

PKL Roadmap

From working prototype to an independent, transparent public institution

Knowledge should be traceable.

Working roadmap • September 2026

Public Knowledge Ledger • Version 1.0

Executive direction

RECOMMENDATION Build PKL first as a mission-locked independent organisation with a small operating company, transparent governance, and diversified funding. Do not sell control of the ledger, its standards, or its public-interest mission during the proving stage.

PKL should become a trusted public record for claims, evidence, provenance, uncertainty, limitations, relationships and review. Its credibility will come from transparent rules, traceable decisions and meaningful independence—not from claiming to be an unquestionable authority.

The near-term task is to close the operational loop: a person submits a claim, the system validates it, Kollin assists with triage and analysis, accountable human reviewers decide what happens, the decision is recorded, and the submitter is notified. Every stage should be auditable and appealable.

What success looks like

- A reliable public website with working submission, storage, review and publication flows.
- A moderation system that is fast, consistent, explainable and resistant to capture.
- A clear separation between automated assistance, human judgement and governance authority.
- A lean team that can operate without depending on one person—or one funder—to keep PKL alive.
- A sustainable revenue mix that does not charge the public for access to core knowledge.
- Public metrics, change logs, conflicts disclosures, appeal records and regular governance reports.

Strategic principles

Principle	Working rule
Traceability	Every public conclusion links to its claims, evidence, provenance, review history and limitations.
Fallibility	Records can be challenged and revised; older states remain visible.
Independence	Funding, sponsorship or partnerships cannot purchase outcomes or hidden influence.
Human accountability	Automation may recommend, detect and summarise; named human roles remain responsible for consequential decisions.
Pluralism	Good-faith disagreement is represented rather than erased.
Public benefit	Core browsing, provenance and audit access remain open.

Roadmap at a glance

Phase	Indicative window	Primary outcome	Exit gate
0. Stabilise	Now–30 days	Production submission and reviewer access work reliably	End-to-end tests pass; no critical storage/auth failures
1. Close the loop	Months 1–2	Moderation, publication, notification and audit trail	Pilot claims processed under a published procedure
2. Govern	Months 2–4	Interim charter, roles, appeals and conflict controls	Independent oversight and public decision logs active
3. Public pilot	Months 4–6	Controlled launch with measurable service levels	Quality and safety thresholds sustained for 8 weeks
4. Sustain	Months 6–12	Diversified funding and institutional services	12-month runway; no funder dominates
5. Scale	Year 2	Broader domains, partners and federation-ready standards	Replication without weakening governance

Phase 0 — Stabilise the foundation

Objective: make the current PKL service dependable before increasing submissions or recruiting a broad reviewer pool.

Priority work

1. Verify production deployment, custom domain routing and health checks.
2. Complete durable claim storage with tested read/write behaviour and recovery procedures.
3. Repair reviewer authentication and replace shared-token habits with individual reviewer identities.
4. Add structured logging, error identifiers, backups and a basic incident runbook.
5. Test one full journey: submit → store → triage → review → publish/reject → notify → appeal.

Technical integrity gate

- Declared correlations and conflicts of interest must affect assessment, not merely appear as notes.
- Evidence-quality dimensions must become load-bearing in assessment or be removed until they are.
- Single-evidence routes to ‘supported’ status require explicit safeguards and tests.
- Council/reviewer selection, legitimacy and collusion risks require documented controls before authority expands.

DECISION GATE Do not invite high-volume public submissions until production reliability, reviewer identity and recovery procedures pass an independently witnessed end-to-end test.

Phase 1 — Close the moderation loop

Kollin can act as a moderation assistant and operational reviewer, but should not become an unaccountable sole authority. The strongest design combines automation, accountable humans and visible escalation.

Moderation workflow

Stage	Lead	What happens	Record produced
1. Intake	System	Validate fields, detect spam/duplicates, acknowledge receipt	Submission ID and timestamp
2. Triage	Kollin + duty moderator	Classify domain, urgency, risk and completeness	Triage note and route
3. Evidence review	Reviewer	Check sources, provenance, independence, relevance and limitations	Signed assessment
4. Decision	Senior reviewer or panel	Publish, request changes, hold, reject or escalate	Reasoned decision
5. Notification	System	Tell submitter what happened and how to appeal	Delivery record
6. Appeal	Separate reviewer/panel	Reconsider using the record and any new evidence	Appeal outcome
7. Ongoing review	System + community	Flag stale evidence, corrections and linked contradictions	Revision history

Decision classes

- Publish: sufficiently complete, within scope and safe to expose with its uncertainty clearly shown.
- Request changes: promising submission needs sources, clearer wording or declarations.
- Hold: requires specialist or legal/safety review; the reason and time limit are recorded.
- Reject: out of scope, abusive, fabricated or irreparably deficient; reasons remain reviewable.
- Escalate: high-impact, disputed or conflict-sensitive cases go to a panel.

Quality and safety controls

- Two-person approval for high-impact claims; no self-review.
- Mandatory reviewer conflict declarations and recusal.
- Random second-review sampling of routine decisions.
- Published reasons using a standard decision template.
- Rate limits, abuse controls and safe handling of personal or legally sensitive material.
- Time-bounded holds and a separate appeal route.

Phase 2 — Establish governance and independence

PKL needs enough structure to earn trust without creating a heavy institution before the service works. Start with an interim charter, publish how decisions are made, and evolve toward a mission-locked model.

Recommended structure

Layer	Purpose	Authority and safeguard
Operating company	Employ staff, contract services and run the product	Cannot rewrite the mission or suppress ledger records for commercial reasons
Independent oversight council	Approve policy, appoint key review leadership and hear systemic appeals	Term limits, public interests register, minutes and removal rules
Editorial/review function	Apply published assessment and moderation standards	Operationally independent from sales and fundraising
Technical stewardship	Security, releases, standards and auditability	Open change log, peer review and incident disclosure
Community forum	Surface errors, disputes and policy proposals	Advisory voice with tracked responses, not mob veto

Private company or funded institution?

The practical answer is a hybrid path. Use a company initially because it is quick to operate, contract and employ through. Add binding mission protections and independent oversight early. Consider a UK Community Interest Company, foundation, charity partnership or dual-entity structure after legal and tax advice, once PKL has evidence of demand and a stable operating model.

RED LINE No investor, sponsor, buyer, founder, automated system or council member should be able to secretly alter evidence weighting, moderation outcomes or published history.

Initial staffing model

PKL can pilot with a small core and a trained external reviewer pool. Staffing should scale with submission volume and case complexity, not ambition alone.

Function	Pilot capacity	Scale trigger
Executive/product lead	1 full-time	Separate product and executive roles when partnerships and operations compete for attention

Function	Pilot capacity	Scale trigger
Technical lead	1 full-time	Add engineer when reliability backlog or security response exceeds agreed service levels
Moderation operations lead	1 full-time	Add shift lead when coverage extends beyond one operating window
General moderators	2 part-time or 1 full-time equivalent	Add 1 FTE per sustained 15–25 substantive cases per working day, recalibrated from measured handling time
Specialist reviewers	6–12 retained/volunteer experts	Expand by domain; require availability and conflict declarations
Governance/appeals	3–5 independent people	Expand cautiously; odd-number panels and quorum rules
Admin/comms/fundraising	0.5–1 full-time equivalent	Increase when reporting, grants and partner support delay core work

The pilot therefore needs roughly four core full-time equivalents, supported by a specialist pool and a small independent oversight group. Automation should improve consistency and throughput, but staffing assumptions must be updated after four weeks of measured case data.

Roles for Kollin

- Screen completeness, duplicates, source accessibility and obvious policy conflicts.
- Summarise evidence and counter-evidence while preserving source links and uncertainty.
- Suggest routes, check decision templates and flag missing declarations.
- Monitor service levels, stale records and inconsistent reviewer outcomes.
- Never conceal its involvement, invent evidence, make irreversible high-impact decisions alone, or adjudicate appeals about its own work.

Phase 3 — Run a controlled public pilot

Pilot scope

- Begin with a limited number of knowledge domains and an explicit scope statement.
- Invite a manageable cohort of submitters before opening unrestricted intake.
- Publish moderation guidance, reviewer expectations, appeal rules and response targets.
- Show status, evidence, limitations, relationships and review history on every public record.
- Release a monthly transparency report from the first month of operation.

Public-pilot exit thresholds

Measure	Initial threshold
Availability	At least 99.5% during the pilot measurement window
Acknowledgement	Immediate automated receipt with traceable submission ID
Triage	90% within two working days
Routine decision	80% within ten working days
Appeal independence	100% handled by someone outside the original decision
Audit completeness	100% of decisions include author, timestamp, reason and policy version
Quality sampling	At least 10% of routine decisions independently checked
Critical incidents	No unresolved severity-one integrity or privacy incident

Phase 4 — Build financial sustainability

PKL should make money from services around the public ledger—not by selling truth, ranking, favourable decisions or exclusive access to the underlying public record.

Recommended revenue mix

Stream	What PKL can offer	Integrity condition
Grants and public-interest funding	Core development, research, access and standards work	Multiple funders; published amounts and conditions
Institutional subscriptions	Workflow tools, alerts, exports, dashboards and team features	No privileged moderation outcome
API and data services	Higher-volume access, monitoring, provenance queries and integrations	Core public access remains available
Verification services	Structured evidence audits and provenance mapping	Method and conflicts disclosed; customer cannot dictate findings
Training and certification	Reviewer training, organisational readiness and standards implementation	Certification rules public and independently reviewable
Research partnerships	Joint methods, datasets and public-interest studies	Publication rights and independence protected
Sponsorship	Events, educational resources or infrastructure support	Brand visibility separated from claim assessment

Funding guardrails

- Publish every material funder, sponsor and condition.

- Aim for no single funder to provide more than 25% of annual operating income by the end of year two.
- Create a minimum operating reserve target of six months once revenue permits.
- Keep editorial/review budgets structurally separate from commercial account management.
- Reject funding tied to a specific claim outcome, evidence ranking or suppression request.

Wikimedia and institutional partnerships

Wikimedia would be a natural mission-aligned conversation, but sponsorship should not be treated as the first or only route. PKL should approach the wider Wikimedia ecosystem with a concrete pilot showing how traceable claims, provenance and disagreement could complement—not replace—Wikipedia and Wikidata workflows.

Partnership sequence

6. Demonstrate a small, credible public corpus and publish the moderation method.
7. Prepare an interoperability note covering citations, identifiers, exports and licensing.
8. Invite feedback from relevant Wikimedia communities, researchers and open-knowledge organisations.
9. Propose a bounded pilot or research collaboration with shared evaluation criteria.
10. Pursue grants, infrastructure support or sponsorship only with explicit non-interference terms.

Other suitable partners may include universities, libraries, fact-checking organisations, standards bodies, public-interest technology funders, journalism organisations and research institutes. Partner selection should follow published compatibility and conflict criteria.

Growth and long-term options

Year-two growth priorities

- Expand domain coverage only where trained reviewers and policy guidance exist.
- Publish machine-readable standards and stable identifiers.
- Support federated or independently operated instances with common audit rules.
- Develop multilingual submission and review carefully, beginning with translation transparency.
- Commission external security, governance and epistemic audits.

Acquisition or investment

PKL may attract interest from knowledge platforms, publishers, AI companies, research-data providers, verification businesses, philanthropic foundations or public-interest institutions. Interest is not the same

as suitability. During the proving stage, partnership, licensing or minority mission-aligned investment is safer than selling the project outright.

Option	When it may fit	Required protection
Grant or sponsorship	Early validation and public-interest development	No outcome control; full disclosure
Commercial partnership	A defined integration or service has mutual value	Data use, branding and editorial boundaries in writing
Minority investment	Repeatable revenue exists and capital accelerates delivery	Mission lock, board independence and protected matters
Acquisition	Only after institutional durability and a clearly superior steward are proven	Permanent openness, archive integrity, governance continuity and enforceable reversal rights

DEFAULT POSITION PKL is not for sale while its governance, public value and sustainable economics are still being proven. Any future proposal should be evaluated publicly against the mission—not merely the price.

Transparency framework

Publish continuously

- Current moderation and assessment policies, with version history.
- Reviewer role definitions, selection method, term limits and aggregate activity.
- Material conflicts of interest and recusals.
- Decision, correction and appeal statistics.
- Funding sources, material contracts and concentration risk.
- Security and integrity incidents after responsible containment.
- Governance minutes, policy proposals and responses to community feedback.

Core dashboard

Area	Measure
Demand	Submissions, active submitters, domain mix and backlog
Speed	Median triage, decision and appeal times
Quality	Second-review disagreement, correction and successful-appeal rates
Integrity	Conflict recusals, provenance gaps and policy exceptions
Trust	Reason usefulness, repeat contributors and external citations

Area	Measure
Resilience	Availability, incidents, recovery time and reserve runway
Independence	Funding concentration and commercial/editorial separation tests

Immediate 90-day action plan

Timing	Actions	Owner
Days 1–14	Stabilise storage and reviewer authentication; document the production architecture; complete end-to-end test; freeze high-risk intake until passed	Technical lead + product lead
Days 15–30	Implement individual reviewer accounts, audit logs, decision templates, submitter notifications and incident procedure	Technical + moderation leads
Days 31–45	Recruit pilot moderators and specialists; train against sample cases; publish conflicts and recusal policy	Moderation lead
Days 46–60	Run a private pilot; measure handling time, disagreement and failure modes; revise staffing assumptions	Operations team
Days 61–75	Adopt interim charter; appoint independent oversight; publish appeals and transparency framework	Founder + interim council
Days 76–90	Open controlled public pilot; publish first dashboard; prepare funding and Wikimedia partnership packs	Whole team

Decision gates

11. Reliability gate: production workflow survives failure and recovery testing.
12. Moderation gate: trained reviewers reach acceptable agreement on blinded sample cases.
13. Governance gate: conflicts, appeals, appointments and authority are publicly defined.
14. Launch gate: pilot thresholds are met for eight consecutive weeks.
15. Sustainability gate: funding is diversified and at least 12 months of credible runway is visible.
16. Scale gate: new domains or partners can be added without weakening review quality or independence.

Closing position

PKL's strongest opportunity is not to become another website that declares what is true. It is to become dependable public infrastructure for showing why a claim is believed, what evidence supports or challenges it, where that evidence came from, what remains uncertain, who reviewed it and how the record changed.

THE NEXT MOVE Stabilise the live service, close the reviewer loop, and prove the moderation model with a controlled pilot. Everything else becomes easier once that foundation is demonstrably trustworthy.

The roadmap therefore puts reliability before publicity, accountable moderation before volume, governance before concentrated funding, and sustainable services around an open public core. If PKL follows that order, it can grow independently while remaining attractive to partners, funders and institutions that genuinely share its purpose.