

Rio 2.0 - Revising the Rio Scale for SETI Detections

Duncan Forgan¹, Jason Wright^{2,3}, Jill Tarter⁴, Eric Korpela⁵, Andrew Siemion^{6,7,4}, Iván Almár⁸ and Elisabeth Piotelat⁹

¹Centre for Exoplanet Science, SUPA, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of St Andrews, North Haugh, St Andrews, UK

²Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics and Center for Exoplanets and Habitable Worlds, 525 Davey Laboratory, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802, USA

³Visiting Associate Professor, Breakthrough Listen Laboratory, Department of Astronomy, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA

⁴SETI Institute, Mountain View, CA, USA

⁵Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA

⁶Department of Astronomy, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA

⁷Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands

⁸Konkoly Observatory, Konkoly Thege ut 13-17, H-1121 Budapest, Hungary

⁹Laboratoire d'Informatique pour la Mécanique et les Sciences de l'Ingénieur, (LIMSI-CNRS), Orsay, France

ABSTRACT

The Rio scale is a tool for communicating the significance of a signal to the general public. It assigns scores to signals detected in searches for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI), which characterises both the consequences of a signal, and the probability the signal is truly from ETI, in an easily digestible format for laypeople to interpret. In the seventeen years since its construction, the number of groups actively conducting searches for evidence of intelligent life beyond Earth has increased significantly, and theoretical work has established a new suite of observables that are capable of revealing the presence of ETI in a range of astronomical observations.

In this paper we revise the Rio scale, with the aim of i) achieving consensus across academic disciplines on a scheme for classifying signals potentially indicating the existence of advanced extraterrestrial life, ii) supplying a pedagogical tool to help inform the public about the process scientists go through to develop an understanding of a signal, and iii) providing a means of calibrating the expectations of the world at large when signals are discussed in the media. We also present (and encourage the SETI community to adopt) a single set of consistent terminology for discussing signals.

Keywords: SETI, Rio Scale, science communication, extraterrestrial intelligence

1 INTRODUCTION

The discovery of extraterrestrial intelligence (ETI) (or its absence in rigorous, complete surveys of the local Universe) would clearly have enormous consequences for humanity. This has prompted scientists to conduct searches for ETI, or SETI, at least for the last 50 years or so. The lack of confirmed detections of ETI so far may be dismaying, but it remains an important data point in our quest to place human beings in cosmic context.

SETI searches vary widely in their methodology, targets and analysis. The “classic” radio SETI method (Cocconi & Morrison 1959) focuses on detecting either intentional or unintentional radio transmissions from ETI. This search is motivated by Earth’s suitability for transmitting and receiving radio signals at a specified range of frequencies commonly known as “the terrestrial microwave window” (see Colloquy 4, in Morrison et al 1977), as well as the ability for radio waves to travel interstellar distances without suffering significant absorption.

Similarly, optical SETI searches (Schwartz & Townes 1961) have been attempted to detect pulsed, narrowband, collimated optical light from stars. “Artifact” SETI searches for other signs of technology, including waste heat (Dyson 1960) or Solar System probes. The interested reader can find historical lists of radio and optical SETI searches in Ekers (2002). Both fields continue to advance: examples of the latest searches in both radio and optical are recorded in Isaacson et al (2017), Tellis & Marcy (2017).

Both radio and optical SETI have been boosted by an improved understanding of planetary systems around other stars (Wright 2017). Indeed, the science of exoplanet detection has begun to yield new observables for SETI science, such as the possibility of detecting megastructures in exoplanet transit light-curves (Forgan 2013, Korpela 2015, Wright et al 2015).

As electronic costs have fallen, and the number of available sites for SETI observations has increased, the SETI community continues to grow throughout the world. Astronomers increasingly observe via large surveys (which produce large quantities of time series data at high sensitivity and cadence). This gives rise to the prospect for SETI via data mining of public archives, opening up the search to effectively the entire planet.

Regardless of the detection method, the characterisation of a SETI signal has several different phases. During each phase, the likelihood of such a signal being *bona fide* ETI increases or decreases. In every signal to date, the likelihood has decreased to low enough values that there are no widely agreed ETI candidates at the time of writing.

Almár & Tarter (2000) attempted to encapsulate the significance of a possible SETI signal using a simple linear scale. This was named the Rio Scale, as it was first presented at the 51st International Astronautical Congress in Rio de Janeiro (see also Almár 2001, Almár & Tarter 2011). Broadly, this tool was designed for communicating with the public as to “how excited” they should be regarding a signal. The scale is constructed by multiplying two numbers: **Q**, which describes the consequences of a signal if it is an ETI discovery, and **δ**, a description of the credibility of the signal being truly ETI. The resulting scale

$$R = Q\delta \quad (1)$$

Ranges between 0 and 10, with 10 being of the greatest possible excitement.

In the seventeen years since the scale was formulated, it has seen a modest level of traction in the press. Despite its simplicity and the availability of online calculators, in recent years the scale has fallen out of use by SETI practitioners when evaluating their signals. As a result, the scale is not well known amongst science journalists, and by extension the wider public.

The level of “brand recognition” of Rio has been stymied to some degree by the general fragmentation of the media. The number of news outlets has proliferated significantly, and stories now break and distort at alarming speed thanks to social media, which can hamper the efforts of scientists to communicate effectively with the public (Forgan & Scholz 2016). The personal experience of the authors suggests that knowledge of the Rio scale among journalists is patchy at best, although Rio scale values have been reported for some recent claimed signals.

The Rio scale should be assigned as standard to any putative signal, and could be a valuable tool in managing public expectations. However, the scale was formulated during a

period when the scientists had the luxury of time in analysing the signal. It is increasingly common that signals become public knowledge without a great deal of analysis and checking, and the scale as it stands tends to over-rank signals compared to consensus opinion from the SETI community.

We revisit the Rio scale, with the intent to

- a) encourage all SETI groups to give every signal an **R** value, and to revise this value as further analysis is undertaken,
- b) enhance the effectiveness of the scale in modern science communication, and
- c) to help calibrate public expectations of tentative signals.

In the following sections, we recap the initial Rio scale (which we dub Rio 1.0/1.1), and then propose our replacement scale, Rio 2.0, which is calculated by completing a questionnaire. Finally, we discuss how this scale should be used when communicating with the media and the general public about potential SETI signals.

1.1 TERMINOLOGY

Before beginning, it is important to be clear on the use of jargon. A “detection” has a clear astronomical meaning (in that a signal was received that exceeded some predefined noise threshold), but its meaning to the layperson has unwanted connotations of discovery and confirmation.

We advise the SETI community to adopt a single set of terminology for discussing signals. We will use the following phraseology to distinguish the various stages of a signal’s journey, from its initial registering on instrumentation to the final reduced data product (with accompanying physical interpretation). *The vast majority of signals fail to proceed past the first or second steps.* No current signal, not even the famous Wow! Signal (see Gray & Ellingsen 2002 and references within), currently scores greater than 1 on either Rio 1.1 or Rio 2.0.

- Speculative Signals (S) are signals at their earliest stage. Speculative signals have only been analysed by one research group, on a single instrument.
- Unverified Signals (U) are signals whose data has been analysed by more than one research group, ideally using different methods, but the signal has only been detected by one set of instrumentation.¹
- Verified Signals (V) have been confirmed by at least one extra measurement with independent instrumentation. Verified signals may still be due to instrumentation error. Depending on the signal and the equipment used, a non-instrumental origin

¹ By definition (see later), both speculative and unverified signals will achieve negligible scores on the Rio Scale.

can be demonstrated for some verified signals, and these progress immediately into the next category.

- Candidate Signals (C) should only refer to a verified signal which is demonstrably not due to instrumentation effects. Candidates may have an as-yet-unidentified natural or anthropogenic origin, such as radio frequency interference (RFI). Examples of candidates have included both pulsars and quasars in the immediate aftermath of their detection, before their natural causes were understood (see e.g. Penny 2013).
- Discovery (D) refers to a signal characterised as from ETI with high confidence.

1.2 The Rio Scale 1.0/1.1

The initial Rio Scale was defined as per equation (1), where **R** is the Rio score, **Q** represents the significance of the consequences of an event, and **δ** describes the probability that the event did indeed occur (and was not an instrumentation error, an interpretation error, a human-made signal or a deliberate hoax).

Almár and Tarter (2000, 2011) describes **Q** as a sum of three factors, relating to the phenomenon class, the method of discovery and the distance of the event from Earth (Table 1). Adding the three factors gives a value for **Q** between 3 and 15. Crucial factors in the construction of **Q** include whether the signal is a message, containing information as opposed to a beacon, and whether the signal indicates knowledge of the Earth's existence (i.e. is the signal specifically transmitted at Earth or broadcast in all directions?). The nature of the observation - either a deliberate search for SETI signals/evidence of artifacts (SETA) or an accidental or serendipitous observation - also influences **Q**, as does the apparent distance of the signal from the Earth.

Phenomenon Class	Index	Discovery Method	Index	Distance	Index
Earth-specific message	6				
Omnidirectional Message	5	SETI/SETA observation - steady	5		
Earth-specific beacon	4	Serendipitous observation - steady	4	In the Solar System	4
Omnidirectional beacon	3	SETI/SETA observation -	3	Within 50 light years	3

		transient			
Leakage Radiation	2	Serendipitous observation - transient	2	In the Milky Way	2
Traces of Astroengineering	1	Archive Data	1	Extragalactic	1

Table 1: The Schema for evaluating Q in the Rio 1.0 and 1.1 schemes

In the Rio 1.0 scheme, the δ parameter was allowed to vary between 0 and 1, giving the range of R to be [0,15]. The later Rio 1.1 scheme (Almár 2001) modified δ so that R ranged between [0,10].

A calculator for Rio 1.1 is available online² - the user interface is shown in Figure 1. The calculator takes the form of a very simple quiz, with three questions to determine Q using the schema in Table 1, and a single question to determine δ . While it is useful to have such a calculator for the public, it is extremely simple. δ can only take one of five values: (0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0).

It is also rather opaque to the user. The values of Q and δ are not displayed, only R . If the user reads Almár & Tarter (2001), they can deduce these values, but this takes a notably larger effort.

Finally, this appears to be the only calculator available, and was designed well in advance of the Web 2.0. Web browsing is increasingly the domain of mobile devices, not desktop or laptop computers (Ofcom, 2015, Pew Research Center, 2015, StatCounter, 2016). Future Rio scale calculators should be flexible enough to be viewed on any internet accessing system, and should respect accessibility standards - it is noteworthy that the current Rio 1.1 calculator respects HTML 4 and is accessible from current smartphone and tablet browsers.

Rio 1.1 has helped us to clarify our thinking as to how to communicate to the public regarding SETI signals. It has unfortunately only seen limited use by the SETI community when discussing its own signals, and it is not widely known amongst journalists or the general public. We feel that a revised Rio scale is necessary not only to improve the scale's public profile, but to make it more relevant to modern communication practices and technology. This will in turn make it more appealing for both SETI practitioners and science communicators to use, as we describe in the following section.

² <http://avsport.org/IAA/riocalc.htm>

Select Class of Phenomenon:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Earth-specific message, or an ET artifact, capable of contact, or a physical encounter <input type="radio"/> Omnidirectional message with decipherable information, or a functioning ET artifact or space probe <input type="radio"/> Earth-specific beacon to draw our attention, or an ET artifact with a message to mankind <input type="radio"/> Omnidirectional beacon designed to draw attention, or an ET artifact with a message of a general character <input type="radio"/> Leakage radiation, without possible interpretation, or an ET artifact the purpose of which is understandable <input type="radio"/> Traces of astroengineering, or any indication of technological activity by an extant or extinct civilization at any distance, or an ET artifact, the purpose of which is unknown
Select Type of Discovery:	<input type="radio"/> SETI/SETA observation; steady phenomenon verifiable by repeated observation or investigation <input type="radio"/> Non-SETI/SETA observation; steady phenomenon verifiable by repeated observation or investigation <input type="radio"/> SETI/SETA observation; transient phenomenon that has been verified but never repeated <input type="radio"/> Non-SETI/SETA observation; transient phenomenon that is reliable but never repeated <input checked="" type="radio"/> From archival data; <i>a posteriori</i> discovery without possibility of verification
Select Apparent Distance:	<input type="radio"/> Within the solar system <input type="radio"/> Within a distance which allows communication (at lightspeed) within a human lifetime <input checked="" type="radio"/> Within the Galaxy <input type="radio"/> Extragalactic
Select Credibility of Report:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Absolutely reliable, without any doubt <input type="radio"/> Very probable, with verification already carried out <input type="radio"/> Possible, but should be verified before taken seriously <input type="radio"/> Very uncertain, but worthy of verification efforts <input type="radio"/> Obviously fake or fraudulent

Rio Scale Value

and Importance: **6** **Noteworthy**

Figure 1: A screenshot of the Rio 1.1 calculator. The first three questions define Q , the significance of the consequences of a signal, and the last question estimates δ , the credibility of a claimed discovery.

2 The Rio Scale 2.0

2.1 Desiderata for Rio 2.0

In this section we list some desired properties of the Rio Scale, given its intended use as a tool to calibrate the public's expectations of the importance of an event.

i) The new Rio scale should not completely discard the structure of Rio 1.0/1.1, i.e. it should still be derived as $R = Q \delta$, where Q is the consequence of the signal and δ is the credibility.

However, there should be less focus on interpreting the signal, and more on its observational properties.

ii) We need to preserve the ability of Rio to deliver a score quickly. It should become a matter of course for SETI groups around the world to calculate a score in a few minutes, and for groups to score each other's work.

iii) The score needs to be as objective as possible - the subjectivity of the user must not be allowed to dominate the final score. An ideal calculator would allow a roomful of people from various technical backgrounds to return similar scores. That being the case, if a SETI group announces a candidate with a high Rio score, and another gives a vastly different score (say a very low one), this remains valuable information for the public.

iv) Rio 2.0 should reflect our current estimations of signals (such as the Wow! Signal, and Boyajian's star). It should also reproduce previous estimations of old candidates such as quasars and pulsars.

v) The score should be easy to comprehend. A layperson should be able to answer the questions necessary to derive a score, as a means to understanding how signals are evaluated (see vii)). It is of course the case that expertise is needed to produce a sufficiently reliable score.

vi) The algorithm and code that implements the score should be open source for maximum transparency. Easily accessible websites, webapps and smartphone apps should be developed so that anyone can derive a Rio score for a signal, given appropriate coaching. It is clear from citizen science projects that the general public are able to complete similar classification tasks with relatively low amounts of training.

vii) Most importantly, the Rio Scale should teach the public how SETI scientists evaluate signals. A well-designed website has the potential to be a powerful pedagogical tool, to inoculate against overblown press. It provides transparency to scientific thought processes, and indicates to the public how much work remains to be done to characterise the signal.

viii) Science communicators and other allied groups should be able to use it effectively when discussing the implications of a signal in social and digital media (Forgan & Scholz 2016).

2.2 Algorithm for the Rio 2.0 Calculator

We envisage the new Rio Scale calculator as being a website hosting a short quiz rather than a range of buttons on one page. Each page has a single question, and the user does not learn the values of Q or δ until the quiz completes. In the case of δ , the quiz may complete early (for example if there is good reason to believe the signal is a hoax).

As with Rio 1.0, it is clear that the scale value will likely change with time (as other teams verify a signal, or as a plausible natural explanation is discovered).

2.2.1 Questions to compute Q (0-->10)

Q1) What is the estimated distance to the source of the signal? (Begin with Q between 0 and 4)

Less than a light day (i.e. in the Solar System):	Q=4
Light-days — light-years (i.e. about as close as the nearest star):	Q=3
Light-years – tens of light years:	Q=2
Hundreds - thousands of light years (in the Galaxy):	Q=1
Longer / unknown:	Q=0

Q2) What are the prospects for communication with the source of the signal? (add between 0 and 4 points to Q)

We are in active two way communication:	Q=Q+4
We could respond using the same medium/encoding as the signal within 20 years:	Q=Q+3
We can understand the signal or we have artifacts we can study:	Q=Q+2
No communication is taking place:	Q=Q+0

Q3) Is the sender aware of humanity/its technology? (add between -1 and 2 points to Q)

Yes, certainly—the signal is intended for us, specifically:	Q=Q+2
Possibly, but there is little or no evidence for this:	Q=Q+1
Almost certainly not (e.g. they are too far away):	Q=Q+0
Senders are apparently extinct:	Q=Q-1

If $Q < 0$: $Q = 0$

2.2.2 Questions to Compute δ (0 \rightarrow 1)

Since any discovery of extraterrestrial intelligence is newsworthy, δ maps well onto a scale of interest for the press, which we call **J**.

J is computed as the product of three quantities: the probability that the signal is real (Section A), the probability that it is not instrumental (Section B), and the probability that it is not natural or human-made (Section C). To preserve dynamic range at the bottom, the scale is expressed in terms of logarithms and rescaled to have a maximum at 10:

$$2 \log_{10}(\delta) + 10 = J = A + B + C - 20$$

where **J** is the rescaled, logarithmic probability, and **A**, **B**, and **C** represent the three logarithmic, rescaled probabilities that go into the final probability.

The idea behind this rescaling is that 2 steps on the scale is a factor of 10. A value of 10 means 100% certainty, 8 means 10% confidence, 6 means 1% confidence, and so on.

J and δ can be computed directly if probabilities for the 3 components can be assessed quantitatively. That is, if the probabilities to “yes/no” answers to the questions to **A**, **B**, and **C** can be determined, one multiplies them together to get δ and calculates **J** using equation above.

To assist with this assessment, one can construct a series of questions to guide the process of determining **J**, given below.

Please note that this questionnaire is geared towards “everyday” SETI “detections,” which means it is about splitting fine hairs for very low probabilities. As a result, this questionnaire does not provide much granularity between $\delta=0.1-1$. If a signal is confirmed to be artificial and extraterrestrial with $\delta > 0.1$, it may be necessary to revisit this calculation according to the specifics of that signal, while maintaining the spirit of the scale.

Also note that the **A**, **B**, and **C** terms are not entirely independent: the same fact can affect more than one term. Some facts also appear in **Q**. This is intentional and desirable: the nature of the signal, which contributes to **Q**, can also influence its credibility as being real, being astrophysical, and being alien.

2.2.3 Questionnaire for computing **J**

Experts in a field relevant to a given “signal” may use their judgement to give half points or otherwise interpolate for phenomena that land in between points on the scales below, or to adjust their points based on idiosyncrasies of a given signal that were unanticipated by this questionnaire. Notes are given below the questions to help users with their interpretation.

A “perfect” score on the questionnaire yields A=10, B=10, C=10, giving $J=A+B+C-20=10$, or a 100% probability that the signal is real and alien. For these purposes, it is useful to remember that one point is worth roughly a factor of 3 in confidence, and two points is worth a factor of 10.

On this form, these terms mean:

anthropogenic: Made by humans. Includes radiation from objects made by humans.

artificial: Engineered by intelligent beings

extraterrestrial: Originating outside the Earth. Can but does not definitively imply origin outside the solar system.

instrumental: A product of a measurement instrument itself or its operator, as opposed to something natural or artificial

natural: Not made by intelligent beings (i.e. the opposite of artificial)

terrestrial: Originating from the Earth. Not necessarily artificial. Includes objects that have left the earth - for example, under this definition Voyager 1 and 2 are still terrestrial.

Section A: How real and amenable to study is the phenomenon?

A1) Is there significant uncertainty about whether the phenomenon occurred/occurs at all? For instance, are the data corrupted, is there a significant risk of misunderstanding or transcription error? “Significant” here means more than 10%.

Yes, there is significant uncertainty	A = 6 (Skip rest of A, go to B1)
No, something almost certainly happened	A = 7

(Examples of significant uncertainty: reports of sighting of a UFO or aliens, interpretation of ancient art, telescopic data from amateurs, interpreting other people’s data with little or no documentation or metadata).

A2) How amenable to study is the phenomenon? Award between 0–3 points based upon the repeatability of the phenomena.

x=0: The phenomena has been observed exactly once (e.g. the Wow! Signal).

x=1: The phenomenon has been observed a small but plural number times, either as multiple targets showing similar phenomena, or a single target showing multiple similar events (Examples: claimed laser pulses in SDSS data (Borra & Trottier 2016), discovery of a few Fast Radio Bursts (FRBs) at a single observatory (cf Lorimer 2007))

x=2: The phenomenon has been confirmed to be real and repeated, for instance by multiple groups using a single instrument to observe the phenomenon or by an

additional observation with a different instrument or from a different site. (Examples: FRBs discovered at other observatories, or once several FRBs were known)

x=3: The phenomenon is observed routinely by different groups using different equipment. (Example: FRBs as observed today, see Petroff et al 2016).

$$A = A+x$$

A3) Is the discoverer of the phenomenon the same person/group that predicted that such a phenomenon would indicate the presence of alien intelligence?

The claimants predicted the phenomenon they have “discovered” A=A-1
The claimants have identified a new phenomenon, or one predicted by others. A=A+0

People are natural wishful thinkers, and often see what they want to see, so it gives extra credibility to a claim if the groups doing the prediction and those doing the discovery are not the same.

Section B: How certain are we that the phenomenon is not instrumental?

B1) Does the phenomenon look like a known instrumental or psychological effect?

Yes B=0, go to C1
No B=7

Examples of known instrumental effects: DC channel in a filterbank file, cosmic rays in spectra, lens flare in photograph, known source of noise / bad data,

Examples of known psychological effects: Reports of alien abduction, UFO sightings; subjective, qualitative interpretations of apparent correlations in noisy data.

B2) What chances do the instrument builders / experts in the method / observers of the phenomenon give that the signal is not instrumental?

Award between 0-3 points:

x=0: These experts have not weighed in at all

x=1: These experts give a ~90% chance that it is instrumental (so a ~10% it is real)

x=2: These experts give even odds that it is instrumental

x=3: These experts give less than 10% chance that it is instrumental

$$B=B+x$$

Section C: How certain are we that the phenomenon is not natural or anthropogenic?

C1) Is there good reason to think the phenomenon is a hoax?

Yes C=0 → J=0, end quiz
No C=1

C2) How does a wide community of experts assess the probability that there are any known sources of natural or anthropogenic signal that could explain the phenomenon?

x=0: A wide range of experts agree that the signal is clearly natural/anthropogenic, or said experts have not been consulted

x=1: It is consistent with a common phenomenon

x=3: It is consistent *only* with rare or poorly-understood phenomena

x=6: It is not consistent with any known natural or anthropogenic phenomena (but unknown natural/anthropogenic phenomena could still be the cause)

x=8: Only extraterrestrial, artificial explanations make sense (that is, those requiring non-human design and engineering, for instance: a Dyson sphere, a narrow band carrier wave from an extraterrestrial source, a strictly periodic pulsed laser. In other words: all natural and anthropogenic explanations been ruled out)

x=9: The phenomenon contains information content of clearly intelligent design (i.e. it contains a message; or is an obviously artificial and alien artifact available for close - perhaps robotic - inspection)

C=C+x

Examples of anthropogenic signals: terrestrial radio frequency interference (RFI) for radio observations, terrestrial laser communications, experimental aircraft for well-documented UFO sightings.

===

Now, calculate:

$$J = A + B + C - 20$$

$$\delta = 10^{(J-10)/2}$$

2.3 Interpreting Rio Scores

2.3.1 Interpreting Q

If the signal is truly due to aliens, then the following scheme illustrates the consequence of the discovery:

Q=10: Revolutionary. Everyday life on Earth will change forever.

Q=8-9: The making of an epoch; the future direction of humanity is changed.

Q=6-7: SETI becomes the “study of ETI”. There are good prospects for near-future, limited understanding of ETI.

Q=4-5: Scientifically revolutionary, but of no everyday consequence. Prospects for understanding ETIs remain decades in the future.

Q=0-3: Philosophically ground-breaking, but of limited immediate social or scientific impact. The prospects for understanding ETIs remain unclear.

2.3.2 Interpreting J

The value of J gives reporters a scale on which to compare previous claims of signals or detections to new ones with enough dynamic range to distinguish, say, the Wow! signal, the SDSS lasers, sincere UFO claims, and outright hoaxes. The scale is:

J < 1: No interest warranted

J=1-4: SETI interest potentially warranted; no press interest warranted

J=5-6: SETI interest probably warranted; technical popular press interest potentially warranted

J=7-8: SETI interest definitely warranted; technical popular press interest probably warranted; possible off-beat news item for general press, if expressed with appropriate caveats. If not aliens, still very interesting.

J=9: Significant mainstream press interest warranted, heavy coverage by technical popular press. Broad agreement that the signal *could* be due to aliens.

J=10: Aliens. Front page of every major newspaper.

2.3.3 Interpreting R

We retain the description of R from Rio 1.1:

R=10: Extraordinary

R=9: Outstanding

R=8: Far-reaching

R=7: High

R=6: Noteworthy

R=5: Intermediate

- R=4: Moderate
- R=3: Minor
- R=2: Low
- R=1: Insignificant
- R=0: Nil

3 Distribution of Scores

It is instructive to consider the range of possible scores produced by the new calculator, as was done by Almár & Tarter (2000, 2011) for Rio 1.0/1.1. Figure 2 shows the distribution of possible Q values in the Rio 2.0 scheme. Q delivers values in the range 0-10, with 5 being the median value (the mean is 4.76). Rather than the symmetric Gaussian distribution of Q seen for Rio 1.0/1.1, Q is slightly skewed towards lower values.




Figure 2: The distribution of all possible Q scores in the Rio 2.0 scheme

Almár & Tarter (2000, 2011) did not calculate a δ distribution, although it seems immediately clear that the new distribution is quite different (Figures 3 & 4). The vast majority of answers to the J questionnaire yield J=0, with a sparse distribution of scoring towards the maximum of 10. This is principally due to some of the “deal-breaker” questions regarding instrumental effects and hoaxes. Consequently, the distribution for δ also tends towards low values (with a median of 10^{-5} and mean of 0.0016), as a result of the log-scaling of J, which discriminates finely among signals of low probability of being artificial.




Figure 3: The distribution of J scores in the Rio 2.0 scheme.




Figure 4: The distribution of delta scores in the Rio 2.0 scheme.

Figure 5 shows the resulting distribution of \mathbf{R} , given all possible permutations of \mathbf{Q} and delta. The credibility variable heavily weights the scale towards 0. Indeed, the median is around 5×10^{-5} (the mean is approximately 0.007).




Figure 5: The distribution of Rio scores in the Rio 2.0 scheme

4 Good Practice for Using Rio 2.0

4.1 Using Rio 2.0 to evaluate signals

We intend for Rio 2.0 to be applied by any scientist (and the public if it wishes) to any signal, either their own signal or that of another team. The Rio score of a signal should be updated as new information or analysis arrives. Ideally, when a team publishes a Rio score, it should also publish the answers to its questionnaire, provide a brief explanation as to what factors contributed to the signal receiving this score, and invite the public to attempt their own Rio scores.

We also advocate that all three parameters ($\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{J}, \delta, \mathbf{R}$) be published. A signal with low \mathbf{Q} but high δ may not result in extremely high impact political events, such as discussions of whether to transmit a response, or the sharing of knowledge from an extraterrestrial culture. That does not mean it is not of high philosophical and cultural interest. *Any SETI signal with high δ will mark a watershed between two scientific epochs, regardless of its \mathbf{Q} .*

Broadly speaking, once a speculative signal is detected, there are two possible futures. In the first, the signal may progress up the sequence towards an unverified or verified signal, and achieve a small non-zero Rio score. New information may then come to light that reduces δ , potentially even ruling out the signal as a SETI candidate, and the Rio score

becomes either very low or zero. This in fact is the typical outcome of all past SETI signals, from pulsars to Boyajian's star (Boyajian 2016).

If this occurs, it is important that the team that is analysing the signal make a clear announcement to the media (via various forms of communication), of their signal's current status.

What if a signal defies refutation, and attains the status of 'candidate signal'? Multiple groups should continue to assign Rio scores as more data are collected. A large collection of Rio scores gives the public a useful barometer for measuring the degree of consensus in the community's opinion of a signal, especially if that opinion is deeply divided.

The following principles should be adopted by SETI scientists using Rio:

- i) Score a signal immediately
- ii) Score it repeatedly, as new data arrives
- iii) Have it scored independently, by experts not participating in the observations

Ideally, press releases announcing signals of possible alien origin will include:

- i) The team's Rio score
- ii) At least one Rio score from an independent team

We would encourage science journalists where possible to compute their own score based on the available data. When the public reads an article about SETI signals, they should check whether a Rio score is computed, and ascribe more credence to stories that have multiple Rio scores from inside and outside the collaboration responsible for the signal. We would also encourage the public where possible to compute their own scores, to learn about the verification process for SETI signals, and to see how their scores align with others available for a given news item.

4.2 Evaluating the Effectiveness of Rio 2.0

Despite our best efforts to build an objective Rio Scale, it is clear that there will always remain a subjective element to any attempt to determine a SETI signal's "significance".

In the past, Rio 1.1's objectivity has been evaluated by considering scores for fictional scenarios (Shostak & Almár 2002). The authors validated Rio 2.0 in a similar fashion, computing (Q, J, δ, R) for several fictional signal scenarios, with the resulting scores in relative good agreement. This of course is not particularly surprising, as the authors have all contributed to the scale's production.

The full calibration of Rio 2.0 represents a "chicken-and-egg" problem. To calibrate the scale, it must be widely used by the community to find areas of subjectivity and disagreement. To be widely used, it must be reasonably calibrated. We therefore have decided to take an adaptive approach. We deliberately label this scale "Rio 2.0", as we

expect that the scale (and questionnaires to deliver values) will continue to evolve as the science of SETI continues to evolve.

Hence, we recommend that Rio 2.0 be revisited after an appropriate time interval and a reasonable amount of use by all interested parties. It should then be evaluated for:

- a) Its level of use by SETI practitioners and the media
- b) Its ability to deliver an objective score for test examples

To achieve this, we recommend collecting test score data from users on a set of well-defined fictional examples, as well as survey data regarding the scale's efficacy. For each fictional example, the distribution of scores for each parameter (**Q**, **J**, **δ**, **R**) should be interrogated, in particular the sample mean and standard deviation, as well as the general distribution shape. Combined with a qualitative analysis of reviews/comments from survey respondents, this should provide sufficient calibration data for the next generation Rio scale.

5 Summary

We have revisited the Rio Scale, a numerical tool used by SETI scientists to inform the public of the level of attention or excitement a SETI signal merits. Since Rio was first established seventeen years ago, it has seen steady use by limited sections of the SETI community, and has a respectable (if limited) media profile.

The last seventeen years have seen a significant increase in the number of groups active in SETI, coupled with an explosion in the production of media for public consumption. Stories about SETI are eagerly converted into newspaper articles, blogs and videos, in many notable cases without due diligence being paid to the credibility of the signal.

Our revision of Rio (Rio 2.0) aims to quickly calibrate the public expectations of a reported signal, and to educate them as to how SETI scientists evaluate a signal, from its initial detection through the various verification stages needed to determine if a signal is credibly from extraterrestrial intelligence.

This article details questionnaires for the two parameters that construct the scale, **Q** and **δ**. We have also provided a consistent set of terminology for the SETI community to use when discussing signals, so that the public understands clearly what has been observed, and what level of verification a signal has received.

As the science of SETI evolves, we expect the make-up of the Rio scale to also evolve - we therefore recommend that the scale's use and efficacy be reviewed on an ongoing basis to ensure that Rio remains a highly regarded, objective, widely used tool for communicating with the public regarding SETI signals.

A browser-based version of the questionnaire is available at <https://dh4gan.github.io/rioscale2>, with the source code published on Github³. We have run every possible iteration of each questionnaire and collated the results to determine the distribution of values for **Q**, **δ** and **R**. The majority of questionnaire responses rightly result in a score of **R=0**, reminding us that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.

Acknowledgements

DHF gratefully acknowledges support from the ECOGAL project, grant agreement 291227, funded by the European Research Council under ERC-2011-ADG. The authors thank Kathryn Denning for stimulating discussions. The Center for Exoplanets and Habitable Worlds is supported by the Pennsylvania State University, the Eberly College of Science, and the Pennsylvania Space Grant Consortium. This research has made use of NASA's Astrophysics Data System Bibliographic Services. Breakthrough Listen is managed by the Breakthrough Initiatives, sponsored by the Breakthrough Prize Foundation⁴.

References

- Almár I., Tarter J., (2000), "The discovery of ETI as a high-consequence, low-probability event", Paper #IAA-00-IAA9.2.01, 51st International Astronautical Congress, Rio
- Almár I., (2001), "How the Rio Scale should be improved", Paper #IAA-00-IAA9.2.01, presented to the 29th Review Meeting on SETI, 52nd International Astronautical Congress, Toulouse
- Almár I., Tarter J., (2011), "The discovery of ETI as a high-consequence, low-probability event", *Acta Astronautica*, 68, pp 358-361
- Almár I., (2011), "SETI and astrobiology: The Rio Scale and the London Scale", *Acta Astronautica*, 69, pp 899-904
- Borra E.F, Trottier E., (2016) "Discovery of Peculiar Periodic Spectral Modulations in a Small Fraction of Solar-type Stars", *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 128, pp. 114201
- Boyajian T.S., LaCourse D.M., Rappaport S.A., Fabrycky D., Fischer D.A., Gandolfi D., Kennedy G. M., Korhonen H., Liu M. C., Moor A., Olah K., Vida K., Wyatt M. C., Best W. M. J., Brewer J., Ciesla F. , Csák B., Deeg H. J., Dupuy T. J., Handler G., Heng K., Howell S. B., Ishikawa S. T., Kovács J., Kozakis T., Kriskovics L., Lehtinen J., Lintott C., Lynn S., Nespral D., Nikbakhsh S., Schawinski K., Schmitt J. R., Smith A. M., Szabo Gy., Szabo R. , Viuhio J., Wang J., Weiksnar A., Bosch M., Connors J. L., Goodman S., Green G., Hoekstra

³ <https://github.com/dh4gan/rioscale2>

⁴ <http://breakthroughinitiatives.org>

- A. J., Jebson T., Jek K. J., Omohundro M. R., Schwengeler H. M., Szewczyk A., (2016), "Planet Hunters IX. KIC 8462852 – where's the flux?", Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 457, pp 3988–4004
- Cocconi G., Morrison P., (1959), "Searching for interstellar communications", Nature, 184, pp 844-846
- Ekers R., (2002), "SETI 2020: A Roadmap for the search for extraterrestrial intelligence", SETI press, 549 p
- Forgan D., (2013), "On the Possibility of Detecting Class A Stellar Engines Using Exoplanet Transit Curves", J. Br. Interplanet. Soc., 66, pp 144-154
- Forgan D., Scholz A., (2016), "#FoundThem - 21st Century Pre-Search and Post-Detection SETI Protocols for Social and Digital Media', Acta Astronautica, 126, pp 312-315
- Gray R.H., Ellingsen S., (2002), "A Search for Periodic Emissions at the Wow Locale", The Astrophysical Journal, 578, pp 967-971
- GlobalStats StatCounter (2016), press release: "Mobile and tablet internet usage exceeds desktop for first time worldwide", <http://gs.statcounter.com/press/mobile-and-tablet-internet-usage-exceeds-desktop-for-first-time-worldwide>, accessed 24/02/2017
- Isaacson, H, Siemion, A.P.V., Marcy, G.W., Lebofsky, M., Price, D.C., MacMahon, D., Croft, S., DeBoer, D., Hickish, J., Werthimer, D., Sheikh, S., Hellbourg, G., Enriquez, J. E., (2017), "The Breakthrough Listen Search for Intelligent Life: Target Selection of Nearby Stars and Galaxies", PASP, 129, 975, pp 054501
- Korpela E.J., Sallmen S.M., Greene D.L., (2015), "MODELING INDICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY IN PLANETARY TRANSIT LIGHT CURVES—DARK-SIDE ILLUMINATION", The Astrophysical Journal, 809, article id 139
- Lorimer D. R., Bailes M., McLaughlin M. A., Narkevic D. J., Crawford F., (2007), "A Bright Millisecond Radio Burst of Extragalactic Origin", Science, 318, pp 777-780
- Morrison P., Billingham J., Wolfe J., (1977), "The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, SETI", NASA Special Publication
- Ofcom, (2015), "The Communications Market Report", https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/20668/cmr_uk_2015.pdf, accessed 24/02/2017
- Penny A.J., (2013), "The SETI episode in the 1967 discovery of pulsars", The European Physical Journal H, 38, pp 535-547

Petroff E., Barr E. D., Jameson A. Keane E. F., Bailes M., Kramer M., Morello V., Tabbara D., van Straten W., (2016), "FRBCAT: The Fast Radio Burst Catalogue", Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 33, id e045

Pew Research Center (2015), Report:"Smartphone use in 2015", http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/03/PI_Smartphones_0401151.pdf, accessed 24/02/2017

Schwartz R., Townes C., (1961), "Interstellar and Interplanetary Communication by Optical Masers", Nature, 190, pp 205-208

Shostak S., Almár I., (2002), "The Rio Scale Applied to Fictional SETI Detections", presented to 34th COSPAR Assembly, Houston, abstract id 363

Tellis, N.K.; Marcy, G.W., (2017), "A Search for Laser Emission with Megawatt Thresholds from 5600 FGKM Stars", ApJ, submitted, arXiv:1704.02535

Wright J.T., Cartier K.M.S., Zhao, M. Jontof-Hutter, D. Ford E.B., (2015)
"THE \hat{G} SEARCH FOR EXTRATERRESTRIAL CIVILIZATIONS WITH LARGE ENERGY SUPPLIES. IV. THE SIGNATURES AND INFORMATION CONTENT OF TRANSITING MEGASTRUCTURES", The Astrophysical Journal, 816, article id 17

Wright J.T., (2017), "Exoplanets and SETI", Invited Review, arXiv:1707.02175