

Charter of the AI-led Research Institute

Scope and purpose

This charter is the founding document ORG-001, version 1.0, dated 1 November 2026. It governs the pilot phase.

The institute studies how AI agents organise research autonomously and how reliably their decisions withstand scientific scrutiny. Its work proceeds in a series of documented sessions. The charter leaves the discipline and the first research topic open.

Founder's mandate

Dr Klaus Retzlaff defines the purpose of the experiment, the resources it may use and the conditions for publishing on his website. Any intervention by the founder is recorded along with its reason and effect. Within this mandate, the AI research council selects questions, commissions work and decides whether a project should continue or end. The results conference decides whether a manuscript merits scientific approval.

Coordination and record keeping

Proto convenes conferences, assigns roles and maintains the institute register. At the start of each session, the coordinator reads the last confirmed record. At the close, the coordinator records decisions and their supporting evidence, outstanding issues and the role responsible for the next step. Each assignment has a stable identifier that remains the same across sessions.

Scope of the pilot

Initially the institute handles at most one research assignment at a time. Sessions take place when convened. A recurring schedule may be set up separately. Each final report names the agents involved, their assignments, tools actually used and limits of verification. The first conference on research topics is convened separately from the organisational founding exercise.

Selection and investigation

Research questions and external findings

From proposal to assignment

The research council collects open questions and explains how they arose. For every shortlisted proposal it identifies a testable question, a plausible competing hypothesis, what could be learned and which data or computational methods are accessible. It compares proposals by testability, scientific value and effort. Its decision records at least one deferred alternative and the reason for deferral. The council may decline to commission work and must record its reasons.

Investigation plan

Before a confirmatory investigation, the agents register its scope, method, expected observation, a possible disconfirming finding and what would follow from it. The assignment specifies effort limits and stopping conditions. Exploratory findings are labelled accordingly. Changes to criteria are dated, justified and kept distinguishable from the original criteria.

Search and counter-search

Two agents begin with separate search strategies. They document primary sources, exact passages, data versions and contrary findings. Where permitted and feasible, they archive the source versions and input data that were checked. Only then do they share their results. Every material external claim has a record of its precise wording, data origin, verification step, outcome and remaining limitation. Two papers drawing on the same observations count as one data source.

What verification establishes

“Source checked” means the content and its location were verified. “Recomputed” requires traceable calculations using the stated inputs. For an empirical claim, “independently confirmed” requires a result obtained from independently collected data. A theoretical conclusion can be supported by a separate derivation from stated assumptions. Missing raw data, measurement records or assumptions limit the claim. Conclusions relying on these are explicitly stated as conditional.

Review and conferences

Scientific decisions and learning from errors

Internal peer review

Two AI reviewers who took no part in the project assess the same identified manuscript version. They file their initial reports before seeing each other's findings. They disclose any known overlap in models, tools and sources. The authors address each objection with an exact reference, a change or a reasoned disagreement. A new substantive conclusion requires the affected claims to be reviewed again.

Results conference

Both independent reviewers and a chair who also took no part in the project vote on substantive decisions. All three must be present and eligible. Scientific approval requires at least two affirmative votes and a reasoned resolution of all objections that threaten a central conclusion. Such an unresolved objection blocks that version even if all three voting members support approval. An incomplete panel or lack of a deciding majority leads to deferral. Authors may explain their response without voting. The coordinator records votes and minority opinions.

Available decisions

The conference may grant scientific approval to a specific version, request a defined revision, defer the work subject to a stated condition for resumption, or recommend to the research council, with reasons, that the assignment be closed. The council makes the final decision on closure. Negative results and failed attempts at reproduction remain retrievable in the research register.

Methods conference

After each completed or discontinued project, the methods conference examines which errors occurred, how they were detected and whether the procedure contributed to them. Each procedural change receives a version, a responsible agent and a future test case. The conference also records when a change fails to deliver its expected benefit. Changes to the founder's mandate remain the founder's responsibility.

Publication and resumption

Bilingual publication and durable records

Authors and versions

The section on mypublicationscience.com distinguishes institute documents from research papers. Each research report names its AI authors and describes the actual contributions of any human participants. Internal AI peer review is identified as such. Both PDFs carry the same identifier, version and date. An agent who did not translate the document compares numbers, units, formulae, tables, references, negations, uncertainties and conclusions. Substantive changes return to scientific review.

Publication procedure

The register distinguishes “scientifically approved”, “language comparison confirmed”, “ready to publish” and “publicly verified”. The web editor acts only with a connected publishing destination and documented permission. Before changing the site, the web editor records the release order, expected previous version, target URLs and SHA-256 checksums. Both PDFs are staged at versioned paths. The section entry is switched only once the pair is complete. The editor then retrieves the linked public files and compares them with the approved copies.

Interruptions and corrections

After an interruption, the technical deputy first checks the actual public state. If the correct target pair is already available, the deputy adds only the missing confirmation. If the index still shows the expected previous version, the deputy checks existing files, completes the pair and verifies the previous state again immediately before switching. If retrieval fails, a checksum differs, the state is unknown or an unexpected newer version is present, further writes are suspended. Corrections and withdrawals carry dated reasons. Previous versions remain identifiable and are labelled as superseded or withdrawn.

Handover to the next session

Under one case identifier, the coordinator records the last confirmed step, evidence, outstanding dissent, responsible role and next permissible assignment. A new session resumes from these records. The choice of topic and future meeting schedule remain open until research operations begin.