

Media Q&A Companion

Institute for Epistemic Stability (IES)

Document Control Register

Document Identifier	IES-MEDIA-QA-2026-03-UFVF
Version	v1.0
Document Type	Prepared Response Guidance
Distribution Status	Media and Stakeholder Briefing Use
Issuing Body	Institute for Epistemic Stability (IES)
Issue Date	March 15, 2026
Contact Channel	media@factverification.org

Usage Guidance

This companion is intended to support consistent public communication regarding UFVF. Responses are written for clarity under scrutiny and should be delivered without overstatement. Spokespersons should distinguish clearly between what the pilot observed, what the framework claims, and what remains unresolved.

Core Message Discipline

- UFVF is an **experimental governance framework**, not a universal replacement for fact-checking.
- The project prioritizes **procedural transparency** over claims of epistemic finality.
- The stochastic adjudication step is deliberate and disclosed; it is not hidden or incidental.
- The institute welcomes independent audit, critique, and adversarial testing.

Likely Questions and Approved Responses

Q1. Are you saying truth is random?

A. No. UFVF does not claim that truth is random. It claims that institutional label assignment under high-disagreement conditions is often treated as more objective than it is in practice. UFVF keeps evidence collection rigorous and makes the terminal classification mechanism explicit, auditable, and procedurally neutral.

Q2. Why remove human judgment at the decisive step?

A. The decisive step is where accusations of selective bias concentrate. UFVF reallocates human effort to evidence quality and documentation, then isolates final label assignment from discretionary interpretation. The design objective is legitimacy through transparent procedure, not infallibility through authority claims.

Q3. Is this meant to replace traditional fact-checking?

A. No. IES does not position UFVF as a universal replacement. It is a reference design for contexts where trust in substantive neutrality is low and where explicit process constraints may improve perceived fairness and accountability.

Q4. How do you prevent misuse of favorable outcomes?

A. The framework publishes methodology, disclosures, and procedural caveats alongside outcomes. A verdict in isolation is incomplete by design. Responsible interpretation requires review of the associated case documentation and protocol context.

Q5. What evidence do you have that this is useful?

A. Pilot observations indicate that participants frequently rated process fairness positively even when they disagreed with individual outcomes. This is a legitimacy signal, not proof of epistemic superiority. The report presents these findings as preliminary and context-bound.

Q6. Who funded the project?

A. Funding disclosures are provided in the methodology report transparency addendum. IES policy is to disclose sponsors and maintain explicit separation between funding and methodological control.

Q7. What are the biggest limitations?

A. The pilot is limited by sample composition, timeframe, and self-selection effects. External validity is therefore constrained. IES treats UFVF as an ongoing research program subject to revision under independent critique.

Q8. What should the public take away today?

A. The key takeaway is procedural honesty: UFVF makes assumptions visible, trade-offs explicit, and adjudication mechanics inspectable. The institute invites public scrutiny rather than asking for deference.

Red-Line Statements (Do Not Use)

- “UFVF proves truth can be automated.”
- “UFVF eliminates bias entirely.”
- “UFVF is the final model for all fact-checking systems.”
- “Pilot results are conclusive for broad public deployment.”

Closing Statement Template

IES presents UFVF as a rigorous, evidence-grounded experiment in procedural design under contested information conditions. We publish assumptions, methods, limitations, and funding disclosures so independent observers can evaluate the framework on transparent terms.

###