AGI Signal vs Noise Evaluation Framework

Type: Evaluation Framework

Target Audience: Executive Leadership, AI Strategy Teams, Technical Leadership

This framework helps leaders evaluate AGI claims and separate genuine AI breakthroughs from marketing hype. Use these criteria when assessing new AI capabilities, vendor claims, or media reports about AI advances.

1. Critical Evaluation Questions

When evaluating any claim of AI breakthrough or AGI progress, ask these five questions:

#	Question	What to Look For
1	**Peer Review Status** Was this verified by independent peer review?	Published papers vs. press releases; independent replication attempts
2	**Understanding vs. Mimicking** Does the system actually understand, or mimic patterns?	Novel reasoning vs. statistical pattern matching; edge case performance
3	**Novel Problem Solving** Can it solve genuinely new problems?	Performance on problems not in training data; out-of-distribution tests
4	**Autonomous Goal-Setting** Does it set its own goals or only respond to prompts?	Self-directed behavior vs. instruction-following; initiative and planning
5	**Transfer Learning** Can it transfer knowledge across domains without retraining?	Cross-domain application; zero-shot performance in new fields

2. Signal Indicators (Real Progress)

These factors suggest genuine advancement:

- ☐ Published in peer-reviewed academic venues
- ☐ Results reproducible by independent researchers
- ☐ Demonstrates capabilities on novel benchmarks (not training data)
- ☐ Shows genuine reasoning, not just pattern matching
- ☐ Acknowledges limitations and failure modes
- ☐ Provides technical details sufficient for replication
- ☐ Performance consistent across diverse test conditions
- ☐ Independent experts validate claims

3. Noise Indicators (Hype)

These factors suggest marketing hype over substance:

- ☐ Announced only via press release or blog post
- ☐ Claims not independently verified
- ☐ Cherry-picked demonstrations or carefully staged demos
- ☐ Conflates "impressive output" with "understanding"
- ☐ Vague language ("breakthrough," "revolutionary") without specifics
- ☐ No technical paper or methodology disclosure
- ☐ Timelines for capabilities repeatedly pushed back
- ☐ Claims tied to funding announcements or product launches

4. Claim Assessment Scorecard

Use this scorecard to evaluate specific AI claims or announcements:

Criterion	Score (1-5)	Notes
Peer review / verification	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
Technical transparency	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
Independent replication	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
Honest about limitations	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
Novel capability (not incremental)	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
Expert consensus supports	[ ]1 [ ]2 [ ]3 [ ]4 [ ]5	
TOTAL SCORE	_____ **/ 30**	

Score Interpretation:

Score Range	Assessment	Recommended Action
25-30	High credibility - likely genuine progress	Monitor closely; consider strategic implications
18-24	Moderate credibility - needs more validation	Wait for independent verification
10-17	Low credibility - significant skepticism warranted	Treat as unverified; avoid strategic decisions
6-9	Very low credibility - likely hype	Disregard for planning purposes

AI Claim/Announcement: _____

Assessed By: _____ **Date:** _____