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.

THRESHOLD | thresholdsummit.org

THE THRESHOLD

A global view of the programme that turns citizen outrage into evidence, and evidence into the structural change that courts, governments and markets cannot ignore.

- The scale of the crisis: if nothing changes
- Why hundreds of millions of engaged people have not been enough
- The political trap: vested interest against public will
- The role of journalism and a hungry media landscape
- What the Threshold is and how every element connects
- The Independence Charter and Initiative governance
- The Youth Council: nothing about them, without them
- Budget, timeline and the urgency of the moment

Section 1

The crisis: if nothing changes

The world is drowning in plastic. Slowly. Measurably. And almost nobody is stopping it.

Every year, humanity produces around 460 million tonnes of plastic. Less than ten percent is ever recycled. The rest, eventually, escapes into oceans, rivers, soil, air, and finally into the bodies of every living creature on this planet, including our own.

We are not talking about litter. We are talking about particles so small they pass through the gut wall, enter the bloodstream, cross the blood-brain barrier, and embed in foetal tissue. A landmark 2024 study in NEJM NEJM found that people with plastic particles in their arterial deposits had a 4.5 times higher rate of heart attacks, strokes, and death. This is no longer a hypothesis. It is clinical evidence.

460Mt	<10%	22Mt	4.5x	~5g
Plastic produced every year	Ever recycled globally	Leaks to environment every year	Elevated cardiac risk from microplastics	Plastic ingested per person each week

The global plastics treaty, the single most important international mechanism available, failed at Busan in late 2024 and again at Geneva in August 2025. No binding production cap exists. No legally mandated cleanup fund exists. The European recycling industry (built at a cost of EUR 5 billion between 2020 and 2023) has experienced catastrophic collapse, with more than one million tonnes of processing capacity lost since 2023.

> *'Nobody can predict the future with certainty. But the probability that everything gets worse, absent structural action, is, based on published science and economic modelling, almost certain.'*

What the next decade looks like

Horizon	Accumulation	Conditions
12 months | April 2027	+22 million more tonnes	Another year's worth of plastic escapes. A brief market window created by geopolitical disruption partially revives recycling economics, but the infrastructure to capitalise on it has already been dismantled.
2 years | April 2028	+60 million more tonnes	The market window closes. A second wave of recycler closures begins. Scientists establish, for the first time, a direct causal link between microplastic exposure and specific diseases. The first producer liability lawsuits are filed.
5 years | April 2031	+150 million more tonnes	The first generation with documented plastic exposure before birth reaches fifteen. The health evidence is clinical. The word 'irreversible' appears consistently in peer-reviewed papers.
10 years | April 2036	+300 million more tonnes	Children born today carry more microplastics than any generation in history. Rebuilding the recycling capacity that could have existed in 2026 costs 3 to 5 times more. Legal settlements reshape the industry, too late for the damage already done.

Section 2

Why hundreds of millions of engaged people have not been enough

The scale of public concern about plastic pollution dwarfs almost every other environmental issue in terms of measurable public engagement. Yet production continues to rise every year. The gap between what people want and what happens is not a gap of awareness or will. It is a structural gap: a failure of architecture.

700M+	800M	250M+	71%	8M
Social media users engaged	Environmental app users (2025)	Petition signatures on plastic	EU consumers wanting refill options	Active citizen science participants

Global plastic production is projected to reach 736 million tonnes per year by 2040 under business-as-usual. The recycled share, despite decades of effort, remains near 10%. The gap between what hundreds of millions of engaged people want and what the system delivers is not closing. It is widening.

Three structural weaknesses

Engagement without evidence has no legal standing. A petition, however large, cannot be cited in a courtroom. It carries no evidential weight in regulatory proceedings. It is routinely dismissed as emotional preference rather than factual grounding.

Engagement without a constituency architecture has no institutional leverage. Two million anonymous petition signatures carry far less institutional weight than ten thousand named, verified medical professionals co-signing a formal declaration, or fifty city governments publishing quantified cost audits.

Engagement without coordination dissipates its energy. Millions of people each individually concerned about plastic pollution are not, without a coordinating structure, a political force. The Threshold provides the structure that converts dispersed concern into coordinated institutional pressure.

> *'The question is not whether enough people care. They demonstrably do. The question is whether caring can be structured into something that courts, governments, and capital markets cannot ignore.'*

Section 3

The political trap: vested interest against public will

Politicians know exactly what the evidence says. The trap is that knowing and acting are separated by money.

The OECD has explicitly called for a plastic tax rising to $750 per tonne by 2060. The EU's own Environment Commissioner has publicly acknowledged the recycling industry is in a 'deep crisis.' Parliamentarians across Europe, North America, and Australia have been briefed on the health evidence and the economic consequences of inaction. They know.

What they face is a structural stalemate in which public opinion, moral obligation, and the financial pressure of organised vested interest are locked against each other. The petrochemical industry is the largest industrial sector on earth by capital value. As fossil fuel demand for energy declines with electrification, plastics have explicitly become its primary growth strategy. New cracker capacity coming online between 2026 and 2029 will add more than 50 million tonnes of annual polymer capacity.

A legislator who acts on meaningful upstream production controls faces simultaneously: organised industry opposition; direct employment consequences in their constituency; a short electoral cycle that makes ten-year policy investments politically risky; and an opposition that will characterise any action as economically reckless if the full social cost of inaction cannot be demonstrated in legally credible terms.

The Threshold is designed to remove every one of those barriers.

THE TOBACCO PRECEDENT: WHY THE POLITICAL TRAP EVENTUALLY BREAKS

For forty years, the tobacco industry maintained that its product was not proven to cause cancer. For forty years, that argument held political and legal ground, until the evidence base became unassailable, the litigation became financially existential, and state governments began quantifying their healthcare costs. The final settlement recovered $206 billion from US tobacco companies.

The plastic industry is ten years behind tobacco on this trajectory. The Threshold is designed to accelerate the arrival of the moment when the legal and political cost of continued inaction permanently exceeds the cost of acting.

Section 4

The role of journalism: a hungry media landscape

The media landscape is not the enemy of this story. It is one of its most powerful amplifiers, and it is hungry for exactly what the Threshold produces.

Investigative and science journalists consistently face the same problem: a vast volume of claims, counter-claims, industry-funded studies, and contested statistics, with very little reliable infrastructure to distinguish verified fact from wishful thinking. The programme's Fact/Opinion scoring system, which precedes every assertion with a colour-coded grade from A to F, is not primarily a quality filter. It is a professional tool for journalists, researchers, and litigators who need to know the evidential status of what they are about to cite.

A journalist writing about a corporate claim scored F by the programme's expert panel has something to publish that no press release can counter. That is what this programme produces that no existing platform provides.

The documentary series is not a nature film. It is something new: twelve real people playing characters drawn from authentic institutional positions, working through the hardest policy question of our time, with the evidence scored and displayed in real time as they argue. The format does not yet exist. The audience is demonstrably there. A single well-crafted documentary generated over 100 million Netflix views within weeks of release. Plastic-focused content consistently outperforms genre averages for streaming engagement.

> *'Journalism is hungry for what this programme produces: evidence that is graded, verified, institutionally endorsed, and legally defensible. The shortage has never been editorial interest. It has been the evidence itself.'*

Full media breakdown by outlet type: see Appendix C.

Section 5

The programme: what it is and how every element connects

The Threshold is not a single tool. It is a system, designed so that every element creates a condition that makes the next element possible.

Single-element interventions can each be absorbed and dismissed by the systems they are trying to change. A system in which citizens, scientists, medical professionals, city governments, investors, and legal funders are all contributing to and endorsing the same evidence base is structurally far harder to dismiss.

Component 1 | Public	Component 2 | Closed	Component 3 | Public
The App: The Threshold. A free global application turning anyone's observation into verified, trust-weighted evidence. Six layers of constituency, from citizen Spotters to institutional investors, all connected to the same evidence base.	The Althing Simulation. A 24-month structured online programme. Twelve experts play named character roles representing authentic institutional positions. They produce a ranked list of interventions, including where they genuinely disagree.	The Story. A documentary series, podcast, and policy publications translate expert findings into a form the world can act on, without compromising participant confidentiality.

The chain of change: from citizen observation to legal proceeding

Step	Stage	What happens
1	The citizen submits	A citizen photographs plastic waste, reports a health concern, or documents a corporate announcement through the app. An AI system classifies and scores it for relevance. Other citizens corroborate it independently. A human validator reviews the cluster and decides whether it enters the official evidence record.
2	Evidence builds trust	Each citizen builds a Reliability Index: a score from 0 to 100 based on the accuracy, consistency, and corroboration of their submissions. A high-scoring contributor's observation carries substantially more evidential weight. Trust is earned slowly and lost quickly, exactly as in peer-reviewed science.
3	Evidence enters the Knowledge Base	Verified submissions enter the Knowledge Base, the programme's central evidence library. Every entry carries a Fact/Opinion score from A to F. The Library is used simultaneously by expert participants, journalists, researchers, and litigators.
4	Evidence informs expert analysis	Twelve expert participants, each playing a named character drawn from a real institutional position, use the Knowledge Base as their evidence foundation. Over four Voting Rounds and a Matrix assessment, they produce a ranked list of interventions: which policies work, in what order, and why.
5	Findings reach the public	The documentary series and podcast tell the story of the Althing Simulation without breaching confidentiality. The ranked findings are communicated to a public audience in a form that is compelling, evidentially grounded, and actionable.
6	The public adds institutional weight	Citizens act at six levels: from a two-minute signature to a formal investor disclosure request. Medical professionals co-sign a global declaration. City governments commission cost audits. Pension funds formally request producer liability disclosure.

Step	Stage	What happens
7	Evidence enters legal proceedings	Citizens who opt in explicitly create a verified witness pipeline. Municipal cost audits create a quantified liability database. The legal architecture for producer liability, modelled on tobacco litigation, is built from evidence that is trust-weighted, verified, and institutionally endorsed.

The twelve expert characters are drawn from authentic institutional positions, chosen to represent the full landscape of genuine positions including those in fundamental tension. Full character profiles are in Appendix B.

Section 6

Initiative governance:

the Independence Charter

The Threshold cannot be sold, pivoted, or influenced. Its independence is not a promise. It is a legally binding structural commitment.

A platform whose outputs may enter legal proceedings, whose evidence is cited in parliamentary briefings, and whose expert findings are used to argue for binding regulation cannot be commercially compromised. Its credibility is its primary asset, and credibility requires independence.

THE THRESHOLD INDEPENDENCE CHARTER

1. No funder influence: No organisation providing funding receives any influence over analytical findings, participant selection, or programme methodology, at any investment level.

2. Findings follow evidence: All conclusions belong to the evidence, not to any individual, institution, or funder. If the evidence changes, the conclusions change.

3. Permanent mission: The programme cannot be sold, pivoted, or discontinued without governance board approval. The mission is binding.

4. Transparent correction: When errors occur, they are corrected publicly and completely within 72 hours, never quietly amended.

5. Youth co-governance: The Youth Council runs with equal protocol and process alongside the Althing Simulation. Nothing affecting the programme's scope is decided without their formal input.

The Governance Board comprises five to seven members with expertise spanning environmental law, independent journalism, academic research, civil society, and science. None are funders. None represent commercial interests. The board meets quarterly and must approve any change to the programme's core methodology, mission statement, or evidence standards.

Users retain copyright over their submissions. The platform holds only a usage licence. Reliability Index scores cannot be reset arbitrarily or commercially influenced. Evidence cannot be sold or transferred to any commercial interest. No funder receives influence over findings, at any investment level.

Section 7

The Youth Council: nothing about them, without them

The client of this programme is the generations who will live with its consequences. Nothing about them is decided without them.

The Threshold Youth Council runs in parallel with the Althing Round, not as a symbolic addition, but with the same protocol, the same tools, and the same analytical rigour. Youth participants aged 15 to 25, selected through the same transparent process as adult experts, engage in their own Voting Rounds, Matrix Assessments, and Statement System. Their ranked findings are published alongside the adult expert findings. Where the two rankings agree, the agreement is powerful. Where they diverge, the divergence is the most important data the programme produces.

The generations now aged 15 to 25 carry a qualitatively different relationship to this crisis than any previous generation. Studies of cord blood and placental tissue published between 2021 and 2026 document microplastic concentrations in foetal tissue at levels not present in their parents' generation. They are the first generation for whom plastic contamination at birth is not a projection. It is a documented condition of their existence.

A policy decision made in 2026 with a ten-year implementation horizon will reach full effect when the children born today are ten years old. The moral case for their co-governance of a programme that exists to change those decisions is not symbolic. It is foundational.

> *'Nothing about them, without them. The generations who will live with the consequences of our decisions have the right, not merely the opportunity, to co-govern the programme that exists to change those decisions.'*

Section 8

Budget, timeline, and the case for urgency

EUR 1.26M	EUR 1.16M	EUR 2.42M	1.2M+	EUR 280k/yr
Althing Simulation budget 24 months	Public app budget 24 months	Total programme investment	Target app users by month 24	Founding Circle revenue at target

The programme is built in three phases. The Althing Simulation runs over 24 months, covering leadership, participant payments, expert advisory pools, four live simulation sessions, the documentary series, and the public engagement platform. The app builds from a browser-based Phase 1 to a full native platform with camera submissions, convergence scoring, moderation, and the six-level institutional cascade. Phase 3 activates the litigation evidence pipeline where the legal architecture permits. Full budget detail is in Appendix A.

The three converging forces: why now

The market signal. Global conflict disrupting major shipping routes from February 2026 caused virgin plastic prices to surge by 40 to 42% within weeks. For the first time in three years, recycled plastic is price-competitive. This window will close when shipping normalises.

The health science. The scientific community is within one or two large-scale studies of establishing a direct causal link between microplastic exposure and specific diseases. The 2024 NEJM arterial plaque study was the first major clinical step. When that link is firmly established, the regulatory and litigation consequences will accelerate at a speed that will overwhelm an unprepared evidence infrastructure.

The generational shift. The generation now aged 15 to 25 are entering political life with measurable plastic loads present before their birth. The programme's 24-month timeframe is designed to produce results before their frustration transforms into something less orderly.

THE COST OF WAITING

12 months of inaction: +22Mt to environment | cost of eventual reversal EUR 30 to 50 billion

2 years of inaction: +60Mt | recycling window closed; infrastructure rebuilding cost 2x

5 years of inaction: +150Mt | causal health link legally established; litigation begins without full evidence infrastructure

10 years of inaction: +300Mt | rebuilding recycling capacity costs 3 to 5x the 2026 price

The three interventions: all required simultaneously

Intervention	What it is	Why it is necessary
A liability framework	Plastic producers held financially accountable for quantifiable harm to human health, wildlife, marine ecosystems, and municipal infrastructure. Modelled on tobacco litigation ($206 billion recovered).	Creates the only financial pressure large enough to change the fundamental production economics of the industry.

Intervention	What it is	Why it is necessary
A levy on virgin plastic	A charge of EUR 600 to EUR 800 per tonne on plastic placed on market, ring-fenced to directly subsidise recyclers and fund collection infrastructure. Generates approximately EUR 10.8 billion per year.	Makes every recycling stream permanently viable. Internalises the social cost (EUR 1,380 to EUR 3,400 per tonne leaked) that currently falls on society rather than producers.
Upstream redesign	Robotic bulk-dispensing supermarket model: products in reusable bulk containers, dispensed to customer quantities. 55 to 65% of food retail plastic can be substituted.	Breaks the causal chain before plastic enters the waste stream. Reduces food waste and lowers consumer prices by removing packaging costs (10 to 40% of retail price).

What we are choosing

Nobody can say exactly what the future holds. That is not the point.

The point is that the probability of things getting worse, absent structural change, is not speculative. It is the mathematically expected outcome of continuing a trajectory that is documented, measured, and published by the OECD, the United Nations, and the peer-reviewed scientific community.

A child born today will be ten years old in 2036. They will grow up in a world where plastic particles are measurably more concentrated in their food, water, and air than in the world you were born into. That is not a projection. It is already true for the children being born today.

> *'The plastic crisis is not unsolvable. It is unsolved, because those who benefit from the current system have more organised power than those who are harmed by it. The Threshold is a systematic effort to reverse that imbalance using the one resource that cannot be lobbied away: the number of people who are already angry, and who need a structure that turns their anger into something courts and governments cannot ignore.'*

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.

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 Simulation, vote on them. The poll is the public record of which interventions citizens have endorsed.

Write your Pledge.

In your own words. Write to your unborn grandchildren.

Tell them what you knew, particularly about the consequences of plastic and when you knew. What you did, and what you did not do. What you felt and what you hope, in spite of everything, they will inherit.

Seal it with your mark. It will be held in the Threshold Knowledge Base, protected and permanent, until the threshold is crossed, or until the year you choose to have it opened and by whom.

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.

THRESHOLD | thresholdsummit.org

APPENDIX A

Full budget breakdown

Althing Simulation budget | EUR 1.26M over 24 months

Item	Budget
Lead Architect (0.6 FTE)	EUR 144,000
Chief of Staff (0.6 FTE)	EUR 144,000
Communications Director	EUR 96,000
Legal Counsel	EUR 72,000
Programme Coordinator	EUR 60,000
Data Analyst	EUR 48,000
Participant payments (12 x EUR 10,000 in three tranches)	EUR 126,000
Expert advisory pools: health science, economics, international law, materials science, geopolitics	EUR 54,000
Four live online simulation sessions	EUR 80,000
Documentary series (professional production)	EUR 250,000
Public platform technology: six-level engagement cascade	EUR 60,000
Contingency reserve (15%)	EUR 163,000
Total Althing Simulation	**EUR 1,257,000**

App budget | EUR 1.16M over 24 months

Item	Budget
Phase 1 (months 1-6): browser-based launch	EUR 104,000
Phase 1 includes: Ledger Live counters, Signal/Noise evidence feed, Pulse questions, Founding Circle subscription, programme archive	
Phase 2 (months 6-18): native mobile app	EUR 665,000
Phase 2 includes: camera and GPS submissions, full Reliability Index and convergence scoring, micro-payment system, 24/7 moderation, six-level institutional cascade, Schools layer	
Phase 3 (months 18-26): sustained operations and litigation pipeline (if legal architecture complete)	EUR 316,000
Total App	**EUR 1,085,000**

Path to financial independence

The Founding Circle (voluntary subscriptions at EUR 3 to EUR 50 per month) targets 40,000 members by month 24, generating approximately EUR 280,000 per year. At full scale (200,000 members), this reaches

EUR 5.4 million per year, covering the programme's full running costs without dependence on external funders. Season 2 costs approximately 30% less because the verification infrastructure, moderation team, and institutional relationships are already built.

APPENDIX B

The twelve expert characters

The twelve participants in the Althing Simulation are not chosen to agree with each other. They are chosen to represent the full landscape of genuine institutional positions, including positions in fundamental tension. The simulation derives its credibility precisely from that tension.

Character	Role	Position and interest
The Recycler	Processing plant operator	Facing a third closure wave; needs policy certainty to survive
The Mayor	Municipal leader, river delta region	Pays the clean-up costs; has no power over upstream production
The Health Analyst	National public health researcher	The data is correct, but credibility is institutionally contested
The Young Activist	Youth policy lead, 18 to 20, mandate from 200+ young people	First generation with documented plastic exposure before birth
The Insurer	Major reinsurance company director	Pricing the uninsurable; existential interest in early action
The Brand Owner	Consumer goods procurement director	Caught between cheap packaging and reputational collapse
The Scientist	Epidemiologist and toxicologist	Has data they cannot say publicly; the simulation gives them the space
The Diplomat	Trade negotiator, small island state	Least production, most exposure; moral weight without power
The Litigation Funder	Senior partner, legal finance firm	Already modelling producer exposure; watching for the tobacco moment
The Farmer	Cereal producer on contaminated land	Plastic particles in food crops: the agricultural productivity case
The Regulator	Mid-level official, major regulatory body	Knows exactly where the political constraints are; only safe space to say so
The Fund Manager	Senior ESG portfolio manager, major pension fund	Long-term liability exposure needs pricing; litigation risk re-rates the sector

APPENDIX C

Media strategy by outlet type

Each media category has a distinct need and a distinct offering from the programme. The Fact/Opinion scoring system serves all categories simultaneously, giving every outlet the evidential infrastructure they require.

Media type	What they need	What the programme provides
Investigative print (Le Monde, Guardian, Spiegel, NRC)	Credible, legally defensible data with institutional backing	Fact/Opinion scored Knowledge Base; citizen evidence clusters; expert consensus rankings
Science journalism (Nature, Science, New Scientist)	Peer-reviewed data; institutional endorsement; novel findings	Medical Declaration; academic citation pathway; convergence-scored evidence data
Broadcast and documentary (BBC, Arte, Netflix, streaming)	Narrative access; characters; programmatic structure over time	The documentary series from the Althing Simulation; 24-month character arc
Digital and social media (independent creators, substacks)	Shareable, graded evidence; weekly hooks; interactive data counters	Signal/Noise A to F graded feed; Ledger Live counters; Pulse results maps
Local and regional press (municipal, regional outlets)	Local evidence; local costs; local officials on record	City cost audits; geographic Spotter clusters; municipal commitments
Podcasting (news, science, policy genres)	Long-form narrative; expert voices; structured story over months	Threshold podcast series; participant character story arc
Trade and sector press (packaging, retail, chemical)	Market data; regulatory trends; competitor intelligence	Polymer market analysis; recycling economics; policy trajectory briefings

APPENDIX D

Technical architecture reference

The programme's technical infrastructure is specified in full in two dedicated documents. This appendix provides a summary orientation for institutional readers who want to understand the technical foundations before reading those documents in full.

The Knowledge Base

The Knowledge Base is the programme's permanent evidence infrastructure. It has four components: the Library (public, permanent record of verified evidence), the Vault (sealed Althing Simulation deliberations, opened only by a process agreed at founding), the Bank (evidence under active review), and the Signal Layer (published analysis outputs for external audiences).

The Vault is sealed once a simulation concludes. The deliberation record of who argued what and what was decided is permanently protected. It cannot be accessed, summarised, or processed by any AI system. It opens only through a formal custodian process that cannot be changed by any individual. The findings from the simulation, by contrast, are public from the moment the simulation concludes.

Full specification: **KBS-Knowledge-Base-Specification-EN-v2.pdf**

The AI stack

The programme's AI system processes incoming citizen evidence through four layers: a baseline safety filter, image and video intelligence, fraud and synthetic detection, and a behavioural pattern engine. The AI classifies, scores, and routes. It does not determine truth. No automated decision significantly affecting a contributor's standing is applied without human review.

The Reliability Index (the score that weights each contributor's evidence) is partly AI-assisted and fully human-supervised. Every significant automated change requires a human validator to confirm. The AI's role is to accelerate the search for truth. The determination of truth belongs to humans.

Full specification: **MST-AI-Strategy-EN-v2.pdf**

Regulatory status

The programme operates under EU jurisdiction. The AI pipeline is classified as limited risk under the EU AI Act for content moderation and Reliability Index functions. The Litigation Signal feature, if implemented in Phase 3, is classified as high-risk and subject to conformity assessment. The Knowledge Base custodian is legally domiciled in Geneva under Swiss international association law, with symbolic founding jurisdiction in Iceland.

Contact: Andrew Henderson | Lead Architect | programme@thresholdsummit.org | Marans, France | June 2026
The Threshold Summit | Season 1 | thresholdsummit.org

This document is intended for general distribution. All budget figures are estimates. This document does not constitute an offer of investment or a legal commitment of any kind. Copyright THRESHOLD 2026. All rights reserved.