

# ANNEX

## MANDATED AUTHORSHIP – CLARIFICATION FOR COSTS AND CLASSIFICATION

### Offline Forensic Reasoning Platform

---

#### 1. Purpose of This Annex

This annex clarifies the circumstances of authorship of the Offline Forensic Reasoning Platform **solely for the purposes of cost assessment, proportionality, and classification**.

It is intended to prevent mischaracterisation of the work as discretionary, elective, or expressive activity.

This annex does **not** address liability, causation, merits, or outcome.

---

#### 2. Authorship

The platform was authored by a single individual.

Authorship arose **as a matter of necessity**, not preference.

The system was not authored as personal preparation, advocacy drafting, or narrative compilation.

---

#### 3. Circumstances Giving Rise to Mandated Authorship

At the time the work was undertaken:

- the evidential material extended across multiple institutional domains and time periods;
- no institutional or professional mechanism existed that could, within required timeframes:
  - preserve provenance adequately,
  - reconcile cross-domain chronology,
  - operate safely offline on restricted professional systems,
  - or provide defensible auditability under adversarial review;
- delegation to third parties was not realistically possible without:
  - loss of evidential integrity,
  - delay incompatible with procedural requirements,
  - or uncontrolled reinterpretation of source material.

In those circumstances, authorship was **functionally unavoidable**.

---

## 4. Constraints Governing the Work

The platform was developed under material constraints which directly shaped its architecture, including:

- single-author execution;
- absence of a development team or institutional tooling;
- no build pipeline or framework dependencies;
- operation within locked-down or offline professional environments;
- requirement for deterministic behaviour across machines;
- requirement for traceability, auditability, and preservation of historical states.

The system's structure reflects compliance with those constraints.

---

## 5. Evidence of Professional Self-Limitation

The platform exhibits deliberate self-limitation consistent with forensic or expert infrastructure, including:

- strict separation between primary evidence and analytical representation;
- preservation of original source material without mutation;
- deterministic navigation and rendering;
- exclusion of collaborative editing and inline annotation;
- preservation of historical builds rather than retrospective alteration;
- internal documentation recording architectural rationale and limits.

These characteristics are inconsistent with casual, narrative, or expressive preparation.

---

## 6. Relevance to Cost Assessment

For the purposes of CPR 44.3 and PD 44 §§5–9:

- the fact that the platform was self-authored does **not** reduce its reasonable replacement cost;
- the appropriate valuation measure remains the cost a reasonably competent professional team would incur to reproduce equivalent:
  - functionality,
  - integrity,
  - governance,
  - auditability,
  - and adversarial survivability.

Authorship does not alter the nature or scale of the work required to reproduce the system.

---

## 7. Matters Not Asserted

This annex does not assert:

- expert status;
- special insight;
- immunity from critique;
- correctness of conclusions.

It asserts only that authorship was **mandated by necessity**, and that classification and cost assessment should proceed by reference to **observable structure and function**, not assumptions about motive.

---

## 8. Conclusion

This annex exists to prevent a specific analytical error:  
the conflation of **authorship circumstances** with **system character**.

The Offline Forensic Reasoning Platform should be assessed as forensic infrastructure produced under constraint, not as discretionary personal preparation.