

UAV Technologies

ENGINEERING INTELLIGENCE STANDARD

EIS-001

Engineering Observation, Analysis, and Reporting Methodology

Revision B | Public Release

Document ID	EIS-001
Revision	B
Status	Controlled Public Standard
Effective date	16 August 2026
Document owner	UAV Technologies Engineering Intelligence

Public-use notice. EIS-001 is an original UAV Technologies company standard governing the preparation of its Engineering Intelligence products. It is not an ISO, AS9100, FAA, USDA, NRCS, or other government or consensus standard, and publication does not represent third-party certification or accreditation.

Document Control

Revision	Date	Status	Description	Approval
B	16 Aug 2026	Public Release	Expanded methodology; formalized evidence, confidence, QA, release, and correction controls.	UAV Technologies

Contents

1. Purpose
2. Scope and Applicability
3. Core Principles
4. Terms and Definitions
5. Engineering Intelligence Workflow
6. Data and Evidence Requirements
7. Observation and Analysis Requirements
8. Engineering Interpretation and Causal Attribution
9. Confidence Assessment
10. Recommended Actions and Decision Support
11. Quality Assurance and Technical Review
12. Report Structure and Release
13. Data Governance and Customer Information
14. Analytical Tools, Automation, and Human Responsibility
15. Limitations, Corrections, and Revision Control
16. Continuous Improvement
- Appendix A - Standard Observation Record
- Appendix B - Confidence Decision Guide
- Appendix C - Minimum Data Provenance Record

1. Purpose

EIS-001 establishes the minimum methodology UAV Technologies uses to acquire, validate, analyze, interpret, review, and report technical observations as Engineering Intelligence. Its purpose is to produce work that is decision-focused, repeatable, traceable to evidence, transparent about uncertainty, and resistant to unsupported causal claims.

2. Scope and Applicability

This standard applies to Engineering Intelligence products issued by UAV Technologies when the work involves Earth observation, aerial or UAV imagery, geospatial data, public technical records, customer-furnished information, engineering documentation, or other observational evidence. It may be applied to infrastructure, transportation, industrial, manufacturing, environmental, agricultural, aerospace, site-development, natural-hazard, and related technical questions.

Project-specific contracts, statements of work, customer requirements, laws, regulations, licensing conditions, and authoritative technical standards take precedence where they impose additional or different requirements. EIS-001 does not convert screening or remote observation into a field inspection, design certification, regulatory determination, or licensed professional-engineering opinion unless such services are expressly included and lawfully provided.

3. Core Principles

- Evidence first. Findings shall begin with evidence that can be identified, described, and traced.
- Separate observation from interpretation. What is directly visible, measured, calculated, or documented shall be distinguished from what it may mean.
- Fit-for-purpose data. Resolution, age, coverage, geometry, spectral content, metadata, and known limitations shall be appropriate to the decision question.
- Traceability. Material findings shall be traceable to the source data, analytical step, figure, record, or calculation supporting them.
- Uncertainty is part of the result. Missing evidence, ambiguity, disagreement among sources, and alternative explanations shall be communicated.
- Proportionality. Analytical depth and review rigor shall scale with consequence, complexity, novelty, and customer need.
- Actionability. Reports should identify what the customer can reasonably do next, including what additional evidence would reduce uncertainty.
- Technical independence. Conclusions shall not be strengthened or weakened to satisfy a preferred narrative.

4. Terms and Definitions

Term	Definition
Observation	A directly visible, measured, calculated, or documented condition supported by identified evidence.
Derived result	A value or classification produced from source data by a defined analytical method, such as an index, change metric, geometry, or screening class.
Engineering interpretation	A reasoned explanation of the technical significance of one or more observations or derived results.
Causal attribution	A conclusion that identifies a specific cause or mechanism. Causal attribution requires evidence beyond mere spatial or temporal association.
Corroborating evidence	Independent or complementary information that increases or decreases support for an interpretation.
Area of Interest (AOI)	The defined geographic, physical, organizational, or system boundary within which the assessment is performed.
Confidence	The assessed strength of support for a stated finding, considering evidence quality, agreement, completeness, specificity, and alternative explanations.
Screening	An analytical process used to identify, rank, or prioritize conditions for further review; screening is not by itself a diagnosis or final determination.
Authoritative source	A source with recognized responsibility, custody, technical competence, or official standing for the information being used.

5. Engineering Intelligence Workflow

Unless a project-specific method requires otherwise, work shall proceed through the following controlled sequence:

Stage	Control Point	Minimum Requirement
1	Engineering Objective	Define the decision question, intended use, required outputs, and material constraints.
2	AOI and Requirements	Define spatial/system boundaries, dates, thresholds, customer requirements, and acceptance criteria.
3	Data Acquisition	Identify and obtain suitable primary, supporting, and contextual evidence.
4	Data Validation	Verify provenance, metadata, coverage, resolution, coordinate reference, temporal suitability, quality, and known limitations.
5	Engineering Review	Determine whether the evidence is sufficient and appropriate for the intended analytical method.
6	Observation / Derivation	Record direct observations and calculate derived results using documented methods.
7	Interpretation	Assess technical significance and plausible explanations without exceeding the evidence.
8	Confidence Assessment	Assign confidence separately to material findings and, when necessary, to identification, condition, function, cause, or attribution.
9	Recommended Action	State the next reasonable action and the evidence needed to reduce remaining uncertainty.
10	Quality Review	Conduct an independent technical review proportionate to the work before external release.
11	Report Release	Issue the controlled deliverable with revision status, limitations, and source traceability.

6. Data and Evidence Requirements

6.1 Evidence hierarchy

No single hierarchy is universally controlling. Evidence shall be weighted according to relevance, authority, directness, quality, spatial and temporal correspondence, and suitability for the question. Typical evidence classes include:

- Field measurements, inspections, surveys, or verified ground truth.
- Customer-controlled engineering, operational, maintenance, asset, or agricultural records.
- UAV or aerial data collected with known acquisition parameters and appropriate georeferencing.
- Earth observation data and derived products with documented sensor, acquisition date, processing level, and spatial/spectral characteristics.
- Authoritative government, scientific, regulatory, meteorological, hydrologic, or technical records.
- Publicly available contextual sources used for corroboration or hypothesis development.

6.2 Minimum suitability checks

Before quantitative or comparative use, the analyst shall evaluate, as applicable: source identity; acquisition date/time; spatial coverage; coordinate reference system; spatial resolution; spectral or sensor characteristics; processing level; radiometric scaling; cloud, shadow, haze, occlusion, saturation, or no-data effects; registration between dates; temporal comparability; and known source limitations.

Rendered imagery. Screenshots, JPGs, PNGs, web tiles, and other rendered products may support visual interpretation, communication, or preliminary screening. They shall not be treated as quantitative source measurements when the rendering process has removed, compressed, rescaled, or obscured the underlying analytical values.

7. Observation and Analysis Requirements

Material observations shall be recorded so another qualified reviewer can understand what was seen or calculated, where it occurred, what evidence supports it, and how the reported conclusion was reached.

- Direct observations shall use descriptive language before interpretive language.
- Quantitative results shall identify the method, relevant inputs, units or dimensionless index, thresholds when used, and material preprocessing assumptions.
- Multi-temporal comparisons shall address registration, common valid coverage, seasonality, acquisition conditions, and other comparability limits.
- Classification or threshold layers shall be described as analytical screening constructs unless independently validated as ground-truth classes.
- Negative evidence shall be treated cautiously. Failure to observe a feature does not establish absence when resolution, coverage, occlusion, timing, or sensor limitations could explain non-detection.
- Where an observation can support several materially different explanations, those alternatives shall be retained until evidence justifies narrowing them.

8. Engineering Interpretation and Causal Attribution

Engineering interpretation shall explain why an observation matters to the customer's decision while preserving the boundary between evidence and inference. Interpretations may identify consistency with a mechanism, condition, or scenario when the evidence supports that relationship.

8.1 Causal language

Evidence condition	Preferred language	Avoid
Association only	consistent with; may indicate; warrants investigation	caused by; proves; confirms
Multiple independent lines agree	strongly consistent with; supported by independent evidence	certain; definitive, unless actually established
Specific mechanism independently established	attributed to / caused by, with the supporting basis stated	unsupported generalization beyond the verified scope
Evidence conflicts or is incomplete	uncertain; competing explanations remain; insufficient data	selecting a preferred cause without basis

8.2 Attribution granularity

Confidence in feature identification, condition, function, ownership, mission, mechanism, and cause may differ. These shall be assessed separately when combining them into one confidence statement would overstate what is known.

9. Confidence Assessment

Confidence shall be assigned to material findings using the following four-level scale. Confidence is a statement about evidentiary support, not a statistical probability unless a project explicitly defines and validates a probabilistic model.

Level	Evidence quality	Agreement / completeness	Reporting meaning
High	Strong and fit for purpose	Independent evidence agrees; material alternatives substantially reduced	Finding is well supported within stated scope and limitations.
Moderate	Generally suitable	Evidence supports the finding but meaningful uncertainty or alternatives remain	Finding is useful for decisions that tolerate stated uncertainty.
Low	Limited, indirect, or partly unsuitable	Important gaps, ambiguity, or competing explanations remain	Use primarily for screening or directing additional evidence collection.
Insufficient Data	Evidence cannot support a defensible finding	Critical evidence absent, contradictory, or not fit for purpose	No substantive conclusion should be drawn beyond identifying the information gap.

9.1 Confidence factors

The reviewer shall consider: source authority and provenance; directness; spatial and temporal match; sensor or measurement suitability; data quality; repeatability; agreement among independent sources; completeness; specificity of the claim; and the strength of plausible alternative explanations.

10. Recommended Actions and Decision Support

A material finding should conclude with a practical next step when action is appropriate. Recommended actions may include field verification, record review, targeted higher-resolution collection, engineering inspection, monitoring, additional temporal observations, customer coordination, or no immediate action. Recommendations shall be proportional to the confidence and consequence of the finding and shall not imply authority UAV Technologies does not possess.

11. Quality Assurance and Technical Review

Every externally released Engineering Intelligence report shall receive a technical review by a person other than the primary preparer when practicable. Review depth shall be proportionate to project consequence and complexity.

- Verify the engineering objective and scope are answered.
- Verify material claims are supported by cited or traceable evidence.
- Check data provenance, dates, metadata, coordinate reference, and analytical assumptions.
- Reperform or independently check material calculations, thresholds, or transformations where practical.
- Check that observation, derived result, interpretation, confidence, and causal attribution are not conflated.
- Challenge alternative explanations and confirm limitations are visible to the customer.
- Check figures, annotations, tables, legends, captions, and units against the underlying evidence.
- Confirm recommendations follow from the findings and do not exceed the contracted scope.
- Record review completion and resolve material review comments before release.

Independent review. Independent review means independence from preparation of the specific finding or deliverable. It does not imply third-party certification, accreditation, or regulatory approval.

12. Report Structure and Release

Unless the statement of work specifies another format, a controlled Engineering Intelligence report should contain the following elements in a sequence appropriate to the engagement:

- Title, subject, document identifier, revision, date, and report status.
- Executive summary and decision-focused conclusion.
- Engineering objective, AOI, scope, and intended use.
- Data sources, provenance, dates, and material limitations.
- Methodology and analytical basis.
- Engineering observations and derived results.
- Engineering interpretation and confidence assessment.
- Recommended actions and next evidence required.
- Supporting imagery, figures, maps, tables, and annotations.
- Technical appendix sufficient to preserve traceability and reproducibility appropriate to the work.

12.1 Release controls

Released reports shall be identifiable by title, revision, and release date. Drafts shall be clearly marked. Superseded revisions shall not be represented as current. When a report is provided as a sample or case study, that status and any limitations on customer reliance shall be stated.

13. Data Governance and Customer Information

Customer-furnished information shall be used only within the authorized scope and handled according to applicable contractual, confidentiality, security, privacy, licensing, and legal requirements. Public-source information shall retain sufficient provenance to allow later verification. Commercial imagery and third-party datasets remain subject to their license terms.

EIS-001 does not itself establish a cybersecurity classification, records-retention period, export-control determination, or data-rights allocation. Those requirements shall be established by contract, law, customer direction, or a separate UAV Technologies procedure as applicable.

14. Analytical Tools, Automation, and Human Responsibility

UAV Technologies may use software, scripts, geospatial platforms, statistical methods, automated processing, machine-assisted analysis, or other computational tools to support Engineering Intelligence. Tool output is not self-validating.

- Material analytical methods shall be appropriate to the source data and intended decision.
- Automated outputs shall be subject to human technical review before being adopted as report findings.
- Where a tool materially transforms data, the transformation shall be documented at a level appropriate to reproducibility and customer need.
- Unverified generated content, automated classifications, or machine suggestions shall not be presented as established fact solely because a tool produced them.
- Responsibility for the released technical conclusion remains with UAV Technologies and the designated human reviewer.

15. Limitations, Corrections, and Revision Control

15.1 Limitations

Limitations that could materially affect interpretation shall be disclosed where the customer is likely to rely on the affected finding. Limitations may include resolution, temporal gaps, cloud or shadow, missing records, uncertain geolocation, inaccessible ground truth, mixed pixels, unverified source claims, incomplete coverage, or inability to distinguish competing mechanisms.

15.2 Corrections

If a material error is identified after release, UAV Technologies shall evaluate its effect on the conclusions and customer decision. When correction is warranted, the affected deliverable shall be revised, the change identified, and the corrected version issued through controlled revision.

15.3 Revision control

Changes to EIS-001 shall be issued by revision. Public copies should identify the revision and effective date so customers can determine which methodology governed a proposal or report.

16. Continuous Improvement

UAV Technologies shall periodically review EIS-001 using lessons learned, technical-review findings, customer feedback, changes in analytical capability, and developments in relevant engineering and quality practice. Updates shall strengthen repeatability, transparency, technical credibility, and customer decision value without weakening evidence requirements.

Appendix A - Standard Observation Record

Field	Requirement	Example / Guidance
Observation ID	Required	EO-YYYY-### or project-specific controlled identifier
Objective / decision question	Required	What decision or technical question does this record support?
Category	Required	Infrastructure, vegetation, drainage, surface water, asset identification, etc.
Location / AOI reference	Required when spatial	Coordinates, polygon, station, asset ID, parcel, or map reference
Source evidence	Required	Dataset, image, record, date, figure, band/product, or source reference
Direct observation	Required	What is visible, measured, calculated, or documented without causal interpretation?
Derived result	When applicable	Metric, index, change value, class, geometry, or other computed output
Engineering interpretation	Required for material findings	Why the observation matters technically
Alternative explanations	When material	Plausible competing mechanisms not excluded by the evidence
Confidence	Required	High / Moderate / Low / Insufficient Data
Recommended action	Required for actionable findings	Next reasonable action or evidence needed
Reviewer / disposition	Required before release	Review completed; comments resolved or dispositioned

Appendix B - Confidence Decision Guide

High: Would another qualified reviewer, using the same evidence and stated method, be likely to reach substantially the same finding? Are material alternatives reduced by independent evidence?

Moderate: Is the finding supported and useful, but dependent on assumptions, incomplete corroboration, or unresolved alternatives that matter to interpretation?

Low: Is the signal real enough to prioritize investigation, but too ambiguous, indirect, or incomplete to support a stronger conclusion?

Insufficient Data: Would stating a substantive finding require filling a critical gap with assumption rather than evidence?

Appendix C - Minimum Data Provenance Record

- Source / provider and dataset or record name.
- Acquisition, observation, publication, or effective date as applicable.
- Processing level, product type, or document revision when relevant.
- Spatial reference, resolution, scale, or positional basis when relevant.
- Band, layer, variable, field, or page/section used.
- Access or receipt date for externally obtained information when useful to later verification.
- Known quality flags, masking, exclusions, transformations, or preprocessing.
- License, customer restriction, or handling limitation when applicable.

Informative Basis

EIS-001 is an original UAV Technologies methodology. Its structure reflects widely used engineering-quality concepts such as documented processes, customer requirements, risk-based thinking, technical review, traceability, and controlled outputs. References to external quality-management concepts do not constitute certification or a claim of conformity to any external standard.

- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Policy Statement 431, Quality Management System Standards.
- International Federation of Consulting Engineers (FIDIC), Quality Management guidance for consulting engineering practices.
- ISO/IEC TR 90005:2008, Systems engineering - Guidelines for the application of ISO 9001 to system life cycle processes.
- NASA Technical Reports Server, Systems Engineering and Management Applications of ISO 9001:2015 for Government (2016).

Customer transparency. The current public revision of EIS-001 is intended to allow customers to understand the minimum analytical and reporting controls referenced in UAV Technologies proposals and Engineering Intelligence reports.