MP-FRS

Multi-Platform Forensic Reconstruction System

White Paper — General Release

PW Data Systems · April 2026

The Completion of Something New

This paper announces the completion of a multi-case forensic reconstruction infrastructure whose analytical implications for law and governance have not previously existed in this form.

The single-case platform — a forensic reconstruction environment for one individual's cross-domain institutional record — has been publicly documented and is operational. That is not the news.

The news is what has been built around it: an authoring system that produces independently authored forensic reconstructions to a shared grammar, and a registry architecture that makes those reconstructions directly comparable without requiring any central analytical authority, any aggregated database, or any surrender of the individual case's evidential integrity.

The infrastructure is complete. The analytical surface it opens is described below.

What a Completed Forensic Reconstruction Contains

When an author completes a forensic reconstruction using MP-FRS, the output is a structured evidential environment held in a single directory — the case corpus. That directory contains the complete temporal graph of the case: every primary document, every classified event, every cross-reference, every legislative test, every cause of action, all structured to a common grammar and navigable through six interconnected surfaces.

The corpus is self-contained. It requires no external system to read it. It requires no installation. It operates in any standard browser from a local file system. A reviewer opening that directory encounters a deterministic evidential environment that presents the same material in the same structure regardless of platform, regardless of reviewer, regardless of when it is opened.

Every structural claim in the corpus is backed by a committed entry with attached primary documents. The grammar cannot be populated with assertion. It requires evidential grounding at every node. This is not a policy. It is an architectural property: fabricated chains collapse when traversed because the nodes they require do not exist in the corpus with supporting documents.

The Registry: What Changes When Cases Can Be Seen Together

A single completed forensic reconstruction is a forensic instrument. It sequences evidence, classifies events by structural role, and makes the architecture of one institutional failure visible to any reviewer who follows the temporal graph in order. That is substantial. It is also bounded. The chain it reveals is the chain of one case.

The multi-case registry changes the analytical register entirely.

To bring a completed case into a registry, a body with analytical responsibility collects the case corpus — a single directory containing the complete evidential environment the author has already produced. No reformatting. No migration. No central database. No API integration. No requirement on the author beyond the work they have already done for their own purposes. The grammar is already in the corpus. The structure is already there. The shell already knows how to read it.

When independent case corpora are held in the same registry, three categories of structural observation become available that are invisible at single-case resolution.

Load-bearing joints

Nodes that carry multiple chains from multiple domains within a single case appear significant but their cross-case significance is not apparent in isolation. When multiple cases are in the registry, nodes that recur across cases — the same institutional mechanism, the same convergence point, the same actor in the same structural position — become identifiable as load-bearing joints in the wider institutional architecture. These are the points where structural intervention would be most effective, because they are held in place by multiple independent chains simultaneously. A case-by-case approach addresses downstream effects. A load-bearing joint analysis identifies where the structure itself requires attention.

Route closures

Within a single case, a fracture in an escalation path — a complaint routed to a body that absorbs it without producing change, an appeal blocked at a specific stage, a referral returned to the body complained about — may appear contingent. When the same fracture recurs at the same structural position across multiple independent cases, it is no longer contingent. It is a route closure: a systematic property of the institutional architecture that blocks certain propagations regardless of their individual merits. Route closures are what distinguish institutional policy from individual conduct. The registry makes the unwritten policy visible.

Temporal clustering

Events that cluster unusually tightly across independent cases within the same narrow window — the same type of institutional action appearing across unrelated matters in the same period — indicate coordinated institutional response to a perceived pressure

rather than the coincidental expression of individual conduct. This signal is not detectable in any single case. It requires the multi-case surface to become visible.

What This Means for Law and Governance

No court, tribunal, ombudsman, or oversight body currently collects the structural legal intelligence that a multi-case registry produces. Their jurisdiction is case-specific. Their outputs are individual determinations. The patterns that exist across cases are invisible to them because no instrument exists within their architecture to surface those patterns.

MP-FRS is that instrument.

A legislative provision that appears consistently across multiple independent cases and that consistently fails at the same stage of the institutional process is a provision whose enforcement architecture is deficient. That is governance intelligence of a kind that Parliament and regulatory bodies currently have no systematic means of gathering. It derives entirely from what individual authors have determined, documented, and verified against primary sources — not from what any analytical system has concluded.

A governance body, oversight committee, law commission working group, or public inquiry with access to a registry of completed forensic reconstructions does not need to commission new investigation. The investigation has been done. The evidence is already structured. The grammar is already applied. The cross-case patterns are available the moment the corpora are collected into a registry and the shell is pointed at them.

The analytical capability at governance scale is latent in every completed case. It does not require new infrastructure. It requires only that the cases be collected.

The Authoring System as Democratic Infrastructure

The most significant governance property of MP-FRS is the reproducibility of its authoring system by individual authors working with their own evidential material.

Every major institutional failure chain that has been publicly recognised — Hillsborough, Post Office Horizon, Windrush, Grenfell, Mid Staffordshire — required either a public inquiry or sustained investigative journalism to become visible. Both require institutional support, funding, and public recognition before the work can begin.

The MP-FRS authoring system requires none of these. An individual with a documented evidential record, access to a browser, and the discipline to apply the grammar can produce a structured, evidentially grounded reconstruction that is directly comparable to the outputs of any other author using the same system — without requiring the institutional apparatus that makes public inquiries possible.

This is not a challenge to public inquiries. It is a complement to them. An individual who has completed a forensic reconstruction using MP-FRS arrives at any institutional process — tribunal, court, ombudsman, inquiry — with a structured, grammar-governed,

evidentially grounded record that constrains how the sequence can be interpreted. The grammar cannot be argued with. The documents are attached. The chain is traceable.

At registry scale, the aggregate of those individual reconstructions provides something that no existing institutional intelligence system produces: a structural map of which institutional mechanisms are generating cross-domain failures, which legislative frameworks are being engaged and blocked, and where in the institutional architecture the load-bearing joints of systemic failure are located.

The infrastructure for producing that map does not need to be built. It is operational. The cases that populate the registry are being authored now, independently, by individuals who need the instrument for their own purposes. The governance application is a consequence of the architecture, not an addition to it.

The Standard of Record

The governing principle of MP-FRS — *any system that cannot survive being replayed in strict temporal order is not a system of record, it is a system of concealment* — is not only a design principle for the forensic reconstruction platform.

Applied to institutional conduct generally, the standard asks: if this institution's decisions, and the information it held at each decision point, were replayed in strict temporal order, would the conduct it exhibited be the conduct that the information available to it warranted?

A governance architecture that adopts this standard, and that uses MP-FRS outputs as the instrument for testing compliance with it, has a mechanism for accountability that is structural rather than adversarial, evidential rather than political, and reproducible rather than dependent on the quality of any individual inquiry or investigation.

The infrastructure exists. The grammar is validated. The outputs are being produced. The cases are accumulating.

The question for law and governance is not whether this capability is available.

It is what is done with it.