

Making UAP Data Comparable

From five years of orb research to structured observation and experienter datasets

Dr. Andrew D. Morgan | NRGscapes LAB



Editorial illustration of UAP imagery and recorded experienter accounts connected through structured records and provenance. The depicted records are illustrative; they are not case evidence.

The next question is comparability

A luminous source can be recorded thousands of times without producing a dataset that another analyst can reliably compare. A clip may preserve appearance while losing its original file, capture settings, clock reference, viewing direction or processing history. A government infrared recording, an academic sensor stream and a civilian phone video can all contain useful information, but their measurements and uncertainties are different. Making those differences explicit is the starting point for structured research.

The recent NRGscapes five-year orb portfolio article mapped the connections between observations, published papers, manuscripts and technical work. This feature returns to that portfolio with a different question: what does each relevant strand contribute to records that can be collected, coded, measured, checked, compared and independently re-examined? It includes unpublished analytical work because practical methods also sit in developing tools and manuscripts, while keeping their status separate from published findings. Engineering concepts are outside the scope of this feature.

The timing is appropriate. NASA's 2023 independent study identified shortcomings in calibration and metadata, while the AARO–AUI–FSU workshop addressed preservation and interoperability. New civilian initiatives are seeking compatible records and evidence rules. These sources support a shared need for better data practice; they do not justify claiming that every organisation lacks methods or that one protocol already solves the whole problem. [2,3]

Different organisations solve different parts

The new UAP Coalition makes the connection unusually explicit. Its data-standardisation initiative proposes formats, provenance, quality requirements, contributor permissions and a common schema. Its integration initiative proposes bringing compatible records together while contributors retain underlying data. The public initiative pages describe standards and integration as awaiting charter: this is a roadmap, not an already validated global database. It is distinct from UAP Coalition Netherlands, which centres professional reporting and policy advocacy. [1,14]

The Society for UAP Studies is developing standards of evidence and forensic methods. Sol's code addresses reproducibility, uncertainty and access, alongside image-analysis and citizen-observation projects. SCU contributes technical case analysis and evidence principles. Loeb's described advisory council and the Galileo Project also need separate treatment: one is an advisory activity described by its participants; the other has published instrument and data-system research. [4–8] Experienter research also needs explicit coverage: FREE published structured self-report research, while CCRI works across extraordinary-experience and contact modalities. Their interpretive positions do not remove the need to distinguish reported experience from corroborating evidence. [29,30]

The table maps major relevant initiatives checked against their own public material as of 10 October 2026. It includes government, academic, professional, technical, civilian and archival roles. It is a working landscape review, not an exhaustive global census or a ranking. Similar objectives do not imply equivalent data quality, organisational endorsement or a partnership with NRGscapes.

Who is doing what

Source-checked landscape • roles and status as of 10 October 2026 • source numbers refer to the register

Organisation initiative	or Data contribution	Status and boundary
UAP Coalition [1]	Proposes shared formats, metadata, provenance, permissions and known-source checks; a future integration centre.	Data standards and integration initiatives awaiting charter.
NASA [2]	Recommends calibrated observations, contextual metadata and consistent scientific data collection.	Independent study recommendations, 2023.
AARO / AUI / FSU workshop [3]	Addresses metadata, preservation, interoperability and analysis across government and academic evidence.	2025 workshop; report released in 2026.
Society for UAP Studies [4]	Develops standards of evidence and forensic research methods; publishes scholarly work through Limina.	Standards project developing during 2026–27.
Sol Foundation [5]	Code calls for reproducibility, uncertainty, provenance and FAIR access; image analysis and citizen observation projects.	Published code; project development and assessment.
UAP Science Advisory Council [6]	Loeb and Sol describe advice on sensors, AI and coordinated scientific evaluation.	Advisory role as described by participants; common schema not established here.
Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies [7]	Technical case analysis and evidence principles; workshop engagement on standardising anecdotal and sensor data.	Published analyses and principles; not a universal adopted standard.
Galileo Project [8]	Calibrated multi-sensor observatories, data architecture, metadata and reproducible acquisition methods.	Published instrument and system research.
CNES GEIPAN [9]	Receives, investigates, classifies and publishes anonymised case records.	Established national investigation and archive service.
3AF SIGMA2 [10]	Selects cases with physical records and analyses radar, imagery and related observables.	Published technical reports and analysis programme.
AIAA UAP Integration and Outreach Committee [11]	Recommends standard civil aviation fields, reporting routes and a central repository compatible with government reporting.	2025 committee opinion paper; not an AIAA-wide standard.

Organisation initiative	or Data contribution	Status and boundary
Americans for Safe Aerospace [12]	Collects pilot reports and advocates a common aviation reporting framework.	Reporting programme and safety advocacy.
NARCAP [13]	Documents and investigates aviation safety observations and reporting problems.	Technical reporting and aviation research.
UAP Coalition Netherlands [14]	Advocates recognised reporting points and cooperation between aviation, police, defence and science.	Professional reporting and EU policy advocacy; distinct from UAP Coalition.
UAPx [15]	Instrumented field expeditions and quantitative analysis of acquisition limitations and follow-up requirements.	Published expedition research.
Würzburg IFEX / ADEOS [16]	Automated optical test systems, known-object filtering and prospective networked triangulation.	Active development and test programme.
Sky360 [17]	Open station design, all-sky imaging and tracking; distributed observation and data sharing goals.	Hardware/software development and network building.
UFODAP [18]	Optical tracking and optional supporting sensors; time/location information and camera/parameter logs.	Available acquisition technology; outputs still require case-specific validation.
Project Hessdalen [19]	Long-running field observation with cameras; development of networked OpenADS observation systems.	Operational field monitoring and continuing development.
Eye on the Sky / Nightcrawler [20]	Mobile field research and instrumented observation of anomalous aerial events.	Field research; distinct from a shared database standard.
UFODATA [21]	Proposes automated multi-sensor stations and networked acquisition of scientific records.	Published proposal; current deployment not verified in this review.
NUFORC [22]	Receives and reviews civilian reports and maintains a public searchable databank.	Operational reporting archive; report volume does not establish accuracy.
MUFON [23]	Civilian case reports, investigator network and case management database.	Operational reporting and investigation infrastructure.
Enigma Labs [24]	Structured civilian reporting combining observation fields, media and narratives.	Reporting platform; platform scores are not a common validated evidence grade.

Organisation initiative	or Data contribution	Status and boundary
UAP Project [25]	Proposes a common sighting record model for consultation and structured exchange.	Public schema proposal and consultation.
Rice Archives of the Impossible [26]	Preserves and makes encounter collections and oral-history materials available for scholarship.	Research archive; narratives retain a distinct evidence type.
National UFO Historical Records Center [27]	Preserves historical organisation records, photographs, recordings and investigation files.	Historical archive; preservation differs from sensor validation.
COPP [28]	Standardised computational photometry and contextual intake for consumer video.	Measurement tool; image metrics alone do not exclude artifacts.
FREE experiencer research [29]	Published structured survey research into reported contact experiences associated with or without UAP.	2018 self-report study; neither population prevalence nor physical verification.
Consciousness and Contact Research Institute [30]	Extraordinary-experience research and publication of contact-modality material.	Research programme; current common-schema adoption not established.
NRGscapes LAB [31]	Published literature coding and image workflows; developing geometry, intake and screening tools; proposed artifact protocol.	Published, unpublished and in-review strands explicitly separated below.

Overlaps across the data landscape

Shared roles and distinct responsibilities

Editorial synthesis of the source table • 10 October 2026

Organisation / initiative	Intake	Checks	Analyse	Archive	Share	Guide
01 UAP Coalition	○	○	○	○	○	○
02 NASA	○	○	○	○	○	●
03 AARO / AUI / FSU workshop		○		○	○	●
04 Society for UAP Studies		○	●			○
05 Sol Foundation	○	○	○	○	○	●
06 UAP Science Advisory Council	○	○	○			○
07 SCU		●	●			●
08 Galileo Project	●	●	●			
09 CNES GEIPAN	●	●	●	●		
10 3AF SIGMA2		●	●			
11 AIAA UAP committee	○			○	○	●
12 Safe Aerospace	●					●
13 NARCAP	●	●	●			
14 UAP Coalition Netherlands	○					●
15 UAPx	●	●	●			
16 Würzburg IFEX / ADEOS	●	●	●		○	
17 Sky360	●	●	●	○	○	
18 UFODAP	●		●			
19 Project Hessdalen	●					
20 Eye on the Sky / Nightcrawler	●	●	●			
21 UFODATA	○	○	○		○	
22 NUFORC	●	●		●		
23 MUFON	●	●	●	●		
24 Enigma Labs	●		●	●		
25 UAP Project					○	○
26 Rice encounter archives	●			●		
27 UFO Historical Records Center	●			●		
28 COPP	●		●			
29 FREE experiencer study	●		●			
30 CCRI	○		○			
31 NRGscapes LAB	●	●	●	○		○

- Documented work / published guidance
- Proposed or developing
- ⦿ Published work plus developing methods

Blank = role not established in this review, not proof of absence.

Archive includes preservation / access. Share means shared schemas or integration; publishing records alone does not establish interoperability.

Markers identify roles, not scientific quality, adoption or endorsement.

Figure 1. Functional overlap among all 31 entries in the source table. The map is an editorial synthesis of documented roles and proposals, not a verification of dataset compatibility. Source numbers match the table and register.

Common ground and points of difference

The overlap map reorganises the organisation table around six functions: intake, checking evidence, analysis, preservation and access, exchange, and guidance. Its markers describe roles inferred from the reviewed sources; they do not measure effectiveness or demonstrate compatible datasets. Filled circles indicate documented work or published guidance, open circles indicate proposed or developing roles, and half circles indicate published work alongside developing methods. A blank means that a role was not established in this review. [1–31]

Common ground is strongest at the level of requirements: observations need context, claims need scrutiny, methods need to be inspectable, and records need to remain usable. The Coalition's proposed architecture, NASA's recommendations, the AARO workshop, Sol's code and the Society's standards project approach these needs from different starting points. Agreement on an objective does not establish that timestamps, metadata fields, calibration records, confidence labels or access conditions already match. [1–5]

The differences concern evidence type, purpose and maturity. Instrument programmes produce sensor measurements; civilian platforms collect submitted reports and media; archives preserve historical or first-person material; experienter studies code reported accounts; and advisory or standards initiatives define expectations. Aviation safety, government assessment, open scientific inquiry and longitudinal encounter analysis also ask different questions. Their outputs can complement one another without carrying the same evidentiary weight. [6–30]

NRGscapes spans image analysis, comparative coding and reported-experience analysis, with developing intake tools and a submitted protocol. This gives it several potential points of connection, rather than responsibility for the entire data architecture. Trust but Verify addresses a proposed imagery-assessment layer. Encounter taxonomy and staging address a separate analytical layer. Published, unpublished and in-review outputs retain those distinctions in the map. [31,P1–P6,M1–M3,W1,V1]

Provenance must survive integration

Moving forward, provenance needs to record both origin and transformation. A file hash can establish that bytes remain unchanged relative to a recorded hash; it cannot establish that the scene or account is accurate. Each derivative should retain its source identifier, processing method, parameters, software version and analyst. For an account, the equivalent chain includes when it was recorded, whether it was contemporaneous or recalled later, interview prompts, amendments and coding versions. These are recommendations for the shared record architecture, not claims that every listed organisation already implements them.

Integration must also preserve independence. The same video uploaded to three services remains one originating recording. A witness account repeated in a report, interview and archive remains a linked source history rather than three independent confirmations. Event identifiers, source identifiers and explicit duplicate or derivation links would help prevent duplicated material from inflating apparent corroboration. An account and a sensor record should be linked with the timing, location and uncertainty that support the association, while leaving unestablished links unconfirmed.

A common core should therefore carry source and event identifiers, time and location uncertainty, evidence type, permissions, lineage, quality limitations and screening status. Separate modules can retain sensor calibration and image-processing settings, or account provenance, consent and coding definitions. Quality and confidence labels require published definitions and a documented crosswalk before results from different systems are pooled. Unknown, unavailable, not checked and excluded must remain separate states.

Access is part of provenance. Public summaries, anonymised research records and restricted originals can be connected through stable identifiers and documented access conditions. Restrictions on witness identities, sensitive context or government material should be visible to the analyst assessing completeness. A workable comparison does not require every raw record to be public, but it does require clarity about what can be inspected, by whom and under which conditions.

The implication for UAP and reported NHI studies is to standardise the traceable record before assuming a shared conclusion. Interoperability would make differences inspectable, preserve uncertainty and allow independent tests of processing and coding. It would not automatically convert a reported experience into a measured event, an unresolved source into an anomalous mechanism, or a proposed protocol into a validated standard. A useful NRGscapes next step is a versioned data dictionary and benchmark package spanning its imagery and encounter modules, followed by independent evaluation.

A common record with context

A useful common core would carry an event identifier, UTC time and uncertainty, location and viewing geometry, sensor identity, calibration state, environmental context, file provenance, permissions and a record of known-source checks. Sensor-specific extensions then preserve exposure, optics, spectral response, tracking, radar or radio-frequency settings as appropriate. A field left unknown should remain unknown; “not checked” must never silently become “excluded”.

Raw observations, derived measurements, screening results and interpretations should remain linked but

separately labelled. An angular track is not a physical speed without a defensible range model. A colour channel in processed video is not a measured emission spectrum. A recurrent narrative category is not independent instrumental confirmation. Cross-domain integration becomes more useful when these distinctions survive the export.

For NRGscapes, this suggests a shared core with separate image, literature and encounter modules. This is an architectural recommendation drawn from the portfolio and wider review, not an implemented interoperability standard. The contribution is strongest where analysts can inspect a source, reproduce a measurement or coding decision and see why a conclusion was limited.

The published foundation

The six published papers form several different data traditions. P1 and P2 organise observations and explanatory literature. P3 makes the coding step explicit through thematic categories and recurrent signature classes. That supports comparative literature analysis, while requiring clear separation between a source's reported claim and an independently measured property. [P1–P3]

P4 develops an imaging workflow around the Perth luminous event. P5 applies that method to a separate ambiguous Pilbara recording. Replication adds value because it records both transfer and failure: colour/intensity and peripheral asymmetry are the strongest transferred features, while stronger claims about internal architecture, coherent target-centred structure and a trajectory-aligned wake were not securely reproduced. A structured dataset should retain those negative and qualified findings. [P4,P5]

P6 addresses a different evidence domain: a longitudinal single-experiencer corpus. Its 41 primary encounters and 22 analytically derived subphases yield 63 analytical units, rather than 63 independent witnesses. Taxonomy and temporal staging make the record analysable, but do not convert reported experience into physical verification. Its publication in *Limina* establishes a publication connection with the Society for UAP Studies, not endorsement of the wider portfolio. [P6]

The unpublished work is part of data architecture

The unpublished near-infrared work extends questions of morphology and image-plane diagnostics. The orb-rod manuscript in review examines transverse scale and axial regimes across compact and elongated forms. Together, they motivate consistent definitions of frame selection, measurement axes, angular dimensions, range assumptions and uncertainty. Their contribution is a developing comparison method, not confirmation that visually similar sources share a mechanism. [M1,M2]

The current intake and screening workbook provides a practical bridge from submission to analysis. Its case register records times, location, viewing direction, original availability, permissions and limitations. Evidence records distinguish originals from derivatives and allow parent identifiers, capture-device information, compression risk and SHA-256 hashes. Search logs retain source, parameters, run status, errors and coverage limitations. These structures make the process auditable. They do not establish that every configured search ran successfully or that a missed match is an exclusion. [W1]

For reported NHI experiences, useful collection must also preserve the source and timing of an account, interview prompts, later amendments, coding definitions, consent and access restrictions. Event identifiers can link an account to imagery or contextual records, but the relationship must say whether those materials are independent, contemporaneous or retrospectively associated. Sensitive accounts require controlled access and anonymisation that preserve analytic meaning.

The in-review encounter extension develops operational coding and interactional staging. This is directly relevant to structured experiencer research: category definitions, analytical units and temporal ordering can be made explicit and inspected. Independent coding, agreement assessment and testing on further corpora would be needed before claiming general applicability. The proposed field programme and public guidance concern future collection; articles, presentations and videos should not be counted as new independent observations. [M3,A1]

The NRGscapes contribution map

Relevant published and unpublished strands from the five-year portfolio, reorganised around collection and structured analysis. Engineering concepts are excluded from this map. [A1,W1,V1]

Research strand and status	Contribution to data	Interpretive limit
Literature and thematic mapping Published P1–P3, 2025	Organises recurring observational claims, sources and theoretical associations. P3 uses nine categories and five recurring signatures.	A structured literature dataset; coded claims are not calibrated physical detections.

Research strand and status	Contribution to data	Interpretive limit
Perth imaging workflow Published P4, 2026	Frame selection, processing stages and temporal organisation make image analysis traceable.	Image-plane features do not establish propulsion or internal architecture.
Pilbara workflow replication Published P5, 2026	Applies the three-phase method to a separate ambiguous event; documents what transfers and what fails.	Some colour/intensity and asymmetry findings transfer; stronger structural claims do not securely replicate.
Longitudinal encounter coding Published P6, 2026; M3 in review	Taxonomy and staging structure a single-experiencer longitudinal record; extension develops operational coding.	41 primary encounters plus 22 derived subphases are 63 analytical units, not 63 independent witnesses.
Near-infrared and orb-rod analysis M1 unpublished; M2 in review	Develops morphology and comparative geometry, including compact and elongated forms and range-dependent measurement questions.	Angular/image measurements require range and calibration before physical-scale conclusions.
Trust but Verify Submitted and in review	Proposes controls, quality and reproducibility gates, and reason-coded outcomes for consumer imagery.	Protocol proposal; multi-device accuracy and inter-analyst agreement are not yet established.
Intake and screening toolkit Unpublished, in development	Case/evidence identifiers, originals/derivatives, hashes, metadata, permissions and logged known-source searches.	v1.2 workbook design is inspectable; operational completeness and screening accuracy are not established here.
Field collection and communications Proposed field programme; articles, decks and videos	Translate capture, contextual metadata and known-source screening needs into planned field collection and public guidance.	A proposal is not a deployed programme; communications are not independent observations.

Trust but Verify adds a proposed decision layer

Trust but Verify: An Artifact-Discrimination Protocol for Consumer-Grade UAP Imagery, by Michael E. Boyd, Andrew D. Morgan, Gerald T. Tedesco, John J. Tedesco and David Wilkinson, is submitted and in review. It proposes a specific layer between extracting features from civilian imagery and retaining a feature as a candidate for further investigation. Its status is a protocol proposal, not an adopted community standard or a field-validated classifier. [V1]

Following intake, provenance checks and conventional-source screening, the protocol calls for five tests: prosaic-object control benchmarking; chromatic-origin discrimination; processing-parameter sensitivity; synthetic ground truth and null controls; and temporal checks for camera and environmental artifacts. A data-quality gate and a reproducibility gate ask whether the record can support the claimed feature and whether another analyst can inspect the source, code, settings and benchmark process. [V1]

Its proposed outcomes retain an important distinction. Grade A means the prescribed tests and gates support retaining a candidate for follow-up; it does not establish non-human origin or a propulsion mechanism. Grade B records incomplete evaluation. Grade C distinguishes

confirmed artifacts, failed tests with an unresolved mechanism, and insufficient data. The protocol's numerical thresholds are provisional requirements, not universal limits for all sensors. [V1]

The approach also applies to NRGscapes' own work. In the manuscript's assessment, the reported Perth features remain Grade C3 for insufficient data under the proposed protocol, pending the required tests. The Perth and Pilbara cases have not satisfied its reproducibility gate through deposited source files and complete logs. This stricter reassessment is part of the contribution: earlier image descriptions remain testable candidates rather than becoming established physical structures by repetition. [V1]

COPP illustrates why measurement and assessment must connect. Standardised photometry can quantify image-domain behaviour and record metadata; an artifact-discrimination protocol can ask whether that behaviour survives controls. Neither step alone establishes a source's physical identity. Benchmarking across devices, independent analysts and known positives and negatives is still needed to estimate performance. [28,V1]

Where NRGscapes fits

The potential fit is concrete. A coalition schema can define what an event record must contain. An observatory can improve acquisition and calibration. An archive can preserve original media and contextual accounts. NRGscapes contributes published coding and imaging methods, documented replication limits, developing intake and geometry tools, structured longitudinal encounter analysis and a proposed consumer-imagery assessment protocol.

That fit is an analytical comparison, not a claim that any listed organisation has adopted the work. The next useful contribution would be a compact, versioned evidence package: a data dictionary, linked source and derivative identifiers, uncertainty fields, logged screening and coverage limits, reproducible

processing, protocol outcomes with reason codes, and benchmark examples. The encounter module would add a coding manual, consent and access fields, account revisions and a clear separation between reported experience and corroborating records. Independent evaluation could then determine which parts travel reliably between civilian, academic and government contexts.

A structured dataset earns its usefulness by preserving how a finding was produced and what the evidence cannot decide. Five years of NRGscapes work provide material for that task across published and unpublished strands. The opportunity now is to make those strands inspectable and comparable, with methods strong enough to retain a candidate, reject an artifact or record that the available data cannot support a conclusion.

Sources and portfolio register

Organisational descriptions use primary public sources. Status labels describe reviewed material; announcements and proposals are not treated as deployed systems. Links checked for this feature on 10 October 2026. The underlying five-year article and current workbook are retained as internal source documents.

- [1] UAP Coalition. [Primary source](#)
- [2] NASA. [Primary source](#)
- [3] AARO / AUI / FSU workshop. [Primary source](#)
- [4] Society for UAP Studies. [Primary source](#)
- [5] Sol Foundation. [Primary source](#)
- [6] UAP Science Advisory Council. [Primary source](#)
- [7] Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies. [Primary source](#)
- [8] Galileo Project. [Primary source](#)
- [9] CNES GEIPAN. [Primary source](#)
- [10] 3AF SIGMA2. [Primary source](#)
- [11] AIAA UAP Integration and Outreach Committee. [Primary source](#)
- [12] Americans for Safe Aerospace. [Primary source](#)
- [13] NARCAP. [Primary source](#)
- [14] UAP Coalition Netherlands. [Primary source](#)
- [15] UAPx. [Primary source](#)
- [16] Würzburg IFEX / ADEOS. [Primary source](#)
- [17] Sky360. [Primary source](#)
- [18] UFODAP. [Primary source](#)
- [19] Project Hessdalen. [Primary source](#)
- [20] Eye on the Sky / Nightcrawler. [Primary source](#)
- [21] UFODATA. [Primary source](#)
- [22] NUFORC. [Primary source](#)
- [23] MUFON. [Primary source](#)
- [24] Enigma Labs. [Primary source](#)
- [25] UAP Project. [Primary source](#)
- [26] Rice Archives of the Impossible. [Primary source](#)
- [27] National UFO Historical Records Center. [Primary source](#)
- [28] COPP. [Primary source](#)

[29] FREE experienter research. [Primary source](#)

[30] Consciousness and Contact Research Institute. [Primary source](#)

[31] NRGscapes LAB. [Primary source](#)

NRGscapes papers and unpublished analytical work

[P1] Morgan and Leeah, 2025. Boundary-layer Dynamics and Field Interactions in Unidentified Aerial Phenomena: A Scientific Perspective on Repeating Signatures. [10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i113663](#)

[P2] Morgan, 2025. Boundary-layer Signatures and Resonant Mobility in UAP: A Multidisciplinary Literature Review. [10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i113671](#)

[P3] Morgan, 2025. Mapping Boundary-layer Features in Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena (UAP): A Quantitative and Thematic Approach to Observational Signatures and Theoretical Models. [10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i113677](#)

[P4] Morgan, Boyd and Leeah, 2026. Field-Coupled Propulsion Diagnostics from Energetic Flow Imaging: Structural Analysis and Resonant Dynamics. [10.1007/s42423-026-00215-8](#)

[P5] Morgan, Boyd and Leeah, 2026. Replication of a Three-Phase Imaging Workflow on an Ambiguous Pilbara Luminous Aerial Event: Screening, Image-Plane Diagnostics, and the Evidentiary Value of Opportunistic Video. [10.9734/jsrr/2026/v32i84437](#)

[P6] Morgan, 2026. Structured Patterns in Anomalous Experience: A Longitudinal Developmental Analysis of a UAP Experienter Dataset. [10.59661/001c.164488](#)

[A1] NRGscapes Orb Research Portfolio Article, Rev 4. Five-year source article used to identify the full relevant portfolio and its publication status.

[M1] Near-infrared imaging manuscripts, including Internal Flow Architecture and Boundary-Layer Dynamics Revealed by Infrared Imaging of a Luminous Aerial Event. Unpublished; interpretive features require controls.

[M2] Transverse Scale Conservation and Axial Regime Separation in Unidentified Orb–Rod Luminous Forms. In review; comparative geometry manuscript.

[M3] Longitudinal Staging and Interactional Regulation in UAP-Associated Anomalous Experience: An Operational Extension of Structural Analysis. In review.

[W1] NRGscapes UAP Master v1.2 workbook. Unpublished, developing case/evidence registers and screening/search logs. Structure reviewed; no operational performance benchmark performed for this feature.

[V1] Boyd, Morgan, G. T. Tedesco, J. J. Tedesco and Wilkinson. Trust but Verify: An Artifact-Discrimination Protocol for Consumer-Grade UAP Imagery. Submitted and in review; source manuscript Trust_Verify_Corrected.docx. No field-validation or adoption claim.

[R1] NRGscapes LAB journal-articles page provides the current public publication and manuscript register. Engineering and propulsion-policy strands are outside the collection-and-analysis scope of this feature.

[R2] Sol supporting project pages: Citizen Science, Sol UAP Image Analysis Team, and Distributed UAP Observation Project. Projects and proposals are not asserted to constitute an adopted common schema.

[NRGscapes publication register](#)

[Sol image analysis project](#)

[Sol citizen science](#)

[Sol distributed observation project](#)