# Before you read this

What follows is evidence of irrevocable harm being done to everyone alive. To read it is to cross a threshold; to set it aside is to remain on this side of it. Both choices are legitimate. Make yours knowingly.

Threshold is a proposal in development. This document is part of its working canon.

THRESHOLD · thresholdsummit.org

## Power is the problem

Plastic entered commercial use in the 1950s on a promise of necessity. The promise was delivered. Our lives are measurably better.

The question of what to do with the material when it was no longer in use was never asked, and was never resolved. It became rubbish, thrown away.

There is no such place as away. There is only everywhere. Two billion tonnes in seventy-five years, and everywhere now includes our blood.

This was known, measured, and written about as a threat to life on earth for over fifty years. The facts are done. The research is done. The understanding is done.

What has not been done is to stop it.

For half a century, every pathway has failed. Regulation has been outpaced. Voluntary pledges have been broken. Advocacy has been absorbed. Markets have not responded. Litigation has resolved single cases while the system continued.

The reason is not ignorance, and it is not lack of will. The reason is power. The wealth created by plastic does not want the wealth to stop, and has the resources to ensure it does not.

That is what we found out.

The Threshold is what follows.

---

A verified, legally usable, institutionally endorsed evidence base, built by the people who carry the harm in their bodies. Every observation scored for reliability. Chain of custody from phone to proceeding. A cross-stakeholder deliberation that produces ranked interventions on permanent record. An evidence infrastructure built upstream of the actors who will eventually use it, ready before they need it.

Not protest. Not policy. Not litigation. The architecture that makes all three forceful enough, sooner.

The Threshold is still a proposal. Its purpose is to make the cost of continued suppression exceed the cost of accountability. The threshold will be crossed. The Threshold is built to be ready when it is.

| Name | Domain | Function | Visible to |
|---|---|---|---|
| **The Threshold Summit** | thresholdsummit.org | The public-facing programme name. Used in all external communications, media, publications, and participant-facing materials. | Everyone: public, media, funders, participants |
| **The Althing Round** | Internal only | The name for the closed simulation engine that runs inside the Summit. | Confirmed participants only; steering team; need-to-know staff |

In public communications the programme is always "The Threshold Summit." In participant communications it is "The Threshold Summit, powered by the Althing Round." The simulation engine name is never used in public-facing documents.

## Executive Summary

The Threshold Summit is a 24-month policy intelligence programme that is operated almost entirely through its dedicated website. There is no requirement for participants to travel. There are no mandatory in-person meetings. Every tool (the Voting Rounds, the Matrix Assessment, the Knowledge Base, the Statement system, and all secure communications) is accessed through a laptop or desktop browser from wherever in the world the participant happens to be.

The programme answers a single question at a moment when the answer is still actionable: which plastic pollution interventions command the broadest expert support, and in what order must they be pursued? It does this by running an Althing Simulation, in which twelve expert participants play defined character roles, engage with live data and a structured evidence base, and produce findings through a series of scoring rounds, assessments, and live deliberation sessions.

The programme operates across three layers. The first layer is the Althing Simulation (closed). The second layer is the story drawn from the simulation: a documentary series, a podcast, and policy publications. The third layer is the public: a structured engagement cascade that invites people at every level of society to add their weight to the expert findings. The simulation stays closed. The story travels. Everyone is brought along.

| Parameter | Version 8.0 specification |
|---|---|
| Public name | The Threshold Summit |
| Website | thresholdsummit.org |
| Internal simulation name | The Althing Round (participants only) |
| Season 1 subject | Plastic pollution |
| Duration | 24 months active + 2 months close-out |
| Format | Remote-first, website-operated, no mandatory travel, occasional optional in-person events |
| Characters | 12 fixed expert participants + 1 rotating international voice per event |
| Participant payment | EUR 10,000 per participant (full programme) + EUR 500 induction fee on first day |
| Leadership | Lead Architect (final decisions) + Chief of Staff (operations) + Tier 3 anonymous specialist pool |
| Evidence standard | All documents and statements undergo Fact/Opinion audit (A-F scale) before release |
| Deliberation engine | Cross-impact analysis (CIA) tool, operational and purpose-built for the Althing Round |
| Budget | EUR 966,230 for Season 1 (independent initiative model) |

# Why now: the crisis and the window

## Five forces that have opened a limited window for action

The case for action on plastic pollution is not new. What is new is the convergence of five forces that have simultaneously made action more urgent, more economically viable, more politically possible, more legally consequential, and more financially visible than at any previous moment.

## The market signal

The global conflict that disrupted major shipping routes from early 2026 has driven virgin polymer prices up by 40 to 42 percent. For the first time in years, recycled plastic material is price-competitive with newly produced material. Major brand owners are accelerating their commitments to recycled content: not from conviction, but because recycled material has become cheaper. This window will close when shipping returns to normal, probably by mid-2027. The programme is designed to produce a credible ranked initiative list before that window closes.

## The health science

Microscopic plastic particles have been detected in human blood, breast milk, foetal tissue, and the deposits that line arterial walls. A landmark 2024 clinical study published in the New England Journal of Medicine found that people with plastic particles in their arterial deposits had approximately 4.5 times the rate of heart attacks, strokes, and premature death [B, Marfella et al., NEJM, 7 March 2024]. The scientific community is within one or two large-scale studies of establishing a direct causal link, the kind of evidence that triggers regulatory and litigation consequences at speed.

## The generational shift

The generation now aged 15 to 25 are entering political life carrying measurable plastic particle loads that were present in their bodies before they were born. They are the most engaged generation on environmental questions in recorded history, and they are now voters, candidates, and public officials in every democratic system on the planet.

## The litigation signal

Early indicators suggest national attorney general interest in plastic producer liability for public health costs is developing in California and the Nordic countries. These are not lawsuits yet. They are investigations: the same category of signal that preceded the Master Settlement Agreement in tobacco by eight years. The legal infrastructure around plastic producer liability is being assembled.

Municipal authorities in the Netherlands, France, and the United States have begun quantifying the cost of plastic litter clean-up as a precursor to unjust enrichment claims. The Ocean Cleanup's forensic brand audits have begun establishing product-to-ocean-site causal chains.

This signal matters for the programme for two reasons. First, it changes the character of the Althing Round: the Litigation Funder character's role shifts from speculative to operational. Second, it gives the ranked intervention list a new urgency: the interventions the programme produces will be reviewed by institutions now actively preparing proceedings. The Threshold is designed to have its evidence base in the public record before proceedings begin.

## The financial market signal

In June 2025, Swiss Re's SONAR emerging risk report included a dedicated section entitled "Plastics: a new wave of litigation?" identifying product liability, bodily injury, and workers' compensation as the primary exposure lines for polymer producers [C, Swiss Re SONAR 2025]. In September 2025, the Lloyd's Market Association published a formal underwriting advisory, "Beyond PFAS: the single-use plastics crisis," putting the Lloyd's market on notice that plastics litigation is expanding across liability lines using the same structural progression documented in PFAS cases [C, LMA September 2025].

Reinsurers do not issue horizon-scan warnings ahead of policy need. Their alerts are priced assessments of long-tail casualty risk, written by actuaries who have read the same medical evidence and drawn their own conclusions. The PFAS repricing cycle, now well advanced, was first flagged in reinsurance publications around 2004 to 2006. Polymer liability is at an equivalent early stage. The programme is designed to have its evidence base in the public record before that repricing cycle completes.

This is the single most externally verifiable market signal available to the programme. Unlike the shipping disruption (temporary) or the litigation environment (early), the reinsurance signal is institutionally documented and independently sourced. When reinsurers begin pricing a risk, the risk is real.

**None of these five forces can be sustained indefinitely. The programme is designed to produce a credible, expert-backed, ranked initiative list and a named expert constituency committed to it before this particular alignment of forces ends.**

# How the programme works

## Remote operation, three layers, the Althing Round inside the Summit

### 3.1 Remote-first operation

The Threshold Summit is designed to be operated almost entirely through its dedicated website. This is not a compromise: it is a design choice. A global expert group cannot and should not be required to travel repeatedly over 24 months. Remote operation also removes institutional and geographic power imbalances: a participant in Manila has the same experience as a participant in Brussels. The website is the programme.

All scoring, assessment, and evidence work is done through the website at the participant's own pace, in their own time zone, on any standard laptop or desktop computer.

All secure communications between participants happen through encrypted channels on the website. All live simulation events are conducted as structured video conferences through the website with professional facilitation. The five live events (Induction Day, three simulation sessions, and the closing day) are the only moments that require all participants to be available simultaneously. They run for 4 to 6 hours each, conducted entirely online. The final closing event is the one occasion where in-person attendance is encouraged but never required.

### 3.2 The three layers

| Layer | Name | What it is | Who sees it |
|---|---|---|---|
| Layer 1 | The Althing Round | The Althing Simulation. 12 characters. Voting Rounds. Matrix Assessment powered by cross-impact analysis. Knowledge Base. Statement System. Secure rooms. | Confirmed participants only |
| Layer 2 | The Threshold narrative | Documentary series (4-6 episodes) and podcast (8-10 episodes) produced from anonymised simulation outputs. | General public, media, policymakers |
| Layer 3 | The Poll | A six-level public engagement cascade. From a standard signature to a formal medical declaration, a municipal commitment, or an institutional endorsement. | General public, professionals, institutions |

### 3.3 The tools, in plain language

Every tool in the programme has been given a plain-language name for participant use. No technical jargon, no academic method names.

| Plain name | What it does | When used |
|---|---|---|
| Voting Rounds | A structured four-round scoring process. Participants score 50 policy statements on two questions: how desirable is this outcome, and how achievable is it given current conditions. | Months 2-5; four rounds, each 3 weeks, own time |
| Matrix Assessment | A structured scenario tool backed by a purpose-built cross-impact analysis (CIA) engine. Participants assess how policy changes interact. | Month 7 onwards; own time; 2-week window |
| Knowledge Base | A searchable library of relevant science, economics, and policy research. Pre-loaded with the best available | Available from day one |

| Plain name | What it does | When used |
|---|---|---|
| | evidence. Updated automatically. | throughout all 24 months |
| The Statement System | Any participant can issue a formal statement at any time on any topic relevant to the programme. Every statement is circulated to all other participants. | Available from month 1 throughout the programme |
| Secure rooms | End-to-end encrypted conversation channels: one-to-one (any two participants), small group (three to six), and full plenary (all participants). | Available from Induction Day throughout |
| The Fact/Opinion Audit | A transparency system. Every assertion in every document is preceded by a colour-coded A-F score showing its evidential status before anyone reads it. | Active on all documents from month 1 |

# The Fact/Opinion Audit System

## How every assertion in the simulation is scored A to F before anyone reads it

All documents and statements submitted to the Threshold Summit (by participants, by the programme team, or by specialist advisers) undergo a Fact/Opinion audit before they are released. Every single assertion in every document is preceded by a colour-coded bubble showing its score on a six-point scale from A to F. Readers see the evidential status of what they are about to read before they read it.

| A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Verified fact | Evidence-based | Consensus direction | Informed inference | Contested | Unsubstantiated |

A score of A means the assertion is a verified fact: directly supported by reviewed scientific or official data with no credible dispute. A score of F means the assertion is presented as a fact but is not supported by any evidence in the Knowledge Base. The scale is a transparency tool, not a quality filter. A participant can submit an F-scored assertion. It will be released with its score visible. This is valuable data: it reveals where stakeholder positions are built on assertion rather than evidence.

**A** Microplastics have been detected in human arterial plaque tissue (Marfella et al., NEJM, March 2024).
**B** People with microplastics in arterial plaques show substantially elevated rates of cardiovascular events.
**C** Global plastic production currently exceeds 460 million tonnes per year.
**D** A production levy is the most effective single policy instrument available for plastic reduction.
**E** The recycling industry can recover its lost capacity within five years with adequate investment.
**F** Voluntary industry commitments are an adequate substitute for binding production regulations.

| Step | Who | When | What happens |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Submission | Any participant or team member | Any time | Document enters pending state; not visible to others yet. |
| 2. Automated pre-score | AI tool | Within 2 hours | Each assertion compared against Knowledge Base; assigned preliminary A-F score. |
| 3. Human review | Lead Architect (participants) or Chief of Staff (team docs) | Within 24 hours | Human reviewer checks score, adjusts if incorrect, adds source reference. |
| 4. Release with badges | Platform (automatic on approval) | Immediately on sign-off | Document released with A-F badges preceding every assertion. Audit report published. |
| 5. Challenge | Any participant | Any time after release | A participant may challenge any score with a written reasoning statement. Challenge is published. |

# The twelve characters + 1 rotating voice

## Who plays what role in the Althing Round

Each of the twelve fixed character roles represents a distinct and genuine stakeholder position in the plastic pollution landscape. Characters are not caricatures: they are composite portraits drawn from real institutional logics, real constraints, and authentic professional fears.

| Character | Archetype | Core tension |
|---|---|---|
| The Producer | Major plastics manufacturer executive | Knows liability is coming; waiting for someone else to move first |
| The Recycler | Processing plant operator | Third closure wave will end the business; needs policy certainty |
| The Mayor | Municipal leader in a river delta region | Pays the clean-up costs; has no power over what gets produced upstream |
| The Health Analyst | National public health research institute | The data is correct; the credibility is contested; racing against doubt |
| The Young Activist | Youth policy lead aged 18-20, carries constituency mandate | First generation with documented plastic exposure before birth; political actor without institutional power |
| The Insurer | Major reinsurance company senior director | Pricing the uninsurable; existential interest in early action |
| The Brand Owner | Consumer goods procurement director | Low-cost packaging versus reputational collapse; caught between both |
| The Scientist | Epidemiologist and toxicologist | Has the data; cannot say what they know institutionally; the simulation gives them the space |
| The Diplomat | Trade negotiator from a small island state | Least production; most exposure; moral weight without institutional power |
| The Litigation Funder | Senior partner in third-party legal finance | Already modelling producer exposure; the tobacco settlement made visible |
| The Farmer | Cereal producer on contaminated agricultural land | Plastic particles in food crops; the agricultural productivity argument |
| The Regulator | Mid-level official in a major regulatory body | Knows exactly where the political constraints are; the simulation is the only space to say it |
| The International Voice (rotating) | New national or regional perspective at each event | Prevents the simulation becoming a Western European exercise; brings the real cost to the room |

## The Producer

Chief Strategy Officer, Major plastics manufacturer, European operations

| | |
|---|---|
| **Core tension** | Knows liability is coming; waiting for someone else to move first |

**Situation:** Your company has just posted record profits. Your board is celebrating. Your internal legal team is preparing for the litigation they know is coming. You have read the internal health risk assessments that have not been published.

**Goal in this simulation:** Maintain market position through the transition. Shape the regulatory environment before it shapes you. If a levy is coming, ensure your organisation writes the exemptions. If liability is coming, set the precedent in a jurisdiction where damages are capped.

**Greatest fear:** A class action lawsuit with full document discovery. Not because you think it will succeed, but because the process will expose the memos that cannot be explained away.

**What only they know:** You privately believe a production levy is inevitable and preferable to uncontrolled litigation. But your industry position requires categorical opposition. If you move before your competitors, you lose market share. You are waiting for someone else to blink. This simulation may be the only space in which you can say what you actually think.

## The Young Activist

Youth policy lead, aged 18-20, carries mandate from a youth constituency of 200+ people

| | |
|---|---|
| **Core tension** | First generation with documented plastic exposure before birth; political actor without institutional power |

**Situation:** You are the first generation for whom plastic contamination at birth is not a projection but a documented condition. Your cord blood data exists. You conducted a structured consultation with 200 young people across five countries before entering this programme. You carry their views as a formal mandate, not a personal opinion.

**Goal in this simulation:** To ensure the ranked initiative list that emerges from this programme is one your constituency can live with (literally). You are here to ensure that the one question no institutional character can answer comfortably is asked: why has this taken so long?

**Greatest fear:** That the programme produces a technically coherent recommendation that your constituency is then told to wait for adults to implement.

**What only they know:** You are aware that moral authority is not the same as institutional power, and that every other character in this programme has more of the latter. Your mandate is your power. The data on your generation's exposure is your evidence.

## The Insurer

Senior director, major reinsurance company

| | |
|---|---|
| **Core tension** | Pricing the uninsurable; existential interest in early action |

**Situation:** Your company has published formal underwriting advisories on plastics litigation risk. You have read the Swiss Re SONAR 2025 report and the LMA September 2025 advisory. You understand what it means when a reinsurer moves from "emerging risk" to "underwriting concern." You are that reinsurer.

**Goal in this simulation:** Ensure the programme's ranked intervention list includes production-side instruments that would reduce the long-tail liability exposure your company is now beginning to model. A production levy or mandatory reduction target is worth more to you than a recycling initiative.

**Greatest fear:** That the simulation produces a consensus around demand-side solutions (recycling, clean-up) that leave the supply-side exposure intact. Your company cannot write that risk forever.

**What only they know:** You have internal actuarial modelling showing polymer sector casualty exposure on a trajectory that looks structurally similar to PFAS circa 2005-2010. You cannot share the numbers. But the direction is clear.

## The Regulator

Mid-level official, major regulatory body environment directorate

| | |
|---|---|
| **Core tension** | Knows exactly where the political constraints are; the simulation is the only space to say it |

**Situation:** You are not a director-general. You are the person who actually writes the technical annexes and the implementing regulations. You know which recycled content targets are going to be missed and by how much. You know which provisions were weakened in negotiation and why.

**Goal in this simulation:** To ensure the programme's ranked initiatives are technically deliverable within the existing legal and administrative architecture. You have watched too many well-intentioned proposals collapse at the implementation stage because the people who designed them did not understand the system they were designing for.

**Greatest fear:** That the programme produces initiatives that are politically popular but technically undeliverable, and that you are then the person who has to write the regulation explaining why they cannot be done as described.

**What only they know:** The specific constraints you know about (the ones that would reshape the entire debate if they were public) are your most valuable contribution. Playing a character means you can say them here. You cannot say them anywhere else.

## The remaining nine characters

Full character briefs for The Recycler, The Mayor, The Health Analyst, The Brand Owner, The Scientist, The Diplomat, The Litigation Funder, The Farmer, and The International Voice (rotating) are provided in the participant induction pack. Each brief follows the same format: archetype, core tension, situation, goal, greatest fear, what only they know. Character selection is final; substitutions require Lead Architect approval.

## Character selection and confidentiality

Participants are assigned their character roles by the Lead Architect. Characters are not publicly disclosed until the programme closes. Each participant knows only their own character. All participants know the programme has twelve fixed character types. No participant knows which character any other participant is playing. This confidentiality is the engine of authentic deliberation.

# Leadership architecture

## Lead Architect, Chief of Staff, Tier 3 anonymous specialist pool

The programme's leadership is structured as three tiers. This is not a committee. It is a rapid-response intelligence architecture designed to make decisions at speed without sacrificing rigour or confidentiality. The architecture is built around one principle: the person with final decision authority (the Lead Architect) must always have immediate access to the best available specialist intelligence, delivered through a single trusted operational channel (the Chief of Staff), without the latency of committee deliberation.

## Tier 1: The Lead Architect

Andrew Henderson, Lead Architect, Marans, France. Final decision authority on all programme matters.

Decision authority: final and unilateral on programme design and methodology; character selection; Fact/Opinion audit outcomes; deanonymisation procedure (invoked jointly with Chief of Staff only); all outputs crossing from the closed simulation to public layers; funder relationships; publication of all findings.

Time commitment: 0.6 full-time equivalent, approximately 15-19 hours per month on average, peak months 25-30 hours. Total across 26 months: 395-490 hours. Remuneration: EUR 120,000 per year post-funding. Honorary pre-funding.

## Tier 2: Chief of Staff

Operational authority on programme logistics, Tier 3 specialist tasking, financial administration, and funder reporting preparation. Does not override the Lead Architect on any matter. Manages the programme coordinator and data analyst as direct reports. Synthesises Tier 3 inputs into actionable summaries for the Lead Architect. Time commitment: 0.6 FTE. Remuneration: EUR 96,000 per year post-funding.

## Tier 3: The specialist advisory pool

Anonymous to all programme participants and to all Tier 2 staff except the Chief of Staff. Tier 3 specialists never act collectively. They provide targeted briefs that feed into the Chief of Staff to Lead Architect pipeline only. Response window: 48 hours for routine briefs, 24 hours for urgent requests.

| Specialism | Function |
|---|---|
| Health and biomedical science | Peer-reviewed scientific literature, clinical implications, contested evidence |
| Economics and market analysis | Market data, modelling assumptions, range of scenarios |
| International law and treaty process | Applicable legal framework, feasibility assessment, precedent references |
| Materials science and recycling technology | Technology readiness assessment, infrastructure requirements |
| Geopolitics and political economy | Current situation assessment, two to three scenarios, monitoring indicators |
| Artificial intelligence and CIA tools | Literature search, Knowledge Base document ingestion, automated Fact/Opinion pre-scoring, translation |

# Programme budget, version 8.0

## Updated: documentary production line held pending named partnership confirmation

| Budget line | Amount (EUR) | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| **ESTABLISHMENT AND GOVERNANCE** | | |
| Legal registration and governance | 18,000 | Foundation setup |
| Accounting, audit, and compliance (2 years) | 28,000 | |
| Website infrastructure and security | 12,000 | Cloud hosting, air-gapped simulation server |
| **TIER 1 AND TIER 2 LEADERSHIP (24 months)** | | |
| Lead Architect (0.6 FTE) | 144,000 | EUR 10,000/month, Andrew Henderson |
| Chief of Staff (0.6 FTE) | 144,000 | EUR 10,000/month, senior operational lead |
| Communications lead (0.4 FTE) | 96,000 | EUR 8,000/month |
| Legal counsel (0.4 FTE) | 96,000 | EUR 8,000/month |
| Programme coordinator (1.0 FTE) | 72,000 | EUR 3,000/month |
| Data analyst (0.5 FTE) | 36,000 | EUR 3,000/month |
| **TIER 3 SPECIALIST ADVISORY POOL (on-demand)** | | |
| Health and biomedical science | 12,000 | Estimated 8-12 briefs |
| Economics and market analysis | 10,000 | Estimated 7-10 briefs |
| International law specialist | 14,000 | Estimated 8-12 briefs |
| Materials science and recycling technology | 8,000 | Estimated 5-8 briefs |
| Geopolitics and political economy | 10,000 | Estimated 7-10 briefs |
| **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CIA TOOLS** | | |
| Research and synthesis model (enterprise access) | 8,000 | Literature search, document drafting, translation |
| Document analysis and Fact/Opinion pre-scoring | 6,000 | Knowledge Base automated ingestion, pre-audit A-F |
| Cross-impact analysis (CIA) engine | Operational | Purpose-built for Althing Round, provided by programme |
| **PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS** | | |
| Induction fees (12 x EUR 500) | 6,000 | Paid on first day regardless of subsequent participation |
| Programme stipends (12 x EUR 10,000) | 120,000 | Three tranches: month 1, month 7, month 24 |
| **PHASE 1: DISCOVERY (months 1-6)** | | |

| Budget line | Amount (EUR) | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| Voting Rounds platform and four-round analysis | 22,000 | Software, analysis, reporting |
| Knowledge Base build and initial loading | 8,000 | Foundation document ingestion and Fact/Opinion pre-scoring |
| Matrix Assessment and CIA engine integration | 14,000 | Specialist input, platform, and CIA tool integration |
| **PHASE 2: SYNTHESIS (months 7-12)** | | |
| White paper production | 16,000 | Writing, design, translation into six languages |
| Live simulation sessions (x4, all conducted online) | 80,000 | EUR 20,000 per event |
| Expert council convening (x3) | 36,000 | Facilitation, travel support |
| **PHASE 3: MOBILISATION (months 13-22)** | | |
| Advocacy and parliamentary outreach | 36,000 | Briefings, media, digital |
| Expert commentator fees (8 commentators) | 40,000 | EUR 5,000 average per contributor |
| Documentary production | To be confirmed | Subject to named production partnership (EUR 250,000 allocated on confirmation) |
| Podcast series (8-10 episodes) | 30,000 | |
| The Poll platform development | 60,000 | Six-level cascade technology |
| Interactive public tool (Layer 3) | 50,000 | Public exploration of initiative ranking |
| Public polling programme | 35,000 | Baseline and tracking |
| Participant filming kits (x12) | 4,200 | Webcam, ring light, microphone per participant |
| **CONTINGENCY** | | |
| Contingency (15% of committed subtotal) | 126,030 | 15% of EUR 840,200 |
| **TOTAL** | **966,230** | 24-month Season 1, independent initiative model. Documentary production line committed on named partnership confirmation. |

## Note on budget architecture

The Tier 1 and Tier 2 leadership budget (EUR 588,000) represents the sustained 24-month operational platform that makes the evidence and deliberation work possible: continuous programme management, legal oversight, communications, and the data infrastructure the simulation depends on. This is not overhead; it is the operating system.

The Tier 3 specialist pool (EUR 54,000) is priced per-brief at market rates for targeted, time-bounded expert inputs. The low aggregate reflects the programme's precision-targeting model: Tier 3 specialists are called on specific questions, not retained for general advisory work. The ratio reflects design intent, not underinvestment in specialist intelligence.

The documentary production line (EUR 250,000) is held pending a named production partnership. It will be committed once that partnership is formalised and not before.

[C, Swiss Re SONAR 2025; LMA September 2025]: The reinsurance market signals documented in the "Why Now" section independently confirm the programme's timeline case. When institutional insurers begin pricing a long-tail casualty risk, the risk is real and the window for upstream action is finite.

**"The simulation stays closed. The story travels. Everyone is brought along."**

Contact: Andrew Henderson, Lead Architect, programme@thresholdsummit.org, Marans, France, July 2026. The Threshold Initiative. Programme Proposal v8.0. July 2026. Confidential. Copyright The Threshold Initiative 2026. All rights reserved.

## What follows from reading this

You have now read the evidence. The medical evidence is in our blood and our children's. The economic case for recycling, as it has been sold, is dead. The policy interventions exist and have been costed. The architecture that would resolve a case of this shape has been mapped.

From this point you are an informed witness. That is the threshold.

The next question is not whether you care. The historical pattern is clear. Systemic harm has been resolved in every documented precedent (tobacco, asbestos, lead, opioids) not by enough people caring but by enough informed witnesses acting in ways small and large. The relevant distinction is not between those who care and those who do not. It is between those who act and those who do not. The difference is witnessed commitment, not feeling.

### Three civic acts cross the threshold.

Vote. Vote for political representatives who will price the externality, build the levy, and pass the producer liability framework. Plastic is a political problem before it is a chemical one.

Vote in the Threshold poll. When the Knowledge Base presents the ranked interventions that emerge from the Althing Round, vote on them. The poll is the public record of which interventions citizens have endorsed.

Write your Pledge. If you care, show it. Write to your unborn grandchildren. Tell them what you knew. What you did. What you did not do. Tell them why they will live with the consequences. Seal it with your mark. Send it to the Threshold. We will hold it until the threshold is crossed, or until the year you have chosen, whichever comes first. This is the act that crosses your own. You will carry it forever.

> **The Threshold Effect** is the pattern by which documented systemic harm crosses a threshold making it increasingly difficult to ignore (legally, medically, and politically) in documented historical cases, deliberately and systematically.

**The case has crossed every threshold but yours.**

Whether you cross it is now observed.