a decisive resolution on these methods—setting a new benchmark for evidence-based open science in the UAP field.

Electromechanical Signaling Overview

One would expect any advanced monitoring capabilities of UAP might enable them to sense and respond to unique signatures. In recent decades, some researchers have claimed that certain electronic signals prompt UAP responses. This can be viewed as a form of indirect communication, independent of whether back and forth signaling between UAP and human observers is conducted.

Given this backdrop, Skywatcher has compiled and refined electronic signaling methods to attract UAPs. Preliminary results show repeatable success, based on five years of rigorous experiments. This technique consistently prompts UAPs to approach or pass directly overhead of our team, where multiple sensor systems—including electro-optical and multi-band infrared imaging, active and passive telemetry, and radio frequency detection—capture and correlate data on their presence.

Our findings suggest that varying the method can apparently alter the “class” of UAPs that respond (where the class is defined as the form of the UAP as well as their flight characteristics). Colloquially we refer to this set of signatures as the "dog whistle". To be clear, this capability is entirely technology-driven. It involves deploying specific equipment in the field, configuring it in a precise manner, and executing defined

operational activities to elicit UAP responses. Through controlled testing, we have observed that control "dog whistles" (sets of randomly determined electronic signatures) fail to attract UAPs, whereas our refined techniques have to date never failed to elicit a response.

Now, we assess Electromechanical Signaling is at Level 3 in this Framework. This will progress towards Level 4 when we are able to release controlled datasets, engage an independent third party for analysis, and transition to external observation of experiments.

Neuromeditative Interaction Overview

Neuromeditative Interaction involves the participation of individuals with a claimed ability to interact with UAPs through forms of meditation practices. In our current experiments and experience, such UAPs initially appear as flickering lights or orbs that have no prosaic explanation. Eventually, these neuromeditators (or psionics) are reportedly capable of progressing from eliciting the appearance of a single UAP to multiple UAPs, and unique individuals are even reportedly capable of exhibiting behaviors that some interpret as “command and control” over these objects.

Based on our initial observations, there does not seem to be a singular form of “meditation” practice or protocol that works universally for these individuals. Every individual that professes to be capable of neuromeditative signaling seems to engage in their own unique protocol. This leads to a few interesting considerations. First, multiple mental modalities that approximate the same outcome: the appearance of a UAP. Thus, the “receiver” or the “operator” of the UAP might have multiple independent modes by which they can detect the intent of the neuromeditative operator. Second, what initially appears to be distinct protocols might have a common mental mode that is underlying amongst practitioners. Thus, measuring the mental state via EEG or fMRI or other standard medical analysis protocols might define

the common event that causes the apparent result. It may be possible to enhance these states with brain stimulation or other modalities.

Neuromeditative signaling is assessed at Level 2 and will be considered advancing into Level 3 as we refine methodologies that distinguish correlations between chance or bias.

Summary of Overview

The Skywatcher Discovery Framework is intended to transform the pursuit of UAP truths into a disciplined, transparent journey from mystery to understanding. By Level 6, what begins as an anomaly becomes part of humanity's worldview, whether a natural event, advanced technology, or something else entirely. This process not only seeks to uncover facts but also fosters a collaborative, credible exploration of the unknown, potentially reshaping our cosmic perspective. For researchers, policymakers, and the public, it provides a clear, accountable path to navigate one of science's most enduring enigmas.

Introduction

The Skywatcher Discovery Framework is a structured, multi-Level approach designed to guide the process of investigating and disclosing information about Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena (UAP) in a scientific and transparent manner. **It is intended to provide a roadmap from the preliminary observations of unusual events in the sky to the full disclosure of verified UAP, whether that turns out to be evidence of non-human technology or represents a more prosaic explanation.**

We expect this Framework will stimulate both researchers and the general public to understand where we are while turning anomalous sightings or claims into established, credible information. Each Level of the Framework represents a milestone of evidence quality and validation, ensuring that progress is measurable and rooted in scientific rigor. This stepwise approach will gauge progress in Discovery based on existing and future releases of data and do so with a scientific mindset rather than speculation.

Maintaining accessibility for a general audience, while framing it as a scientific endeavor, is a key goal of this project. While we emphasize professional standards and scientific methodologies, we do so in clear language so that anyone interested can follow along.

Data validation techniques and the scientific method are at the heart of the Framework: at each Level, the data collected are scrutinized and verified using best practices to ensure they are reliable. For example, official investigations into unidentified phenomena have noted that many cases remain unsolved simply due to a lack of high-quality data, and that with better data most could likely be explained as ordinary phenomena.

In other words, rigorous data collection and validation are essential to solve these mysteries. To that end, we emphasize using a rigorous analytic and scientific approach over any preconceived beliefs when examining unusual phenomena.

Our Framework builds on these principles by requiring increasingly stringent data validation and analysis at each successive Level. This ensures that by the time a claim reaches the later stages, it has been vetted and examined from multiple angles.

Below is an overview of our Framework's six levels. Each Level (or stage) is described with its focus, the scientific activities involved, and the criteria for transitioning to the next stage. Subsequent sections will then discuss each Level in detail, including examples of data validation techniques and methodologies applied at that stage.

By following the Framework Level by Level, one can systematically progress from an initial sighting to a widely accepted disclosure or determine along the way if a case can be explained by conventional means.

This structured approach not only aids in organizing efforts to investigate UAP but also helps communicate the state of evidence to the public in a transparent, rigorous, and clear fashion.

Framework Overview

The Skywatcher Discovery Framework is organized into six sequential levels. Each Level represents a step forward in evidence quality, scientific scrutiny, and transparency, summarized in Table 1.

This table serves as a roadmap. For instance, a case that is at **Level 1** (Preliminary Observation) would need to gather enough credible evidence to meet the criteria to enter **Level 2** (Structured Data Collection). By **Level 3**, the data is being rigorously analyzed scientifically. If that analysis finds something truly unexplained, the case can advance to **Level 4**, where independent parties attempt to verify the results. Successful verification and peer agreement would then allow it to progress to **Level 5**, where the information is openly disclosed to the public and examined by a wider audience. Finally, if all goes well and the evidence is conclusive, **Level 6** represents a state where the phenomenon is definitively disclosed and accepted as part of our understanding of the world.

At its core, the Skywatcher Discovery Framework provides clarity on how an observation evolves from a mere rumor (or an unverified photograph) into established, credible knowledge. **Each of the six levels requires progressively higher standards of evidence, culminating in Level 6, where the phenomenon is fully confirmed and integrated into official scientific and public understanding.**

Along the way, data is scrutinized via established scientific methods—collecting, curating, analyzing, and validating evidence before sharing it widely. This process prevents premature conclusions and fosters collaboration among researchers, institutions, and the broader public.

Level	Focus & Activities	Transition Criteria
Level 1: Preliminary Observation	▪ Initial reports of a phenomenon, often anecdotal or unverified. ▪ Collect eyewitness accounts, basic photos/videos, or radar hits. ▪ Perform basic checks (time, location, known objects) to gauge credibility.	Multiple credible indications of an unusual phenomenon. Initial data passes basic validity checks (not hoaxed or easily explained). Decision to actively investigate further.
Level 2: Structured Data Collection	▪ Planned collection of data using instruments (e.g. cameras, sensors) or systematic reporting. ▪ Document and log sightings with standardized methods. ▪ Validate data authenticity (e.g. check photo metadata, rule out stars/aircraft/satellites via databases).	Obtain tangible evidence (photos, videos, sensor readings) that remains unexplained after initial analysis. Data quality is sufficient (clear visuals or readings) to warrant detailed study.
Level 3: Analysis & Hypothesis Testing	▪ In-depth scientific analysis of collected data. ▪ Measure characteristics (speed, trajectory, light spectrum) and test hypotheses against known phenomena. ▪ Use multiple data sources if available (visual, infrared, radar) for cross-verification	Analysis confirms that the observations cannot be explained by known causes (after exhausting conventional explanations). Anomalous characteristics are identified with confidence, indicating a genuine unknown phenomenon that merits external review.
Level 4: Independent Verification & Peer Review	▪ Share data and findings with independent experts or organizations for verification. ▪ Draft paper for Arxiv publication and initial peer review and invite third-party analysis to review preliminary observations and findings. ▪ Continue data validation (ensure calibration, eliminate biases) and hypothesis testing.	Independent analysis corroborates the findings. Multiple experts agree on the unusual nature of the data. No significant flaws are found in methods or data integrity. The case gains credibility in the broader scientific community.
Level 5: Public Disclosure & Review	▪ Publication of draft ▪ Broad scrutiny by the public, media, and scientific community. ▪ Engagement with officials or institutions for potential acknowledgement.	Findings withstand public and scientific scrutiny without refutation. Official bodies or scientific institutions may acknowledge the legitimacy of the phenomenon. The phenomenon is widely recognized as real (albeit not yet fully understood), setting stage for final conclusions.
Level 6: Full Disclosure & Integration	▪ Full revelation of the apparent nature and implications of the phenomenon. ▪ Integration of new knowledge into scientific understanding and policy. ▪ Ongoing research shifts from proving existence to understanding details (now part of “normal science”).	Conclusive evidence is obtained and accepted. If applicable, authorities confirm any previously secret information. The phenomenon is no longer in doubt – it becomes accepted knowledge, and focus turns to utilizing or deeper understanding of this knowledge.

Overview of the Six Levels

Level 1: Preliminary Observation

This Level deals with initial sightings that often come from eyewitnesses or incidental captures (e.g., phone videos). The data is typically low-quality, anecdotal, or unverified. The main goals are to gather basic information (time, location, conditions) and conduct quick checks against known objects (planets, aircraft, drones). Many reported sightings end here if identified as mundane phenomena. Only those observations deemed unusual enough to merit deeper investigation proceed to Level 2.

Level 2: Structured Data Collection

Investigators now make organized efforts to collect better evidence, deploying instruments such as high-resolution cameras, infrared sensors, or radar systems with data integrity checks. Consistent reporting forms or apps standardize the way witnesses document new sightings, ensuring metadata (timestamps, coordinates) is accurately recorded. Repeated observations in the same area—if corroborated by multiple sensors—strengthen the case. By the end of this Level, the team compiles a dataset that remains unexplainable by simple checks, justifying a more rigorous scientific analysis.

Level 3: Analysis & Hypothesis Testing

Armed with higher-quality data, investigators apply the technical analysis to test possible explanations. Speed, trajectory, light spectrums, and other characteristics are measured against known aircraft, natural events, or camera artifacts. Statistical and spectral analyses can help eliminate conventional causes. If an object's

behavior convincingly defies known technology or natural phenomena, the phenomenon is judged truly anomalous. Cases with strong anomalous features graduate to Level 4 for external scrutiny; otherwise, they may be closed out if a likely explanation is found.

Level 4: Independent Verification & Peer Review

Level 4 opens the data to recognized outside experts for replication and validation. Qualified scientists, research institutions, or specialized organizations re-examine the raw information to check for mistakes, instrumental errors, or overlooked explanations. If they replicate the original team's findings, the anomaly gains credibility. In many scientific fields, this step includes peer-reviewed publication, reinforcing legitimacy. This independent confirmation is vital to establish that the phenomenon is not merely an analytical artifact. Any significant errors identified here can resolve the case, while corroborated findings allow progression to Level 5.

Level 5: Public Disclosure & Review

With evidence tested by internal and external experts, the phenomenon's details are publicly released and given the proper context and presentation. Media outlets, scientists worldwide, and interested citizens gain access to the data. Official reports and open repositories make it possible for further analysis, crowdsourced insights, and broader peer review. Government bodies or international organizations may acknowledge the anomaly's existence, prompting public debate. During this phase, rigorous scrutiny from all corners often refines the case further. Eventually, if the claim withstands these challenges, the public and scientific community begin accepting the phenomenon as real, setting the stage for the final Level.

Level 6: Full Disclosure & Integration

At Level 6, the anomaly is no longer in doubt. Certainty about the reality of the anomalous phenomenon or material—if confirmed as potential non-human origin technology or an unknown natural occurrence—has been externally determined and established by the academic community, government stakeholders, and much of the informed public. Official agencies and the scientific community shift from asking whether it exists to determining how it functions and how best to study or manage it. This acceptance is reflected in the phenomenon's inclusion in textbooks, research programs, policy considerations, and public knowledge. Any secrecy is lifted, and attention turns toward capitalizing on or adapting to the newly revealed reality.

In the following sections, each Level is described in detail. We will discuss the goals, methods, data validation techniques, and Transition criteria in depth. We will also provide additional context, examples, or hypothetical scenarios to illustrate how a UAP case might progress through these stages.

This systematic progression is crucial: skipping steps can lead to false conclusions, and applying scientific discipline at each Level helps filter out misidentifications or errors early, focusing effort on the truly puzzling cases.

Skywatcher's Mission: Accelerating the Path to UAP Discovery

The Skywatcher Discovery Framework is not just a theoretical model for investigating UAP phenomena—it is an active methodology that we are applying in real-time to two specific research efforts on known UAP modalities: 1) Electromechanical Signaling and 2) Neuromeditative Interaction. These two techniques, if validated, could represent profound breakthroughs in our understanding of unidentified aerial phenomena and their potential interaction with human technology and consciousness. Conversely, if they are found to have no demonstrable effect, it is equally important that we rigorously document and establish that end through structured analysis.

Our overarching objective is to determine, with confidence, whether either of these techniques can reliably induce or correlate with UAP activity. By systematically applying the six levels of the Skywatcher Discovery Framework, we aim to either reach Level 6 (full Discovery and integration) or conclusively invalidate these methods. We have set an ambitious but achievable goal: to resolve whether either Electromechanical Signaling or Neuromeditative Interaction are credible and repeatable by the end of 2025.

Achieving this will require a monumental, interdisciplinary effort, drawing expertise from data science, engineering, physics, psychology, and other fields. This is not a challenge that Skywatcher can tackle alone—it is a community effort that will require open collaboration, transparency, and rigorous peer review. We invite researchers, analysts, and enthusiasts to contribute to this work, ensuring that all findings—whether validating or debunking these techniques—are robustly tested, widely reviewed, and fully accountable.

Electromechanical Signaling:

Current Progress and Next Steps

Electromechanical Signaling refers to the hypothesis that specific electromagnetic signals, sensor configurations, or environmental conditions may influence or attract UAP activity. Over the past several months, Skywatcher has already conducted multiple controlled tests, deploying advanced sensor arrays in locations where anomalous aerial activity has been reported. The results have been compelling enough to **place Electromechanical Signaling at Level 3 in the Skywatcher Discovery Framework**, meaning we have gathered structured, multi-instrument data that suggests an anomalous response, but we are not yet at the stage of independent verification. Our goal is to progress to Level 4 in the coming months, at which point external experts will be invited to analyze our findings.

To advance from Level 3 to Level 4, Skywatcher has developed a structured action plan:

- **Releasing Interview & Data:** Transparency and scientific peer review are critical to building credibility, but it must be done responsibly. We are preparing to release an in-depth interview detailing our Electromechanical Signaling research, alongside controlled data releases. But, due to national security considerations, we must ensure that we are not inadvertently disclosing any information that could compromise classified U.S. Government capabilities or sensor technologies. Thus, data will be published in stages, allowing for careful review before broader public distribution.
- **Independent Review of Existing Data:** A major step in achieving Level 4 is inviting independent parties to review our existing dataset. We plan to engage a validated neutral third-party research entity—ideally an academic institution or a private scientific group—to

assess whether our results withstand scrutiny. Their task will be to determine if our observed anomalies can be explained by conventional factors such as sensor noise, atmospheric interference, or equipment malfunctions.

- **Real-Time Observation & Validation:** In addition to reviewing past data, the next step will be to allow independent observers to witness our data collection in real-time. By enabling an external party to monitor live experiments, we can ensure that our findings are replicable and not the result of data cherry-picking or post hoc interpretation. This process will significantly increase transparency and trust, moving Electromechanical Signaling closer to Level 4, where independent verification becomes a key component of scientific legitimacy.

If we successfully clear these steps, and our findings remain unexplained after independent review, we will move Electromechanical Signaling into Level 5, where it will enter full-scale public Discovery and wider scientific analysis. If any of these stages reveal a conventional explanation, we will be prepared to revise or abandon the hypothesis accordingly.

Neuromeditative Interaction:

Current Progress and Next Steps

Neuromeditative Interaction is the hypothesis that focused human intention, meditation, or consciousness-based techniques may influence UAP manifestations. While this concept is controversial, it is not without precedent—historically, various military and intelligence agencies have explored psi-related phenomena, and numerous anecdotal reports have suggested a non-physical or cognitive component to UAP interactions. Our goal is not to assume the validity of these claims but to test them under controlled conditions.

Now, Neuromeditative Interaction is assessed to be at Level 2 in our Discovery Framework, meaning we have gathered some structured observational data and have determined that there is a measurable correlation worth investigating further. However, we are still transitioning into Level 3, where formal hypothesis testing will begin.

To help this Transition, we are implementing the following structured action plan:

Validating the Baseline: "Something Is There": Before advancing to hypothesis testing, we must ensure that observed correlations between neuromeditative practices and anomalous events are not the result of random chance or external factors. Early observations have yielded statistically interesting results, but to move forward scientifically, we must verify that these effects are not due to confirmation bias, coincidental environmental triggers, or subconscious cues.

Controlled Analysis & Hypothesis Testing: In early 2025, we will refine our experimental design, increasing the number of trials, control groups, and statistical comparisons to assess whether the correlations hold under rigorous conditions. We will test key hypotheses such as:

- Does group meditation or intention practice lead to an increased rate of UAP detections?
- Are there measurable physiological changes (brain waves, heart rate variability) in participants that correlate with observed events?
- Can a control group, unaware of the timing of experiments, also detect anomalous occurrences?

If our testing does not yield statistically significant results, we will conclude that the now structured approach to Neuromeditative Interaction lacks empirical validity. But, if patterns persist, we will prepare for external review.

A defining criterion for advancing into Level 3 is the ability to demonstrate repeatability. We must establish a protocol where rigorous Neuromeditative Interaction operational experiments can be consistently conducted with similar results, across multiple locations, teams, and conditions. Our near-term goal (1–2 months) is to finalize a systematic methodology that will allow independent researchers to review and replicate the process. If we can achieve this, we will formally confirm Neuromeditative Interaction's Transition to Level 3, where scientific analysis and falsifiability become the primary focus.

Should our findings continue to withstand scrutiny, we will move toward external review (Level 4) and eventually public disclosure (Level 5). But, if we find no replicable effect, we will conclude that Neuromeditative Interaction lacks scientific support and move to invalidate it.

Final Objective:

A Rigorous, Transparent Resolution by 2025

By applying the Skywatcher Discovery Framework to both **Electromechanical Signaling** and **Neuromeditative Interaction**, we aim to either validate them as legitimate phenomena or prove them unsubstantiated by the end of 2025. This is an aggressive timeline, but with community collaboration, external verification, and strict adherence to scientific methods, we believe it is achievable.

If either technique passes through all six levels of the Framework, it will represent a historic breakthrough in understanding the mechanisms behind UAP manifestations. Conversely, if we find no valid effect, that outcome is equally valuable, it eliminates false leads and refines our focus toward other investigative directions.

In the months ahead, we will be actively seeking community contributions, whether from engineers, data analysts, psychologists, physicists, or dedicated observers. **If you have expertise in signal processing, psi-research and practice, operational experimental design, statistical analysis, or any related domain, your insights could be instrumental in moving these projects forward.**

Together, we have the opportunity to fast-track humanity's knowledge of potential non-human origin advanced intelligence through rigorous, transparent investigation. If we succeed, we will not only advance the field but set a new standard for responsible, evidence-driven research into anomalous phenomena.

Level 1: Preliminary Observation

Description: Level 1 is the starting point of the disclosure Framework. At this stage, an unusual sighting or preliminary observation is reported, but it remains largely anecdotal or unverified. The information might come from an eyewitness account (for example, a person seeing strange lights in the sky) or from an incidental capture such as a single photograph or a brief video clip. Often, the data at this Level is limited and possibly of low quality – think of a blurry cellphone photo, a vague personal testimony, or a fleeting radar blip that hasn't been confirmed. The primary focus in Level 1 is collecting and documenting these initial reports while performing basic checks to assess their credibility.

Key Activities: When an observation is made, the first step is to record as much detail as possible. Investigators or citizen observers should note the time, date, location, and conditions of the sighting. Any available media (photos, videos) or instrument readings (e.g., radar, if available) are gathered. Alongside collection, data validation in Level 1 involves simple, common-sense checks:

- *Authenticity Check:* Ensure the report is not an obvious hoax or misunderstanding. For example, if someone submits a photo, check if it might be a known fake or a lens artifact. If it's a testimony, see if the person's story stays consistent.
- *Initial Consistency Check:* Cross-reference the sighting with known objects or events at that time. Was there a bright planet like Venus in the direction of the sighting? Could it have been an aircraft (check flight tracking data) or a satellite (check databases of satellite passes)? Many UFO reports turn out to be stars, planets, satellites, or drones; a quick check can filter out these ordinary objects or phenomena.
- *Multiple Sources:* See if more than one person or source reported the same event. If multiple independent witnesses in the area

describe a similar object, the observation gains credibility. Similarly, if a visual sighting coincided with, say, an unusual radar detection, it's more compelling than a single-source report.

At Level 1, the scientific methodology applied is primarily observation and documentation. Investigators maintain an open but skeptical mind. The goal is *not* to jump to conclusions but to gather information systematically. This is analogous to the observation phase of the scientific method – we have an observation that something happened, but we don't yet know what it is. We start asking basic questions: *What was seen? Who saw it? How did it behave?*

Data Validation Techniques (Level 1): Data validation at this preliminary stage is fairly straightforward:

- Use public databases and tools to rule out known explanations (e.g., astronomy apps to identify stars/planets, flight radar for airplanes, weather balloon launch schedules, etc.).
- Check the internal consistency of the report: does the described motion or appearance make sense (for instance, if someone says an object hovered for an hour but no one else saw it in a city, that's inconsistent)?
- Log the data carefully: Even if the data is just a testimony, recording it in a structured way (exact wording of witness, etc.) is important for later verification. This is akin to taking good notes in an experiment so others can review what was done.

All these steps help ensure that by the end of Level 1, we have a documented initial dataset that is as reliable as possible given its limitations. Many cases may actually end at Level 1 if a mundane explanation is found (for example, you determine if the strange light was actually Mars shining brightly, or the moving light was a drone). In those instances, there is effectively nothing to "disclose" – the phenomenon is identified, and its case closed. Such outcomes are a success in their own way, because they prevent time and resources from advancing a

non-issue through the Framework. This demonstrates the Framework's filtering role: it catches the explainable cases early.

Transition to Level 2: A case moves from Level 1 to Level 2: Structured Data Collection when the preliminary observation passes basic credibility checks and still appears genuinely unusual or unexplained. The transition criteria include:

- The observation cannot be readily explained by known objects or common phenomena (after performing the checks above).
- There are one or more credible pieces of evidence (e.g., multiple trustworthy witnesses, or a witness plus a photo) that something unusual occurred.
- Investigators deem the report worthy of further, more systematic investigation. This often means deciding to put effort into collecting more data. For instance, the team might say: "This area has yielded a couple of intriguing reports that we couldn't debunk; let's set up better/more sensors or encourage more reports to investigate further."

When these conditions are met, the case is escalated to Level 2. In summary, Level 1 is about taking *raw, initial inputs* and doing a first round of truth-filtering. If the case survives this triage, it earns the chance for a deeper look in Level 2.

Level 2: Structured Data Collection

Description: Level 2 involves actively gathering structured and higher-quality data on the phenomenon. Whereas Level 1 may rely on chance observations, Level 2 is more deliberate: investigators set up ways to collect data systematically. This could involve deploying instruments (like dedicated cameras, telescopes, radar units, or other sensors) in the area of interest, or creating a standardized reporting system for observers. The main goal is to move beyond anecdote into documented evidence that can be repeatedly examined. In this stage, one treats the

case much like a scientist would set up an experiment to gather more data after a curious initial finding.

Key Activities: At Level 2, the team or community investigating the phenomenon ramps up their data collection efforts:

- **Instrumentation:** If possible, use multiple types of instruments to observe the phenomenon. For example, set up a high-resolution video camera to run during expected active times (if there's a pattern to sightings), or use a spectrum analyzer, infrared camera, or radar. The idea is to capture the phenomenon in as much detail as possible. Researchers in the UAP field have started doing exactly this by going to hotspots with diverse instruments – for instance, using low-light cameras, infrared sensors, and radiation detectors to gather a wide array of data. This approach is akin to having many "eyes" on the phenomenon, increasing the chances of catching it in different forms.
- **Standardized Reporting:** Develop a consistent form or app for witnesses to report sightings. Standard questions (for example: direction of sighting, angular size, color, apparent speed, etc.) help ensure data can be compared across reports. As an illustration, some modern efforts use smartphone apps that not only let users submit photos but also automatically log the direction of the camera and overlay known objects (like star charts or satellites) to help identify misidentifications. Standardization reduces the noise in data caused by people reporting in incompatible ways.
- **Data Logging and Storage:** All data (videos, sensor readings, reports) should be timestamped, geotagged (location recorded), and stored safely, ideally in a database. This ensures nothing is lost and that others can review the raw data. An organized database also allows for pattern analysis later (like finding if events correlate with certain times or conditions).

- **Basic Analysis of New Data:** As data comes in, Level 2 also involves doing initial analysis on it. For example, if a video is captured, the team might analyze a few frames to see if the object could be a bird, drone, or something known. Or if multiple reports came in, they might triangulate the position of an object in the sky. Known-object databases are again used continuously: every new piece of data is checked against star positions, aircraft, satellites, weather events, etc., to see if it can be explained.

Scientific Methodology: In Level 2, we are essentially in the data gathering and exploration phase of the scientific method. From an initial hypothesis that "something is there," we design a way to collect evidence about it. A key methodology here is ensuring repeatability: by systematically observing, we hope to catch the phenomenon more than once or have multiple measurements of it. If it truly exists (and isn't a one-time fluke or error), more data should eventually capture it. We also ensure our measuring methods are reliable – for example, calibrating cameras or sensors. Calibration is an important scientific practice: making sure the instruments accurately measure what we think they are measuring. For instance, one might calibrate a camera's timestamps or a compass to ensure directions are accurate. This ties into data validation.

Data Validation Techniques (Level 2): Now that more data is being collected, validating this data is crucial:

- **Authenticity & Integrity Checks:** For each photo or video, verify metadata such as timestamps and check for any signs of tampering. If a piece of footage is extraordinary, one might examine it frame-by-frame to ensure it's not edited. Similarly, ensure the data files are securely stored to prevent any accidental or intentional alteration.
- **Cross-Verification:** If multiple instruments are used, cross-check their outputs. For example, if a strange light is caught on

camera, was it also seen on radar at that time? If a witness reports something, did the temperature or radiation sensor note anything unusual? Multiple measurements of the same event greatly increase confidence that it's real and provides different perspectives.

- **Filter Out False Positives:** With more data, there can be many "false alarms." For instance, a motion-detecting camera might record a flash of light that on analysis turns out to be an airplane blinking light or a meteor. Developing filters or criteria to sift out these known causes is important so that attention is focused on truly unexplained data. This might involve algorithms or simple rules (e.g., if radar shows steady course at 500 mph at 30,000 ft, it's likely a commercial jet).
- **Data Quality Assessment:** Rate the quality of each piece of evidence. A clear daylight video is high quality; a vague night-time light is low quality. By grading the data, one can prioritize the best evidence for deeper analysis in Level 3. Also, if data quality is consistently low, the team might decide to upgrade equipment or adjust strategy.

By the end of Level 2, ideally, the team has collected tangible evidence of the phenomenon that goes beyond one-off anecdotes. Perhaps there are several videos from different angles of a strange object, or a combination of eyewitness logs and sensor data that all point to something unusual. Importantly, if the phenomenon is not real (for example, if it was a string of coincidences or errors), Level 2 often exposes that. If days or weeks of monitoring with good equipment find nothing further, the initial report might be deemed an outlier or misidentification after all. But, if Level 2’s efforts do capture something and it's still unexplained, the case becomes much stronger.

Transition to Level 3: Analysis & Hypothesis Testing, the structured collection efforts must yield evidence that remains insufficiently explained and is of sufficient quality to analyze scientifically. Transition criteria include:

- **Captured Unusual Data:** There are now one or more pieces of recorded data (e.g., videos, sensor readings) that show something truly anomalous. "Truly anomalous" means that preliminary checks haven't identified it as a known object or artifact. For example, suppose cameras captured a bright object zipping across the sky at an incredible speed, and initial calculations suggest it's moving faster than any known aircraft with no sound – that would qualify as anomalous data worth deeper analysis.
- **Consistency:** The data shows a consistent pattern or behavior that can be studied. It might be a repeat occurrence (e.g., lights appearing every week) or a single event that was recorded in detail. Either way, there's *enough data points* to analyze. One blurry photo alone wouldn't be enough to proceed; but a series of photos or a video sequence or multi-sensor readings from the same event would be.
- **Data Quality and Volume:** The quality of the data is high enough to allow analysis – clear enough images, accurate sensor logs, etc. – and there's enough of it to work with. In other words, the case has moved beyond a fluke; it now has a body of evidence supporting it.
- **Unexplained after Level 2 Analysis:** The team has tried all the straightforward explanations and validations in Level 2, and none have satisfactorily explained the phenomenon. This is essentially a green light saying, "We have something here that we can't figure out with basic checks – time to dig deeper with scientific analysis."

When those conditions are met, the case justifies the more intensive scrutiny of Level 3. In summary, Level 2 produces the raw material (data) that Level 3 will then dissect and scrutinize through scientific analysis. It shifts the investigation from *collecting evidence* to *understanding evidence*. Let's proceed to how that works.

Level 3: Analysis & Hypothesis Testing

Description: In Level 3, the focus shifts to analyzing the collected data in depth and testing possible explanations through the lens of science. This Level is where the case is treated as a scientific puzzle: the team asks, "What could this phenomenon be?" and uses the data to support or refute various hypotheses. By the end of Level 3, the goal is to determine whether the phenomenon can be explained by any known causes or if it indeed exhibits characteristics that defy current understanding. This is a critical stage – it often determines if a case is a misidentification (and thus can be resolved without needing further "disclosure") or if it's genuinely mysterious and worth escalating to external review.

Key Activities: Rigorous tasks are undertaken in Level 3:

- **Detailed Data Analysis:** Every piece of evidence gathered is examined carefully. If it's a video or photo, analysts might perform frame-by-frame analysis, measure the object's apparent size, speed, acceleration, and look for patterns (does it zigzag? go straight? suddenly vanish?). If multiple sensors recorded it, compare their data: e.g., correlate a visual sighting with an infrared reading at the same timestamp. Modern techniques, such as image processing, can be used to enhance clarity or bring out details (with caution to avoid introducing artifacts). If audio or radio signals are part of the data, those are analyzed for any encoded information or patterns.

- **Hypothesis Generation:** Based on the data, the team formulates plausible hypotheses. For instance, hypotheses might include: “This could be a new type of drone,” “It might be a rare natural plasma phenomenon,” “It’s an optical illusion or camera artifact,” or in the truly strange cases, “It could be technology of potential non-human origin.” Importantly, all hypotheses – conventional and unconventional – are put on the table initially.
- **Scientific Testing of Hypotheses:** Each hypothesis is evaluated against the data. If it were a drone, does the object’s behavior match known drone capabilities (speed, maneuverability, thermal signature)? If it were a natural phenomenon like ball lightning, do conditions (e.g. thunderstorms nearby) align with that, and does the data fit the profile (e.g., ball lightning typically lasts seconds, did our event last that long?). This is where scientific models and knowledge are applied. For known phenomena, we consult experts or literature – e.g., compare with known meteor trajectories, satellite re-entry events, etc. For each candidate explanation, the team asks: *Does this explanation account for all the observed data?* If not, that hypothesis is set aside.
- **Use of Scientific Tools and Methods:** Depending on the data, various scientific methods might be employed:
    - Trajectory and Kinematics: If the object is moving, basic physics equations can estimate acceleration and velocity, which might indicate required energy or technology to achieve that motion.
    - Spectral Analysis: If there’s a light spectrum (perhaps from a camera that can do spectroscopy or even color analysis), see if the light emitted matches known chemical signatures (e.g., is it just reflected sunlight or something producing its own light?).
    - Statistical Analysis: If there are many data points (say dozens of similar reports), statistical methods can look for correlations or clusters. Do the sightings correlate with

certain locations, times, or conditions? Are there outliers? Statistics can also assess the probability of the event being by chance.

- Simulations: In some cases, simulate a scenario. For instance, if a certain aircraft could produce a similar sighting under unusual conditions, simulate or model that to see if it's plausible.

- **Continued Data Validation:** Throughout analysis, data validation continues. If a weird result appears, double-check that it's not an instrument error. This might involve re-calibrating sensors or checking if the camera had any glitches. Systematic calibration and careful consideration of sensor metadata are emphasized, as noted by NASA's UAP study team. For example, ensure the timestamps of all devices were synchronized; an apparent high speed could just be a time sync issue between a camera and a radar.

By performing these activities, the team attempts to explain the phenomenon within the Framework of current scientific knowledge. Many cases may find a resolution here. For example, detailed analysis might reveal that an "object" was actually a set of distant flares whose movement created an illusion of a solid craft, or that an odd light was a meteor skipping off the atmosphere in an unusual way.

Outcomes of Level 3: There are generally two possible outcomes at this stage:

- **Conventional Explanation Found:** The data, upon analysis, matches a known phenomenon. The hypothesis testing yields a winner that explains pretty much everything observed. In such cases, the case effectively reaches an end – not a "disclosure" of hypothetical aliens or unknown technology, but a clarification of what it really was. This is akin to a scientific experiment where the mysterious result turns out to be a measurement error or a known

effect once you dig deeper. If this happens, the case might be closed or even moved out of the “disclosure” track into a normal report or published as a solved mystery. (For example, a famous UFO video might be determined to be a glitch in an infrared camera after Level 3 analysis, thereby not progressing to further levels.)

- **No Known Explanation (Anomaly Confirmed):** The analysis fails to find any conventional explanation, and the phenomenon exhibits anomalous characteristics that strongly suggest something not yet understood. This doesn’t mean jumping to the wildest end; it simply means we have an unsolved scientific puzzle. For instance, if data shows an object accelerating from 0 to 5,000 km/h in a second with no sonic boom and no obvious means of propulsion, that remains unexplained by current technology or known natural events. At this point, the team can reasonably say, "We have done our due diligence with our expertise and tools, and we still can't explain what this is." That is a compelling result – and it calls for more eyes and minds on the problem, which is what the next Level is about.

Transition to Level 4: If the outcome is the latter (a confirmed anomaly with no known explanation), the case is ready to move to Level 4: Independent Verification & Peer Review. Transition criteria for advancing include:

- Exhaustive Analysis Completed: The team has thoroughly analyzed the data using all reasonable methods at their disposal and documented the results. They have a report or a set of findings outlining what was done and what was found.
- Persisting Unexplained Features: After exhaustive analysis, key aspects of the phenomenon remain unexplained by any hypothesis consistent with current scientific knowledge. In other words, it’s clearly *not* an airplane, not a drone, not Venus, not a camera glitch, etc. The anomaly is real and not an artifact of error.

- Scientific Significance: The unexplained phenomenon has significant implications or at least warrants serious investigation by others. (For example, if genuine, it could indicate new physics, new technology, or a new natural phenomenon. This importance justifies engaging the broader scientific community.)
- Clarity of Data: The data is clear enough to be presented to others. Before moving to peer review, the team ensures the data and analysis are well-organized and understandable. Any additional validation needed (like re-calibrating instruments or cleaning data) is done so that outside experts will have confidence in its quality.
- Documentation: All findings, methods, and data are compiled, likely into a report or draft paper. This documentation is what will be shared with independent parties in Level 4.

Once these criteria are met, the case leaves the realm of a single team's investigation and enters the wider arena of scientific scrutiny. In summary, Level 3 is the make-or-break analytical phase – if a case remains standing as an unknown after this rigorous gauntlet, it's strong enough to warrant peer-reviewed examination in Level 4. Now, we will see how Level 4 brings independent perspectives to bear on the mystery.

Level 4: Independent Verification & Peer Review

Description: Level 4 involves opening up the case to independent scrutiny and attempting to verify the findings through outside experts and formal processes like peer review. Up to Level 3, typically a single team or a closely knit group (like the Skywatcher team and its advisors) has been investigating the phenomenon. At Level 4, the case is intentionally put into the hands of others to replicate and validate the results. This is a crucial part of the scientific process – no matter how

exciting or convincing an internal analysis is, it gains far more credibility when independent parties can confirm the observations and conclusions. The goal of Level 4 is twofold: to verify that the phenomenon and findings are real (not an error or bias of the original investigators) and to add additional perspective or expertise that the original team might lack.

Key Activities:

- **Data Sharing:** The team shares the collected data (from Levels 1–3) with qualified independent experts or organizations. This could mean providing raw videos, sensor logs, and analysis reports to a university research group, a panel of scientists, or even crowdsourcing it to the broader scientific community. In the context of Skywatcher, for example, we might release the data publicly or hand it to a neutral third-party research institution for examination.
- **Independent Analysis:** Those independent parties will conduct their own analysis of the data *from scratch*. They will apply their own methods to see if they observe the same anomalies. Importantly, they will look for any mistakes or oversights in the original analysis. Could there be a calibration issue the original team missed? Did the original analysts misinterpret something? The independent team's job is partly to attempt to find a conventional explanation or error that might have been overlooked. They serve as a skeptical check.
- **Reproducing Results:** If possible, an independent group might try to replicate the conditions or even gather new data. For example, if the phenomenon tends to occur in a certain place, a new team might go there with their own equipment to see if they can also capture it. While replication isn't always feasible (especially if the phenomenon is unpredictable or requires specialized skills or capabilities), having another set of instruments record a similar event would be powerful

confirmation. Even without new data, just re-analyzing the existing data and reproducing the original team's measurements (like confirming the object's speed was indeed 5000 km/h) is extremely valuable.

- **Peer Review Process:** In parallel, or as a result of these efforts, the findings may be written up in a formal scientific paper and submitted to a journal for peer review. Peer review means other scientists (peers in relevant fields) evaluate the methods and conclusions before publication. They can ask for clarifications, suggest additional tests, or identify flaws. The peer review process is often anonymous and rigorous, ensuring that only work that meets scientific standards gets published. The Skywatcher team or the independent analysts might author a paper detailing the phenomenon, which undergoes this scrutiny. Suitable journals can be discussed, and the paper might be shareable on Arxiv servers of the appropriate field.
- **Collaboration and Consultation:** The case might also draw in specialists from various disciplines. For example, if the data suggests an unusual radiation signature, a nuclear physicist might be consulted. If there are radar readings, an aviation radar expert might weigh in. By consulting a diverse group of experts, the case benefits from many viewpoints. In practice, that means multiple experts working together, sharing data openly, and cross-checking each other's findings in a transparent manner.

Throughout Level 4, maintaining a high standard of scientific integrity is important. All data and analysis steps should be transparent so that any qualified person could, in principle, replicate the work.

Data Validation in Level 4: By now, the data has been validated by the original team, but independent reviewers will validate it again:

- They may verify the calibration of instruments (was the camera's field of view correctly accounted for? Was the clock synchronized?).
- They might check the data processing code if any was used (to ensure no computational mistakes).
- They will also look at whether the original investigators unintentionally introduced any bias. For instance, were they too eager to label something unexplained without fully checking one possibility? Independent reviewers provide a fresh, unbiased perspective to catch such issues.

Outcomes of Level 4: After independent verification and peer review, a few outcomes are possible:

- **Confirmation**: The independent analyses agree with the original findings. They see the same anomalous characteristics in the data and concur that no conventional explanation fits. This dramatically increases the credibility of the case. What was before just the claim of one team now becomes an accepted observation by multiple parties. At this point, especially if peer-reviewed publication occurs, the phenomenon enters the scientific record as something genuinely unexplained. For example, a published paper might say, "Several independent analyses of the recordings confirm an object with X features that does not match any known aircraft or natural phenomenon." This would be a landmark moment for the case.
- **Identification of Error or Explanation:** Alternatively, the independent review might find something the original team missed. Perhaps a scientist notices that the camera that recorded the high-speed object had an internal glitch under

certain conditions, and when accounting for that, the object's speed was not extraordinary after all. Or someone discovers a before unconsidered source (e.g., a secret military craft test in the area) that could explain the sighting. If a mundane explanation is found at this stage, it can be a bit disheartening, but it is still a valuable result – it prevents false mysteries from going further. The case would then be resolved or perhaps regressed to a lower Level (indicating it wasn't truly anomalous).

- **Inconclusive or Disputed:** It's also possible that some reviewers confirm parts of the findings while others are more skeptical, leading to a debate. Maybe most data checks out, but one piece of the analysis is questioned. This might require further data or analysis (sometimes sending the case into a bit of a loop between Levels 3 and 4 until resolved). If disagreements persist, it may slow down progress to Level 5 until consensus or clarity is reached.

Assuming the outcome is confirmation by independent parties, the case has essentially passed the test of scientific scrutiny. It's no longer just a claim; it's documented anomaly recognized by multiple experts. This sets the stage for Level 5, where this knowledge is formally and publicly disclosed on a larger scale.

Before moving on, let's highlight why Level 4 is so important. **Novel claims require good evidence, and good evidence must stand up to the toughest examinations.** By incorporating peer review and independent verification, the Skywatcher Discovery Framework ensures that only cases with truly solid evidence make it past this point. It also aligns with the broader scientific community's processes, making it easier for mainstream scientists and institutions to pay attention. In fact, NASA's recent involvement in examining UAP stresses a whole-of-government and scientific community effort, signaling for systematic data analysis and multiple measurements to create reliable datasets – exactly what Levels 2, 3, and 4 of this Framework enforce.

Transition to Level 5: Public Disclosure & Review, the following Transition criteria are typically met:

- **Verified Findings:** At least one independent, qualified group has verified the phenomenon's key findings, or a peer-reviewed publication of the results exists. In short, the anomaly is confirmed and not an artifact of one team's work.
- **Consensus on Anomaly:** There is a general consensus (or a strong majority opinion) among reviewing experts that the case represents a legitimate unexplained phenomenon worthy of reporting to the broader public or authorities.
- **Clear, Communicable Results**: The findings can be clearly explained to non-specialists. By now, the investigators should have refined the description of what is observed (e.g., "object of approximate size X, moving in manner Y, with properties Z, which do not match any known aircraft or natural phenomenon"). They have figures, data, and perhaps visuals that can communicate this to others.
- **Readiness for Public Release:** Any necessary permissions are in place for releasing the data (for instance, if radar data came from the military, they've approved its declassification or use). The team has also prepared educational or supporting material for the public disclosure, anticipating questions or skepticism that will arise.

Meeting these criteria means the case is primed to go public in an official way. In the next Level, the emphasis will be on transparency to the public and engaging with broader scrutiny, including possibly government or official channels.

Level 5: Public Disclosure & Review

Description: Level 5 is where the investigation moves fully into the public domain. At this stage, the existence of the unexplained

phenomenon, along with the evidence supporting it, is formally disclosed to the public. This could happen through various channels: a public report or white paper, a press conference, a documentary or interview, a scientific conference presentation, or an academic journal article that garners media attention. The key is that the information is no longer confined to specialists – it's openly shared so that any interested party (scientist, journalist, or layperson) can evaluate the evidence. Public disclosure is a critical step for transparency and is often what people think of as "disclosure" in the context of UFOs/UAP: it's the moment when secrets (if any) are revealed or when official acknowledgment occurs. But, in our Framework, it's done only after rigorous validation in earlier stages, so what's being disclosed is backed by solid evidence.

Key Activities:

- **Release of Data and Findings:** All the verified data (videos, sensor logs, etc.) and the conclusions drawn are released publicly. This could be via an official report or a data repository. The Skywatcher team might publish data online for the community to examine while publishing an academic paper on an Arxiv server in preparation to submit to a relevant journal for peer review.
- **Media Briefing and Communication:** The team (or relevant authorities, if involved) may hold briefings or publish a summary in layman's terms. Since the audience is now the general public, the communication should be clear and avoid jargon. For example, instead of saying "the object had a delta-V of X and exhibited no thermal exhaust," they might say "the object accelerated extremely fast without any signs of a jet engine or rocket."
- **Public and Scientific Community Engagement:** Once the information is out, widespread review begins. Scientists worldwide, enthusiastic amateurs, skeptics, and proponents all

have a chance to weigh in. They might point out alternative interpretations, or they might rally behind the findings. The case will be discussed in forums, news articles, and perhaps even government hearings if it's significant enough (as has happened with notable UAP cases recently). This Level can be quite dynamic because feedback and new insights pour in from everywhere.

- **Crowdsourced Analysis:** In the modern era, it's possible that independent researchers (not before involved) will conduct their own analysis on the publicly released data. Some might find new patterns or even attempt to debunk some aspects. The original team should pay attention to these and address them. In essence, Level 5 opens the door for mass peer review – beyond just the select experts of Level 4, now many motivated individuals can scrutinize the case.
- **Official Response:** If the phenomenon has national security or air safety implications (often a concern with UAP), governmental or international bodies may make statements or start their own investigations in response to the public disclosure. For instance, an air force might confirm that they too have tracked such objects, or a space agency might announce a project to gather more data. There could also be debates in policy circles about what to do next (for example, whether to allocate funding for further research, or how to inform the public responsibly if the implications are profound).

Data Validation and Scientific Rigor in Public View: One might think that by Level 5, the validation is done. But in truth, it continues in a broader sense. In the public review phase, every detail might be questioned by someone. The Framework anticipates this by ensuring that by the time of public disclosure, the evidence is as bulletproof as possible. But, being open to questions is important. The team should:

- Provide complete documentation so others can follow the trail (this may include publishing technical appendices or code used in analysis).
- Be honest about unknowns or uncertainties. For example, "We measured X and Y, but we are not sure about Z due to instrument limitations." This helps others trust that the team isn't overstating their case.
- Continue to apply scientific methodology in responding to critiques. If someone proposes a new possible explanation publicly, the team (or other scientists) might go back to the data to test that idea.
- Encourage a culture of skepticism and curiosity rather than belief or dismissal. By framing it as a scientific mystery, the public discourse can remain grounded. Ideally, by Level 5, a lot of the stigma that might surround "UFO reports" is removed because the case is presented not as a tall tale, but as a scientific finding that was rigorously vetted (NASA officials have mentioned destigmatizing UAP study as a goal to allow better data collection).

Outcomes of Level 5: After public disclosure and the ensuing review period:

- **Broad Acceptance:** The ideal outcome is that the evidence is so strong that it becomes broadly accepted that "this phenomenon is real and unexplained by current science." This doesn't mean everyone knows what it is, but there's a consensus that it exists and is worth paying attention. For example, after enough credible pilots and data came forward about certain UAP, even skeptical agencies acknowledged something unexplained was in the skies. Achieving broad acceptance might involve getting endorsements from respected scientists, or no significant rebuttals emerging despite many eyes on the data.

- **Continued Debate:** Alternatively, the public review might result in ongoing debates. Some might remain unconvinced, offering counterpoints. This is common in science – consider how new discoveries (like meteorites being from space, back in history) took time to be accepted. The discussion could continue until more evidence (or maybe a new event) tips the balance. In the Framework context, if there's still controversy, the case might hover in Level 5 until resolved or move forward to Level 6 when conclusive proof arrives.
- **Refinement of Understanding:** Public involvement can also refine what's known. Perhaps crowd-sourced efforts find that the phenomenon only occurs under certain atmospheric conditions, adding a clue. Or maybe an open-data enthusiast combines the data with other data sets (like astronomical data) and finds an interesting correlation. These contributions can be integrated, potentially sending the case back to a mini-Phase of analysis (Level 3) with the new info, and then back through verification, etc. The Framework can be somewhat iterative if new data arises.

If Level 5 is successful, by the end of it the phenomenon will no longer be a fringe topic; it will have been discussed in mainstream channels. The stage is then set for the final Level, which is reaching a end about the nature of the phenomenon and fully incorporating that knowledge.

Transition to Level 6: Progressing to Level 6: Full Disclosure & Integration requires that:

- **The evidence and phenomenon have been accepted as real by the public and scientific community (even if its explanation remains unknown).** Essentially, there's no substantial doubt about the authenticity of the phenomenon.
- **Some form of official or institutional acknowledgment has occurred.** This could be a statement by a government agency confirming the reality of the phenomenon or a scientific body

recognizing it as an established subject of research. For example, if the phenomenon were something like "a new kind of atmospheric event," maybe the National Academy of Sciences forms a task force to study it, or it gets a formal name.

- **The discourse shifts from “Is it real?” to “What is it and what do we do about it?”** That is a sign that Level 5 (where the reality is debated) has transitioned to Level 6 (where the reality is taken as given and the focus is on understanding implications).
- **Remaining secrecy is lifted.** In some cases, especially if authorities were holding back information, Level 6 implies they are now forthcoming with definitive, or at least highly dispositive, evidence (for instance, declassifying historical records or sensor data that corroborate public observations and scientific findings). The word "full disclosure" often connotes that no significant data or information relevant to the scientific analysis and public assessment of UAP or technologies of unknown origin is being kept hidden anymore.

With those criteria satisfied, the process enters its final stage — the phenomenon becomes part of our recognized reality, and we integrate that knowledge going forward.

Level 6: Full Discovery & Integration

Level 6 represents the culmination of the Skywatcher Discovery Framework – the point at which the phenomenon in question is fully disclosed, understood to the extent current knowledge allows, and begins to be integrated into our scientific and societal Framework.

Essentially, the subject graduates from being an “unidentified” or controversial phenomenon to being an accepted part of knowledge or reality. In practical terms, this might mean that what was once mysterious is now openly acknowledged by authorities and studied by scientists without stigma. It’s the stage where focus shifts from proving

that the phenomenon exists to exploring the details of the phenomenon and leveraging the new knowledge.

Key Activities and Characteristics:

- **Official Acknowledgment and Documentation:** By Level 6, typically any relevant official bodies (governments, scientific organizations) will have acknowledged the phenomenon. If, hypothetically, the phenomenon turned out to be an unknown aircraft repeatedly entering airspace and demonstrating performance capabilities beyond that of any human organization, by Level 6 the government would openly admit "Yes, these events are real and under investigation" or even "We know what they are now (or that they are not ours)". If it were a natural phenomenon, the scientific community would document it in textbooks or encyclopedias as a real occurrence. We might see something like a name given to it (e.g., "X Anomaly" if it's not yet explained, or a proper classification if it's understood).
- **Integration into Scientific Research:** At this stage, research into the phenomenon becomes part of normal science. This means new studies, experiments, or missions might be launched focusing on it. For example, if Level 6 disclosure was reached for UAP in general, universities might have programs studying it, and it would be openly discussed at scientific conferences. The data collected so far, plus any newly gathered data, is used to deepen understanding. The phenomenon might branch into various research questions: its properties, causes, implications for physics, neuroscience, consciousness, religion, sociology, geopolitics, exopolitics, etc. We could compare this to how once meteorites were accepted as rocks from space (after long skepticism historically), scientists then moved on to studying their composition to learn about the solar system.
- **Public Knowledge and Education:** The general public is now fully in the loop. The phenomenon can be talked about matter-of-

factly in the media, taught in schools if relevant, and included in educational materials. If, say, hypothetical extraterrestrial or other forms of hypothetical advanced potentially non-human origin intelligence were discovered (a very profound example of Level 6), by this stage it would be something widely known and discussed, not a fringe idea. The key is *transparency* – nothing important is being kept hidden about the nature of the phenomena. People might even have access to live data or continuing reports on the phenomenon as part of open information channels.

- **Policy and Response (if applicable):** Depending on the nature of the disclosure, there may be policy decisions or actions taken. For example, if the phenomenon has security implications, governments will have crafted a response or strategy that is now public. If it's scientific, funding might be allocated officially for research. International cooperation might be established if it's a global concern (imagine an international scientific committee on UAP). Essentially, society collectively decides how to handle the emerging knowledge. This could also include addressing any public fear or misconceptions now that it is an issue the reality of which governments have acknowledged and to which they must publicly respond.
- **Ongoing Validation:** Even at Level 6, science doesn't stop verifying data. New data will continue to be vetted. But by now, the nature of "validation" has changed from *validating existence* to *validating theories about it*. For instance, if an exotic technology was disclosed, engineers worldwide might test its principles, validate its performance, etc. Or if it's a natural phenomenon, scientists will study more occurrences to validate theories of how it works.

Tone and Communication: At this ultimate stage, communication about the phenomenon is fully normalized. The tone is factual and exploratory, rather than persuasive or defensive. Early on (Levels 4-5)

the team has to convince others that the phenomenon was real; by Level 6, that's taken for granted, and the tone is more "given this is real, here's what it means and what we're doing next."

Examples (Hypothetical): To visualize Level 6, consider a hypothetical outcome:

- If the UAP investigated turned out to be a new atmospheric plasma phenomenon (just as an example), at Level 6 it might be officially named (let's call it "Aurora X"), scientists worldwide accept it exists, and research is ongoing to understand its formation. It might be mentioned alongside auroras and lightning sprites as a known atmospheric occurrence.
- If the UAP were advanced technology (from an unknown source), by Level 6 perhaps governments or international bodies have come forward to say, "We have recovered materials or we have established communication," etc. Now it's public knowledge and a matter of global discussion and policy – potentially one of the biggest paradigm shifts in history. Society would then be grappling with the implications (which goes beyond this Framework's scope but is part of the integration process).

The Discovery Process: Achieving Level 6 means the goal of the Discovery Framework is met: what began as an unidentified, possibly dubious claim is now an openly recognized reality. The Framework has provided a pathway to get there methodically:

- *We started with an observation (Level 1),*
- *gathered solid evidence (Level 2),*
- *analyzed it deeply (Level 3),*
- *had others verify it (Level 4),*
- *shared it with the world (Level 5),*
- *and finally reached full disclosure (Level 6).*

At Level 6, the Framework's role transitions to perhaps a monitoring or updating role. If it’s a continuing phenomenon, new data still comes in and is studied, but within the community of experts and with public awareness. If it was a one-time Discovery, Level 6 is more about historical integration and possibly the start of new frameworks for related phenomena (for instance, discovering one new phenomenon might lead to frameworks for finding others).

One important note: Not every case will reach Level 6 quickly, and some may never get there at all. Level 6 is somewhat idealized; it's the end game where uncertainty is gone. There could be phenomena that linger at Level 5 for a long time, with ongoing public debate and no closure. The Framework nonetheless serves as a guidepost, encouraging movement toward resolution by highlighting what's needed at each step.

Even in Level 6, as knowledge is integrated, scientific rigor remains critical. Any new claims related to the phenomenon would still be evaluated. The difference is, by now, the phenomenon itself isn't in question, only the details are. The process could repeat internally for sub-questions: for example, if at Level 6 we accept “X is an anomalous craft,” scientists might start a new multilevel investigation into “What propulsion system does it use?” which goes through its own stages of hypothesis and testing. In this sense, the disclosure Framework might inspire a general approach to tackling big unknowns beyond just the initial identification.

Key Takeaways

Our Skywatcher Discovery Framework provides a systematic and rigorous roadmap for taking a mysterious observation from uncertainty to understanding. By dividing the journey into six clear levels, it ensures that at each stage, appropriate scientific methodologies and data validation techniques are applied, and that analysis of anomalies must meet strict criteria before moving forward. This prevents premature conclusions and maintains a high standard of evidence – crucial when dealing with extraordinary phenomena.

Key takeaways from the Framework include:

- **Scientific Rigor at Every Step:** From the moment an observation is noted, the Framework employs scientific thinking – observing carefully, forming hypotheses, collecting data, analyzing, peer reviewing, and finally concluding. This reflects the general scientific process and emphasizes what officials have stated: only a rigorous analytic approach can unravel these mysteries. The Framework makes sure we don't skip this rigor in the excitement of a potential Discovery.
- **Importance of Data Quality and Validation:** A recurring theme is that better data leads to better conclusions. Many UFO/UAP cases in the past have suffered from poor data, leaving them unresolved. The Framework directly addresses this by encouraging structured data collection and multi-faceted validation (cross-checking with multiple sensors, calibrating instruments, etc. By Level 4 and 5, the data presented is meant to be of such quality that it can convince a skeptical audience. As noted, without high-quality observations, it's impossible to draw firm conclusions hence the heavy emphasis on improving data through Levels 1-3.
- **Transparency and Peer Involvement**: The later stages especially highlight transparency – sharing data openly at Level 4

with peers, and with the public at Level 5. This openness not only builds trust but also allows more minds to work on the problem, aligning with NASA's approach of involving citizen reporting and de-stigmatizing the study of UAP. By the time of full disclosure (Level 6), everything is out in the open. This is critical for a topic historically plagued by secrecy or stigma.

- **Flexibility and Iteration:** While the Framework is linear in presentation, in practice there can be loops. For example, a suggestion from a peer reviewer might send the team back to re-analyze data (back to Level 3) before resubmitting it to Level 4. Or public feedback at Level 5 might prompt gathering more data (a targeted Level 2/3 effort) to address open questions. The Framework can accommodate these iterations; levels can be revisited if the ultimate progression is forward. It's not a rigid ladder one-time through, but a process that can refine itself.
- **General Applicability:** Though designed with UAP Discovery in mind, the Framework is essentially a model for handling any extraordinary claim or emergent phenomena in a responsible way. One could imagine similar steps being used for, say, a new medical Discovery or a claimed breakthrough in physics – start with observation, gather data, analyze, get independent verification, then announce. This makes the Framework valuable beyond just UFOs; it's a blueprint for evidence-based Discovery in general.

In the above descriptions, we kept explanations clear for a general audience. **This ensures the Framework isn't just an academic exercise, but something that citizen scientists, enthusiasts, or any interested person can understand. A clear Framework means the public can also gauge where a certain claim stands.**

For instance, if next month some group claims “we have unambiguous sensor data of UAP demonstrating beyond state-of-the-art capabilities” or even "we have retrieved exotic UAP craft", one can ask: “Have they provided Level 2 & 3 analysis? Was there peer review (Level 4)?” If not,

skepticism is warranted. In contrast, if a claim has progressed methodically through these stages, one might give it more credence. Thus, the Framework also serves as a communication tool between investigators and the public.

Summary

Our Discovery Framework starts with a curious sighting and ends with, ideally, knowledge that is integrated into our worldview. It ensures that on the way to that end, we leave no stone unturned in verifying truth. By requiring validation and consensus at each juncture, it prevents both false positives (mistaking something ordinary for something extraordinary) and false negatives (dismissing something real due to lack of process). It also helps allocate effort wisely – trivial cases get filtered out early, while truly puzzling cases get the attention and resources they deserve.

In practice, employing this Framework means adopting a patient, thorough approach. Discovery of UAPs is not a single event (like a one-time revelation), but a process that can be tracked and measured. This can temper public expectations and improve understanding: rather than expecting sudden revelations, people can watch the progress from Level to Level, appreciating the work being done to ensure any disclosed information is accurate. It builds trust, because each Level adds credibility.

Finally, reaching Level 6: Full Discovery & Integration is not an end, but rather a new beginning for knowledge. It means humanity has learned something new and now incorporates it going forward. The Framework's job is done for that case, but science and exploration continue, now armed with the new insight. In the case of UAP or any other profound unknown, achieving Level 6 would indeed mark a historic achievement – turning a long-time mystery into an accepted reality, with all the exciting possibilities that entails.

By adhering to this rigorous yet flexible Framework, the Skywatcher team aims to ensure that the path from mystery to knowledge is navigated carefully, collaboratively, and transparently. We intend to bring transparency and credibility to the pursuit of truths that lie just beyond the current frontier of understanding.

Each Level is a guardrail against error and a milestone of progress, and together they enable a journey that is both adventurous and accountable – a journey to find the facts that can change our view of the skies, and perhaps, our place in the cosmos.

We hope you will join us on this journey.