

## **JOR Framework v3: Organizational User Manual**

### Field Guidance for Data-Driven UAP Case Triage

#### **1. Purpose and Scope**

The JOR Framework v3 is a decision-support and triage tool, not a determination system. Its purpose is not to “prove aliens,” but to help organizations identify potential technological surprise by separating strong evidentiary signals from noise, misperception, and conventional explanations.

The framework enables analysts to move from qualitative narrative assessment toward structured, probabilistic forensics while maintaining conservative analytical standards suitable for institutional use.

#### **2. Overview of the Two-Score Structure**

The JOR Framework produces two distinct probabilistic outputs, each serving a different analytical function.

##### **SOP — Solid Object Probability**

SOP represents the probability that the observed event involved a persistent, structured, physically real object rather than sensor artifact, perceptual error, or environmental noise.

SOP is derived from weighted evidence across:

- Witness credibility
- Environmental and observation conditions
- Physical or sensor-based evidence

---

##### **NHP — Non-Human Probability**

NHP represents an anomaly-weighted hypothesis score indicating how strongly the observed object, given the evidence entered, deviates from conventional human or natural explanations.

NHP is not a declaration of origin. It is an indicator of conditional investigative risk.

## **Relationship Between SOP and NHP**

Although SOP and NHP are computed through separate scoring pathways, they are not intended to be interpreted independently.

- SOP establishes evidentiary grounding
- NHP reflects anomalous or non-conventional characteristics layered on that grounding

In practice:

- NHP is most meaningful when SOP is moderate to high
- High NHP paired with weak SOP should be interpreted cautiously and treated as model sensitivity rather than operational confidence

## **3. Evidence Scoring and Weighting**

Both SOP and NHP are derived from weighted combinations of three core evidence factors:

- Witness Credibility (C)  
Default weight: 0.40
- Environmental / Observation Conditions (E)  
Default weight: 0.30
- Physical / Sensor Evidence (P)  
Default weight: 0.30

Weights may be adjusted by the user. If modified, the system normalizes them to ensure they sum to 1.0.

### **Flight Behavior Adjustment (NHP Only)**

An additional flight behavior anomaly modifier is applied to physical evidence only for NHP calculation.

This design reflects the analytical distinction between:

- Demonstrating physical reality (SOP)
- Identifying anomalous or non-conventional behavior (NHP)

Anomalous motion therefore influences investigative prioritization without inflating the assessment of physical reality.

---

#### **4. Bayesian Fusion and Posterior Probability**

##### **Prior Skepticism (PRIOR\_NH)**

The framework applies a prior probability representing baseline skepticism toward the non-human hypothesis.

- Default prior:  $\text{PRIOR\_NH} = 0.20$

This reflects conservative institutional baselines consistent with public UAP assessments.

##### **Calibration Constant (K)**

The Calibration Constant (K) moderates how strongly conventional explanations are favored when physical evidence is strong.

- Default value:  $K = 0.20$
- Higher values increase conservative bias
- Lower values are appropriate only for internal exploratory analysis

##### **Posterior Calculation**

The framework computes a Posterior Non-Human Probability using Bayesian updating.

- NHP informs the likelihood of the evidence under a non-human hypothesis
- SOP contributes to the plausibility of conventional explanations through calibration
- The posterior reflects how much the evidence shifts belief relative to the prior

Important characteristics of the implementation:

- SOP does not mathematically cap NHP
- SOP influences the posterior indirectly through calibration
- The posterior remains conservative even for highly anomalous cases

## **5. Interpretation Guidance**

### **How to Read the Outputs**

- SOP answers:  
“How confident are we that something physically real occurred?”
- NHP answers:  
“Given the evidence entered, how anomalous does this case appear relative to conventional explanations?”
- Posterior NH answers:  
“How much should this case shift investigative attention relative to baseline skepticism?”

None of these values assert origin.

### **Manual Overrides**

The framework allows users to manually enter SOP and NHP values, bypassing rubric-based scoring.

This capability exists to support:

- Legacy case ingestion
- External scoring systems
- Sensitivity testing

When manual overrides are used, results should be interpreted as analyst-supplied inputs rather than rubric-derived outputs.

## **6. Organizational Triage Use (Interpretive)**

Organizations may use Posterior NH as an interpretive guide for prioritization.

Suggested interpretation bands:

- Posterior NH from 0.00 to 0.25  
Tier 3 — Mundane  
Likely conventional explanation or insufficient evidence. Archive.

- Posterior NH from 0.26 to 0.45
  - Tier 2 — Anomalous
  - Monitor and cross-reference with intelligence, sensor, or historical data.
- Posterior NH from 0.46 to 0.56
  - Tier 1 — Priority
  - Active investigation. Request raw sensor data, conduct interviews, and pursue forensic analysis.

These tiers are interpretive guidelines, not automated classifications.

## 7. Conservative vs Exploratory Use Modes

### Standard Reporting Mode

- PRIOR\_NH set to 0.20
- K set to 0.20
- Intended for public-facing or institutional reporting

### Exploratory / R&D Mode

- Lower PRIOR\_NH or K values permitted
- Intended for internal discovery, model testing, and sensitivity analysis
- Results should not be released without contextual qualification

## 8. Analytical Cautions

- High anomaly scores without strong physical grounding should be treated cautiously
- The framework prioritizes evidentiary discipline over speculation
- Outputs are decision-support signals, not conclusions

## Summary

The JOR Framework v3 provides a structured, conservative, and transparent method for triaging UAP cases based on evidentiary strength and anomalous characteristics. It is designed to help organizations decide what to investigate, not what to believe.