Responsibility to the Problem

An Explicit Standard for the Expert–AI System

Laboratory of Information Systems

Overview 2 / Artificial Intelligence and Research on the Consequences of War / 15 minutes

The experience that required a response

Conference preparation revealed a missing substantive discussion

The protocol records the organizer’s experience

The reasons for individual silence remain undetermined

The environmental problem still requires investigation

The next task is a more precise question and an evidential plan

Continuing inquiry with AI

Inquiry can continue when colleagues do not enter the discussion

Expert–AI dialogue helps clarify questions and reconsider assumptions

The record preserves consequential corrections

Agreement and fluent explanation still require verification

The expert challenges outputs and checks their sources

Research resources and research purpose

Archives, fieldwork and measurement require resources

Winning a grant can displace the purpose of investigation

That substitution is ethically unacceptable in our programme

The expected scientific contribution must be stated in advance

Resources must enable a specified change in knowledge or action

Responsibility for understanding the object

War-transformed soil belongs to a changing territorial system

Chemical contamination is one possible component

Indicators must correspond to the process under investigation

Administrative permission and environmental explanation differ

A limited study must preserve the boundaries of its conclusion

Five levels of responsibility

Personal cognitive: sustained effort to understand the object

Epistemic: evidence and uncertainty remain distinguishable

Process: consequential decisions remain reconstructable

Decision: an identifiable expert accepts the conclusion

Practical: the contribution to the problem is specified

Evidence and the limits of a conclusion

Each claim retains its evidential status through the research process

A fluent synthesis cannot turn a hypothesis into a verified result

Sources support claims within identifiable limits

Gaps and competing explanations remain visible

The framework requires testing of its proposed relationships

The complete decision path

A selected sentence can demonstrate an error

Diagnosis requires the relevant question and supplied material

Assumptions, corrections and checks identify the point of failure

The expert’s decision to accept the output remains examinable

Reconstruction enables correction and changes future practice

Two levels of documentation

The archive retains the observable interaction and supplied material

Available model identifiers and dates are recorded

The logical record summarizes consequential research decisions

Access restrictions and unavailable version details are explicit

The record documents observable work and expert decisions

The logical record in practice

Object, question, significance and evidence base

Initial assumptions and the functions assigned to AI

Competing explanations and consequential corrections

Tests, accepted conclusions and unresolved questions

Responsible expert, revision history and next required observation

An illustrative soil decision

Illustrative case: a limited measurement shows no exceedance

A proposed summary declares the territory recovered

The expert examines the unsupported extension

The valid measurement survives with a narrower conclusion

Further observations determine whether a wider conclusion is justified

Correction and blocked verification

Contradictory evidence requires revision of the explanation

Unavailable access and omitted tests enter the record

A documented refusal differs from an assumed motive

A failed test differs from a test not performed

The next feasible action and current limits remain explicit

Responsibilities of the two laboratories

Military Ecotones defines the object and field questions

Information Systems preserves evidence and research decisions

The functions organize a shared research programme

Completed activities remain distinct from planned activities

An institution’s existence supplies no empirical confirmation

What this work has produced

The result is a working standard supported by published protocols

An observed gap led to question development and research design

The standard provides a route to testable decisions

Field validation of proposed relationships remains necessary

Progress is assessed through specific changes in knowledge or action

Sources and working standards

Laboratory of Information Systems (2026). Responsibility to the Problem.
DOI 10.66659/gc495972

Nikolaenko (2026). Why Were There No Papers on War-Affected Soil? Protocol v1.0.
DOI 10.66659/rpharj84

Nikolaenko (2026). Soil after War as a Configurational Object. Protocol v1.0.
DOI 10.66659/84a13358

Nikolaenko (2026). Introduction to the Understanding of the Great Trouble.
DOI 10.66659/hq77aq38

Nikolaenko (2026). The Scientist–AI Research System: Integrated Working Standard.
DOI 10.66659/1cabcy23

The decision to continue

A significant problem requires the work we can undertake

AI provides an additional means of continuing cognitive activity

The expert verifies outputs and accepts adopted conclusions

Incomplete verification determines the next research task

The contribution to understanding and action determines success