

# BCI Algorithmic Autonomy Protocol

## BCI

**Protocol ID:** BCI-MOD-2026-007

**Core Positioning:**

This Protocol safeguards BCI's audit sovereignty by establishing the institutional independence and non-negotiable boundaries of algorithmic weight calibration, preventing the audit logic from being reverse-shaped by the assessed subject.

**01 | Governance Rationale: Algorithmic Sovereignty as Credit Sovereignty**

In top-tier audit and structural diagnostic contexts, algorithmic **autonomy** constitutes institutional credit infrastructure rather than a matter of technical preference.

Just as credit rating agencies do not permit rated entities to intervene in model construction or weighting logic, BCI's core equation,

$$BCI = \frac{MT \times TS^n}{PL \times ES^{-1}}$$

and its associated weight calibration mechanisms must remain strictly independent from client strategy, outcome expectations, or organizational power structures.

BCI does not adjust readings to align with pre-existing strategic narratives, nor does it participate in outcome negotiation.

The institutional premise of audit integrity is clear: **strategy must respond to structural readings, not the reverse.**

Algorithmic sovereignty exists to ensure that BCI outputs constitute **structural diagnostic statements**, rather than governance consensus or context-driven interpretation.

## 02 | Insulation Mechanisms for Weight Calibration

To prevent algorithmic logic from being reverse-shaped through inputs, interpretation, or power influence, BCI enforces the following mandatory insulation standards:

### 1. Independent Variable Sampling

*(Independent Variable Sampling)*

#### **Standard:**

All core input variables, including but not limited to MT, PL, TS, and ES, must originate from BCI-validated public or third-party signal capture systems.

Unaudited, non-verifiable, or bespoke internal client data shall not be used as direct inputs for weight calibration.

#### **Insulation Function:**

This prevents clients from influencing outputs through control of input sources and preserves the objectivity and comparability of temporal structure and energy-state assessments.

### 2. Controlled Black-box Calibration

#### **Standard:**

Weight allocation across dimensions (MT / PL / TS / ES) is automatically generated based on BCI's historical structural backtesting and validation models.

The calibration mechanism does not expose parameter-modification interfaces to clients. However, its methodological premises may, within reasonable bounds, be subject to inquiry and discussion.

#### **Insulation Function:**

This rejects requests to reweight variables based on "industry specificity," "transitional phases," or contextual explanations intended to obscure structural deviations.

### 3. Refutability Rather than Negotiability of Results

#### **Standard:**

Clients retain the **Right to Refute** audit conclusions, but do not possess the **Right to Modify** algorithmic outputs.

Refutation must be grounded in one or more of the following conditions:

- Material absence or distortion in key variable sampling
- Falsifiable inconsistencies in structural mapping logic
- Misidentification or omission of known structural conditions

Refutation does not constitute a request to intervene in weighting logic.

**Institutional Definition:**

Once confirmed, algorithmic outputs constitute **structural diagnostic statements** regarding system state.

Such statements are not altered due to negotiation, pressure, or outcome preference.

**03 | Legal Characterization of Algorithmic Autonomy**

To formalize algorithmic independence at the contractual and governance level, every formal engagement shall include the following clause:

**Algorithmic Sovereignty Clause**

“The BCI Equation and its associated weight calibration logic constitute the Algorithmic Sovereignty of BCI Lab.

The Client acknowledges that BCI provides a system-driven structural diagnostic, not an outcome-negotiated or advisory service.

Any attempt to influence the weighting logic or diagnostic parameters shall be deemed a breach of the Independent Audit Protocol, and may result in the suspension or invalidation of the corresponding assessment, without prejudice to other contractual remedies.”