

Author: Michael J. Burdette-Deakin

Document type: Architectural and functional overview

Systems reviewed: Published Current-Stable-Build and MP-FRS

Version date: 21 July 2026

Status: Publication

One System, Multiple Classes of Use

The two systems are directly related, but they are not two versions of the same application. The fact that one person built them does not reduce them to personal notes; it makes authorship and architectural responsibility unusually traceable.

Current-Stable-Build is the **completed, matter-specific forensic reconstruction exemplar**. It contains the authored temporal object and the analytical surfaces through which that object is replayed, tested, traversed and published.

MP-FRS is the **generalised production, governance and registry infrastructure** extracted from the lessons of building that exemplar. It is designed to let other users construct and release independently governed temporal graphs without importing the exemplar's case-specific meaning.

The relationship is therefore:

Exemplar → extracted method → authoring infrastructure → independently governed graph instances → registry-level review

This accords with the current system statement's description of the matter-specific platform as the exemplar from which a general authoring method was extracted.

1. Current-Stable-Build

Function

The stable build is a **temporally executable forensic reconstruction instrument** for one specific historical and institutional continuum.

Its controlling object is the authored chronology DOM and its associated data stores, principally:

- `chronology-backup.js`
- `tri-axial-data.js`
- the typed record stores for claims, appendices, healthcare records and other derived views
- the backward-jump and CHIP/ID authoring embedded in the chronology
- the attached and referenced documentary corpus, where present in the full installation

The system is not primarily a collection of pages. The pages are different operational views over the same reconstructed object.

Operational model

A user reads a dated node as a fixed historical record-state. From that source node, authored backward relations direct the reader to earlier states that answer the question arising at the source.

The relation is not simply:

| *event A links to event B*

It carries an ordered, target-relative packet identifying:

1. the visible function of the target event;
2. its principal substrate;
3. any deeper substrates supporting its persistence;
4. the seed or actor fields available at the target date.

The system therefore preserves distinctions that an ordinary chronology or document bundle would flatten:

- event state versus causal relation;
- source question versus target function;
- direct authorship versus inherited propagation;
- consequence versus provenance;
- visible institutional action versus the deeper record conditions supporting it;
- current node markers versus the meanings of individual backward edges.

Main surfaces

The build contains several classes of interface:

Canonical replay

- chronology
- attached documents
- backward jumps
- node markers
- cumulative state

Derived analytical surfaces

- search
- appendices
- claims matrix
- heads of claim
- healthcare and record-specific views
- three-dimensional and matrix representations
- domain, seed and CHIP/ID visualisations

Validation and architectural surfaces

- active-function checks
- cumulative-agency checks
- case structure
- manifest
- system and build descriptions
- grammar and methodology documents

Publication and governance surfaces

- remediation history

- build provenance
- governance papers
- public explanatory material

These derivative views aid inspection, but they do not supersede the chronology and source records.

Purpose

Its purpose is to reconstruct how propositions entered institutional records, changed classification, migrated between bodies, acquired apparent authority through repetition and produced later consequences.

The governing question is not simply whether an event occurred. It is:

What proposition produced the event, where did that proposition originate, what evidence supported it at that date, who adopted it, and did later institutional repetition conceal the absence of independent provenance?

The system is therefore designed to expose:

- record contamination;
- recursive institutional reliance;
- provenance laundering;
- classification control;
- jurisdictional displacement or superposition;
- inherited narrative frames;
- chain occlusion;
- contradiction preservation;
- correction or refusal after notice.

It does **not** autonomously determine liability, guilt, intent or legal effect. It creates a finite, inspectable structure through which those questions can be tested.

2. MP-FRS

Function

MP-FRS is a **profile-driven authoring, validation, release and multi-graph review system**.

Where the exemplar presents a completed reconstruction, MP-FRS provides the factory that produces governed reconstruction artefacts from bounded user input.

Its architecture deliberately separates:

- authoring;
- canonical output;
- validation;
- released reviewer system;
- graph registration;
- registry-level interpretation.

This is not merely a UI distinction. The reviewer-side `graph-manager.js`, for example, expressly contains no editor logic and reads the authored graph registry without writing to it. The integrity boundary is enforced by file separation.

Production chain

The authoring area is organised as a staged process rather than a free-form editor.

The stages appear to perform a chain roughly of this kind:

- 1. Chronology construction**
Create dated nodes and event narratives.
- 2. Evidence and document typing**
Associate source material and assign evidential roles.
- 3. Node classification**
Identify what is structurally occurring at each node.
- 4. Backward-relation authoring**
Create target-relative jumps rather than generic links.
- 5. CHIP/ID and seed authoring**
Encode domain, class, strand or field meaning and ordered substrates.
- 6. Derived surface production**
Produce claims, appendices and specialist record views.
- 7. Validation**
Test structural consistency, unavailable fields, missing targets and grammar violations.
- 8. Registration and release**
Place the completed graph into the reviewer system under an authored manifest.

The tools include dedicated editors for vocabulary, graph registry, seed authoring, document glyphs, manifests and validation. This makes MP-FRS closer to a governed compiler toolchain than a conventional case-management system.

Multi-case architecture

The reviewer system has an authored `graphRegistry`, with each graph assigned:

- a stable ID;
- a human-readable label;
- an assets location;
- a canonical DOM location.

The registry is explicitly not generated by filesystem discovery. Registration is an intentional governance act.

This matters because the system is designed to preserve the sovereignty of each graph rather than silently aggregate all material into a central database.

At registry level, an operator may examine patterns across cases, but should not rewrite the underlying cases to make them conform to the observed pattern.

Semantic profiles

The educational grammar profile demonstrates that MP-FRS is not tied to forensic allegations or institutional-failure vocabulary.

The structural machinery remains constant:

- chronology nodes;
- typed evidence;
- markers;
- backward-jump stacks;
- CHIP/ID positions;
- cumulative state;
- canonical DOM output.

What changes is the semantic profile:

- labels;
- definitions;
- authoring tests;
- reader-facing meanings;
- field or strand registry;
- permitted taxonomy.

In the educational profile, for example, a seed becomes a learner-owned capability or practice strand rather than an originating institutional actor. The same structural engine therefore supports a different graph class without contaminating it with forensic semantics.

That is the core generalisation mechanism.

Purpose

MP-FRS exists to make the reconstruction method transferable while controlling the dangers created by transfer.

Its purpose is to allow different user classes to:

- author a structured temporal object;
- preserve the author’s evidential and semantic sovereignty;
- validate its internal grammar;
- release a fixed reviewer artefact;
- register multiple independent graphs;
- conduct single-case or cross-case analysis;
- state findings in the operator’s own voice;
- preserve the distinction between surfaced structure and independently verified fact.

It is not designed to manufacture conclusions. The factory documentation repeatedly places interpretation outside the deterministic production layer.

3. The critical functional difference

The simplest accurate distinction is:

Current-Stable-Build	MP-FRS
A particular reconstructed object	A system for manufacturing and governing such objects
Matter-specific semantics	Versioned semantic profiles

Current-Stable-Build	MP-FRS
One authored historical continuum	Multiple independent graphs
Demonstrates the method in operation	Codifies the method into reusable tooling
Contains substantive conclusions and case analysis	Must not embed a predetermined conclusion
Reader traverses an existing authored graph	Author constructs, validates and releases a graph
Public and evidential exemplar	Infrastructure and controlled replication layer

The stable build answers:

What happened in this reconstructed continuum, how did it propagate, and where is its provenance?

MP-FRS answers:

How can another temporal reconstruction be authored, validated, released, read and compared without importing this exemplar’s facts or conclusions?

4. Why they function differently

The exemplar grew around one extraordinarily deep matter. Its architecture therefore contains dense, case-specific relations, specialist derived views, authored interpretations and publication surfaces.

MP-FRS reverses the direction of travel. It begins before the graph exists.

It must govern:

- creation rather than only reading;
- semantic selection rather than fixed vocabulary;
- user input rather than an already-authored chronology;
- validation before release;
- registry membership;
- multiple authorial sovereignties;
- downstream operator conduct;
- cross-case findings that do not overwrite source cases.

Consequently, MP-FRS is more procedural and constitutional. The exemplar is more evidential and demonstrative.

5. Shared conceptual core

Despite their different operation, both systems share the same deep grammar:

- **time is controlling;**
- **nodes are dated record-states;**

- **evidence is typed rather than flattened;**
- **relations are authored and question-dependent;**
- **backward direction prevents later authority being projected into earlier states;**
- **ordered packet positions preserve visible state and supporting substrate;**
- **persistent fields reveal continuity without automatically attributing equal knowledge or culpability;**
- **silence and contradiction are preserved;**
- **the DOM is a canonical authored artefact, not disposable presentation markup;**
- **the human operator remains responsible for interpretation;**
- **structural legibility does not eliminate the need to descend to primary evidence.**

This shared core is what makes MP-FRS directly correlative to the exemplar without making it a replica.

6. Architectural significance

The important innovation is not merely graph visualisation.

The systems divide forensic knowledge production into governed layers:

1. **Primary material**
2. **Authored temporal state**
3. **Authored relational grammar**
4. **Structural validation**
5. **Derived analytical surfaces**
6. **Operator interpretation**
7. **Released finding**
8. **Registry-level comparison**
9. **Downstream institutional use**

Each layer has a different authority. The systems are built to stop authority from silently migrating upward or downward between them.

That is why MP-FRS documentation insists that:

- the instrument surfaces;
 - the author authors;
 - the operator forms the finding;
 - the evidence supports or defeats it;
 - the registry preserves cases;
 - the downstream body remains responsible for what it adopts.
-

7. Present assessment

Current-Stable-Build is a mature forensic exemplar and publication instrument. Its strength is the depth of its authored object and the number of mutually checking surfaces through which the same continuum can be examined.

MP-FRS is a developed authoring and governance infrastructure whose wider deployment model remains emergent. Its strength is separation of functions: deterministic authoring, semantic profiles, validation, reviewer-only runtime, explicit graph registration and operator governance.

Its most consequential feature is not that it can reproduce the original graph. It is that it can preserve the structural method while changing the semantic regime entirely. The educational profile demonstrates that the method has genuinely been abstracted rather than merely stripped of names.

Summary

This assessment was produced by examining the directory structures, canonical data stores, authoring stages, reviewer runtime, registry logic, semantic-profile implementation, validation surfaces and system documentation. It is an architectural and functional assessment, not a complete execution test of every interface.

Taken together, the systems demonstrate both a completed reconstruction and a transferable method. Current-Stable-Build establishes what the architecture can do when applied deeply to one continuum. MP-FRS establishes that the architecture can be separated from that continuum, semantically re-profiled, independently authored, validated and released without importing the exemplar's facts or conclusions. They should therefore be assessed as engineered provenance systems, not as document collections or informal analytical aids.