Structural Audit Summary

Forensic Reasoning Platform (Workspace-Level Assessment)

1. System Classification

The platform is **not** a website, document bundle, CMS, or publication tool.
It is a **governed forensic reasoning workspace** designed for evidential navigation, cross-domain reconciliation, and audit-safe review under adversarial conditions.

Misclassification Risk: High
Static or UX-based review frameworks will reliably misidentify system intent.

2. Architectural Model

- **Closed workspace** with controlled entry points
- **Polycentric navigation** (Shell panels, Chronology engine, Appendices, Provenance)
- **Non-linear by design**; no canonical reading path
- **Context-preserving windows** (named instances) enforce cognitive separation between analysis, reference, and indexing

Assessment: Architecturally coherent and internally consistent.

3. Chronology Engine (Structural Spine)

- Chronology is a **runtime-constructed index**, not a static document
- Entries are ID-normalised dynamically and cross-linked across domains (civil, police, NHS, public, appendices)
- Chronology is explicitly declared **authoritative over time**, with forward extensibility

Critical Finding:
Any attempt to validate chronology via static inspection constitutes methodological error.

4. Provenance & Evidential Integrity

- Evidence is preserved **exactly as received**
- Provenance is distributed and explicit (manifest, build logs, authorship records, codebase viewer)

- No renaming, repackaging, or silent normalisation of evidential material

Assessment: Strong forensic discipline; high resistance to post-hoc narrative manipulation.

---

5. Code & Runtime Behaviour

- JavaScript usage is **minimal and governance-focused**
  - Navigation
  - ID resolution
  - Highlighting
  - Print isolation
- No external dependencies
- No data mutation, inference, analytics, or tracking

Conclusion:
This is governance and navigation code, not application logic.

---

6. Print & Export Model

- Print functions **clone the active runtime state**
- No re-rendering or re-ordering of content
- Printed output represents a **view**, not a reconstructed document

Assessment: Correct forensic export model; incompatible with document-centric expectations.

---

7. Failure Modes (Known & Documented)

Primary failure mode is **observer error**, including:

- Static audits of runtime structures
- Checklist-based compliance reviews
- UX simplification attempts applied to evidential systems

Mitigations are explicitly documented (build logs, caveats, Cognitive Ethogram).

---

8. Governance Intent

The platform intentionally:

- Resists automation-led summarisation
- Preserves contradiction and provenance
- Prioritises evidential integrity over convenience or accessibility norms

This is appropriate and proportionate given adversarial context.

Overall Structural Verdict

Structurally sound. Fit for adversarial forensic review.

The platform is internally coherent, deliberately constrained, and correctly engineered for its stated purpose.
Negative assessments based on usability, linearity, or static validation reflect **reviewer tooling limits**, not platform defects.