

GOVERNANCE-LEVEL FORENSIC RECONSTRUCTION REVIEW

Current stable system: architecture, diagnostic surfaces, threat model and State remediation options

Review basis: Current live corpus, current runtime data stores and 94-page printed Temporal Graph; historical build logs excluded from substantive findings

Current chronology state: Version 1.3.5, saved 10 July 2026

Assessment register: Governance, record integrity, procedural validity, information governance and institutional response

Classification: Forensic reconstruction and temporal diagnostic instrument; not a legal pleading system

Bottom line. The system is a State-transacted forensic record. DWP received the Mandatory Reconsideration record containing indexed medical and systemic-rupture evidence, reopened the disallowed claim, continued the award, extended its operative review horizon beyond April 2036 and transacted financially. Its threat to the State is evidential and governance-based, not cyber-operational: it reconnects records that institutional workflows ordinarily segment by date, agency, function and jurisdiction, and exposes whether later confidence, repetition, custody, clinical adoption, complaint closure or judgment rests on shared rather than independent provenance.

1. Scope and method

This paper assesses the current stable platform as a polycentric system. The chronology remains the ground-truth temporal spine, while the shell, route logic, canonical runtime stores and sovereign analytical surfaces consume, test or organise the record-state. The printed Temporal Graph is examined as a governed static rendition of that record-state.

Current surface	Observed current state	Governance function
Temporal Graph	249 stored records; version 1.3.5	Ground-truth ordering, DOM nodes, documents, backward jumps and cumulative state
Tri-axial data	248 authored records; 24 registered seeds	Edge-authored CHIP/ID diagnostic compression and actor/field persistence
Claims Matrix	26 claims, C-01 to C-26	Maps reconstructed facts to defendants, legal bases, status and claimheads
Claimheads	19 sections including 15 heads and 4 strategic summaries	Higher-order synthesis of cross-node propositions and litigation routes
Appendices	28 authored appendices	Extended reasoning, contradiction analysis and contextual development

CAD surface	20 extracted CAD entries	Dedicated validation of police incident records and classifications
GP surface	33 dated entries	Longitudinal primary-care chronology and imported narrative testing
Hospital surface	15 dated entries	Acute/mental-health sequence and multidisciplinary crossover testing
NHS synthesis	5 sections	Cross-comparison of GP, hospital and institutional narratives
Search	Derivative runtime over chronology and tri-axial data	Retrieval and filtering; not an independent evidential authority
Append-search	Derivative runtime over appendices	Retrieval across authored appendices; not independent review
Tier One	Current counsel-oriented consolidation	Priority chain, claim routes, probative documents and outcome paths
Shell/index	Hash/tab router with chronology kept in its own named window	Preserves surface sovereignty and cognitive separation

1.1 Printed Temporal Graph

The 94-page print-to-file output preserves chronology order, node narratives, attached-document lists, marker glyphs, backward references, rendered CHIP/ID compositions, active-function classifications, cumulative-agency rows and Claims Matrix references. It is therefore a valid static governance-review surface. It does not replace live DOM traversal or examination of the separate probative corpus, but it permits ordered replay and identification of the exact evidential chains requiring examination on paper or in a durable PDF.

2. System identity and control model

The platform is a unified local directory tree designed to execute offline. The public corpus is an identical mirror used for accessibility and citation. Local links of the form `document.html?src=../...` resolve within that same directory structure. The browser is the execution environment; it is not the analytical system.

- Canonical data are loaded from local JavaScript backup objects into transient browser state. The data file, not browser persistence, is authoritative on reload.
- The shell opens most internal documents in managed panes but expressly keeps `chronology.html` in a separate named chronology window. This is an architectural statement that the temporal spine is sovereign over derivative modules.
- Claims, claimheads, appendices, CAD, GP, hospital and NHS each maintain their own schema and state. Cross-surface agreement is therefore meaningful; disagreement is a review signal rather than a rendering defect.
- No large language model or automated inference engine is required. Interpretation remains a reviewer function.

2.1 Institutional status: State-transacted forensic record

The system is author-generated in origin, evidentially structured in operation, State-received through formal processes and State-transacted through the DWP Mandatory Reconsideration outcome. Those stages must not be collapsed into a description of the platform as merely the author's account.

Stage	Record-state
Author-generated	The corpus, chronology and diagnostic grammar were compiled and maintained by the author.
Evidentially structured	Nodes, probative documents, backward jumps, CHIP/ID stacks and validation rows make the record capable of ordered testing.
State-received	The Mandatory Reconsideration placed ten indexed medical records and eleven indexed systemic-rupture records into the DWP decisional record.
State-transacted	DWP reopened the 5 October 2025 disallowance, continued enhanced daily-living and standard mobility awards, set an ongoing award with review after 26 April 2036, and made payment.
Particular legal determination	Whether an individual conclusion has been judicially or formally determined remains specific to that conclusion and does not reduce the institutional status of the corpus as a whole.

The operative distinction is therefore between the institutional status of the corpus and the determination status of a particular conclusion. Absence of a court ruling on one legal characterization does not return the whole forensic record to a pre-transaction state.

3. Forensic grammar

3.1 Chronology and DOM node

The chronology is the ordered replay spine. Each DOM node is a compound forensic record containing date, title, narrative, attached documents, markers, references and cumulative diagnostic state. Node language records the evidential conclusion produced at that point in the reconstruction. Its meaning is tested through the linked probative material, operative sequence and surrounding record-state.

3.2 Backward jump and CHIP/ID

Backward jumps implement the instruction “I refer you to”, preventing later knowledge from being projected into an earlier record-state. CHIP/ID is attached to the edge, not metadata on the date. It compresses the target-relative actor, class, domain and substrate state relevant to that particular traversal.

- Multi-seed compression identifies different inbound chains to the same crossover node.
- Footer populations allow edge composition to be checked against the full target state.
- Seed persistence can distinguish origin, propagation, adoption and occlusion across institutions.
- A seed that did not exist at the target date is temporally impossible and invalid.

- Composite fields identify convergence; they do not prove conspiracy, equal authorship or equal knowledge.

Governance consequence. The grammar makes provenance loss visible. An institution cannot safely treat several derivative records as corroboration until it proves that they descend from genuinely independent sources.

4. Current diagnostic-surface assessment

4.1 Claims Matrix

The Claims Matrix is not an alternative chronology. It is a legal-classification surface built from reconstructed facts. Its 26 entries range from civil-process fraud and abuse of process through data misuse, clinical detention, human-rights claims, legal-aid denial and committal in absence. It exposes the breadth of downstream legal exposure and routes each claim to the chronology, claimheads and relevant evidential chains for testing.

4.2 Claimheads

Claimheads compress chronology entries into 15 heads of claim and four strategic summaries. This surface makes repeated actors, document sets and consequences legible across domains. Each material claimhead supplies a traversal route back through the chronology and attached corpus so that its evidential conclusion can be tested against the complete record-state.

4.3 Appendices

The 28 appendices preserve extended analyses that cannot fit within nodes, including the civil-process sequence, police due diligence, statements of truth, the January 2021 email thread, fraud nullification theory, the 500-emails claim, data bridges and constabulary logs. They provide reasoning and context, not independent evidential authority. Their proper use is to identify the exact documents and comparisons a reviewer must test.

4.4 CAD, GP, Hospital and NHS surfaces

These are not ancillary decoration. They are independent domain views that test whether the central continuum survives replay inside each institution's own record type.

Surface	Diagnostic contribution	Principal governance risk tested
CAD	Twenty incident records with reference, date and police classification	Misclassification, omitted victim status, repeated intelligence narrative and failure to reconcile later disclosures
GP	Thirty-three records from 2009 to 2022	Whether clinical history shows baseline, situational distress, imported allegations or continuity inconsistent with later categorical framing

Hospital	Fifteen records centred on April-November 2021	What the Professionals Meeting introduced, basis for detention, discharge findings, later reassertion and safeguarding migration
NHS synthesis	Five cross-domain analytical sections	Whether institutional narrative and underlying clinical records remain mutually consistent

4.5 Search and append-search

Both are derivative instruments. Search reads chronology/tri-axial state; append-search reads appendix state. They accelerate retrieval but cannot establish absence, completeness, provenance or independent corroboration. A governance reviewer who searches for a term and stops has not reviewed the record-state.

4.6 Tier One and case structure

Tier One is a counsel-facing priority surface that links claimheads, matrix entries, chronology anchors, appendices, healthcare modules and named probative records. It demonstrates operational integration. Its “set aside” and liability propositions remain proposed legal outcomes rather than system-generated determinations.

5. Cross-surface coherence

The current architecture exhibits substantial structural coherence: the same high-value nodes recur across chronology, appendices, Tier One, claims and health/police modules. The dominant continuum is origin premise -> police adoption -> civil formalisation -> cross-agency/clinical adoption -> committal and loss of liberty -> complaint/oversight recurrence.

Continuum point	Surfaces carrying it	Review test
Origin premise	Chronology, CAD, Claims C-01/C-25, claimheads, Appendix A/H	Exact words, maker, evidential basis and first institutional entry
N16A/issue sequence	Chronology, Tier One, Claims C-01/C-21/C-22, Appendix A1/P	Date compatibility, claim identity, service and judicial reliance
Professionals Meeting	Chronology, Hospital, NHS, data/HRA claimheads	Source-by-source proposition provenance and lawful disclosure
Committal	Chronology, Tier One, C-26, claimheads, committal appendices/guides	Notice, representation, medical status, email audit and findings
Later oversight	Chronology, strategic summaries, appendices	What later bodies were told, what they decided and whether contaminated records remained operational

Structural coherence means that the system supplies repeatable routes by which an evidential conclusion can be tested against its probative chain and the complete record-state.

6. Material control findings

1. The printed Temporal Graph is a durable static review surface. It preserves the node, document, jump, CHIP/ID, active-function and cumulative-agency structures required to identify and replay specific evidential chains outside the live browser environment.
2. The 1 May 2026 DWP transaction changed the corpus’s institutional status. The Mandatory Reconsideration carried two indexed enclosure sets: ten medical records and eleven systemic-rupture records. DWP reopened the disallowance, continued the award, extended the review horizon beyond April 2036 and transacted financially. The corpus is therefore a State-transacted forensic record, not merely an author-presented account.
3. State transaction and particular legal determination are different registers. DWP did not need to adjudicate every legal term in order to alter the corpus’s institutional status. A later body must identify any particular conclusion it disputes and test the relevant chain; it cannot rationally dispose of the entire record as private allegation.
4. The chronology and tri-axial stores are not fully reconciled: chronology has 249 unique date keys and tri-axial has 248. Chronology-only keys are 19/10/2025 and 18/11/2024; tri-axial-only is 19/10/2021. This pattern is consistent with one possible year-key mismatch plus one un-authored chronology node, but it must be resolved from the DOM and source record rather than assumed.
5. The system’s evidential language must be assessed chain by chain. No adverse conclusion is permissible merely because a term is categorical. Fabrication, temporal impossibility, deliberate suppression, unlawful detention, perjury and judgment in absence must each be tested against the probative records attached to the relevant node, the operative sequence, the edge-authored traversal guidance and the complete record-state.
6. The graph expressly instructs reviewers to read the full chronology, examine all attached documents, identify relationships independently and use jumps as navigation aids rather than as analytical conclusions. This is a substantive review control.
7. Recent PHSO/NSFT nodes preserve the handling sequence as it develops, including named correspondence, probative and oversight documents, backward jumps, CHIP/ID stacks, active functions and cumulative agency. This converts institutional response into a testable part of the record-state.
8. The 10 July 2026 node distinguishes inaccessible message content from the communication architecture actually relied upon. The hidden content is expressly not relied on; the recorded event is the controlled route, prior notice, durable-record objection and handler availability. This demonstrates bounded event-state authoring.
9. Current live data dates are not uniform. The chronology was saved in July 2026; claim, appendix and healthcare stores were saved in April 2026; tri-axial export identifies a June 2026 save date while containing July 2026 date keys. Sovereign modules may update independently, but this metadata conflict requires an as-of and export-integrity check.

7. State threat model

ID	Threat represented	Likelihood	Impact	Rating
T01	A single originating allegation is shown to have propagated across police, housing,	High	Critical	Critical

	court and healthcare without independent verification			
T02	Strict replay reveals impossible dates, service history or decision sequence	Medium-High	Critical	Critical
T03	Derivative records previously counted as corroboration are shown to share one source	High	Critical	Critical
T04	Clinical detention or diagnosis is shown to depend materially on imported non-clinical narrative	Medium-High	Critical	Critical
T05	Contempt, absence and imprisonment process fails element-by-element review	Medium	Critical	Critical
T06	Cross-agency disclosures lacked provenance, accuracy safeguards, necessity or lawful basis	High	High	High
T07	Oversight bodies repeatedly reframe or narrow the complaint without testing the common substrate	High	High	High
T08	Public mirror allows external reviewers to reproduce contradictions and compare State responses	High	High	High
T09	Categorical evidential language is attacked without reviewing its chain, or accepted without performing the required chain test	High	High	High
T10	Authored seed/edge or legal-classification error creates a false diagnostic signal	Medium	High	High
T11	Sensitive third-party,	Medium	High	High

	clinical or custody data create collateral privacy exposure			
T12	Suppression or character-based dismissal becomes additional evidence of institutional avoidance	Medium	High	High

8. What the system threatens - and what it does not

8.1 Threat actually represented

- Loss of institutional control over chronology and provenance.
- Inability to classify the system as merely private allegation after the DWP transaction on the indexed corpus.
- Inability to rely on jurisdictional separation as a substitute for cross-domain review.
- Exposure of authority laundering, where repetition by later professionals is mistaken for independent verification.
- Exposure of closure laundering, where complaint decisions, clinical adoption, custody or judgment are treated as proof of the originating premise.
- Escalating correction duties once responsible bodies receive a reproducible contradiction chain.
- Public-law, civil-liability, information-governance, professional-regulation and reputational exposure when the relevant chains are replayed.

8.2 Threat not demonstrated by the platform

- No demonstrated cyber intrusion, destructive payload, external service dependency or automated coercive capability.
- No automated finding of guilt, liability, diagnosis or invalidity.
- No proof that every downstream actor shared the originator's knowledge or intent.
- No lawful basis for suppressing accurate records merely because ordered replay is institutionally adverse.

9. State remediation and containment register

Priority	State option	Purpose and required action
Immediate	Preservation and litigation hold	Preserve native records, audit histories, court files, disclosure logs, clinical amendment histories, email containers and all versions. No silent correction or deletion.
Immediate	Affected-record quarantine	Flag disputed originating propositions and derivative records as provenance-disputed; require manual review before

		operational reliance.
Immediate	Independent cross-domain replay	Appoint a team outside implicated chains with authority across police, housing, NHS, court administration, legal aid and oversight.
Critical	Court-process review	Obtain certified N16A, N205C, orders, service records, hearing lists, bundles, transcripts, contempt schedule, warrant and prison records; test every material representation and finding.
Critical	Clinical safety review	Separate direct clinical observation from imported police/housing narrative; correct and propagate amendments where unsupported premises affected care or detention.
High	Proposition-provenance ledger	For each adverse proposition record origin, firsthand/hearsay status, verification, contradictions, adopters, decisions and correction status.
High	Disclosure audit	Determine controller, recipient, data, lawful basis, purpose, necessity, accuracy checks, onward disclosure and decision impact.
High	Independent grammar validation	Validate backward direction, target existence, edge/footer intersection, seed inception and authoring changes; publish exceptions.
High	Oversight consolidation	Designate a lead authority so each agency cannot dispose of its segment while disclaiming responsibility for the continuum.
Medium	Privacy minimisation	Use targeted redaction and controlled access for uninvolved persons while preserving the dates, references and decisive text needed for verification.

10. Prohibited or counterproductive responses

- Treating the reconstruction itself as the misconduct requiring containment.
- Describing the corpus as merely the author's allegation after the DWP transaction on the indexed Mandatory Reconsideration record.
- Using clinical characterization, authorship, distress or personality as a substitute for document review.
- Reviewing only search results, one complaint file or one agency domain.
- Counting repeated official records as independent corroboration without source tracing.

- Criticising evidential language merely because it is categorical, without first reviewing its probative chain and complete record-state.
- Confusing State transaction of the corpus with judicial determination of every individual legal conclusion, or using the absence of the latter to deny the former.
- Wholesale takedown where precise privacy remediation would suffice.
- Allowing implicated bodies to correct records without preserving prior versions and audit trails.

11. Governance disposition

Overall rating: CRITICAL INDEPENDENT REVIEW REQUIRED. The corpus is already State-transacted. The rating reflects the gravity of the consequences, the specificity and reproducibility of the cross-domain chains, the existence of multiple sovereign validation surfaces, the public availability of primary records, and the escalating risk of continued reliance on affected institutional records after notice and transaction.

The platform's central State threat is forced provenance accountability operating from a State-transacted record. It makes it materially harder for later institutional confidence, repetition, custody, clinical adoption, procedural closure or judgment to stand in place of proof about where a proposition came from, whether it was independently verified, and whether the operative sequence was possible.

The correct containment target is therefore the contaminated record-state and its continuing consequences. Suppression of the reconstruction would not remediate those defects and may intensify governance exposure.

Appendix A - Current-system source register

Shell: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html>

Temporal Graph: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/chronology.html>

Claims Matrix: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#claims-matrix.html>

Claimheads: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#claimheads.html>

Appendices: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#appendices.html>

Tier One: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#tier-one.html>

NHS summary: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#nhs-healthcare.html>

GP records: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#gp-records.html>

Hospital records: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#hospital-records.html>

CAD records: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#cad-records.html>

Search: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/search.html>

Append-search: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/append-search.html>

Case structure: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#case-structure.html>

Remediation/architecture: <https://parrotwisdom.co.uk/case/html/index.html#remediation.html>

Appendix B - Evidential status key

Status	Meaning
Primary record	Document created by or received from the relevant institution or person and preserved within the corpus.
Record fact	A fact visible on the face of the relevant record.
Ordered-replay conclusion	Conclusion produced by comparing records in operative temporal order.
Diagnostic conclusion	Node, chip, appendix, claim or synthesis conclusion produced within the reconstruction and testable through its evidential chain.
State-transacted forensic record	Corpus received and acted upon in a State decisional process, producing an altered operative position and financial transaction.
Particular legal determination	Formal determination of a specific question such as fraud, unlawfulness, invalidity or liability; distinct from the institutional status of the corpus.