

DOCUMENT LINEAGE RECORD

From Seed Chronology to Forensic Reconstruction Platform

*Chronology.rtf (2022) → Whiteboard_Report.docx (June 2025) → Chronology.docx (June 2025) → Interactive
HTML Chronology Index (May–November 2025)*

April 2026

1. Purpose

This document records the lineage of the evidence chronology at the core of the PW Data Systems forensic reconstruction platform, from its origin as a 26-entry skeleton compiled under live institutional duress in 2022, through two intermediate Word-document revisions in June 2025, to the interactive HTML chronology index that forms the foundation of the current platform.

The record serves three functions: it establishes provenance for the chronology’s content; it documents the structural limitations that necessitated each transitional step; and it identifies the specific points at which the static document format became incapable of carrying the expanding analytical requirements, making the transition to a dynamic, navigable, indexed system unavoidable.

2. Document Register

Document	Created	Modified	Paragraphs	Author
Chronology.rtf	2022 (file metadata)	2022	26 entries	Michael Burdette-Deakin
Whiteboard_Report.docx	06 June 2025 17:38	08 June 2025 17:03	298	Michael Burdette-Deakin
Chronology.docx	10 June 2025 03:47	13 June 2025 16:29	305	Michael Burdette-Deakin
Interactive HTML Chronology Index	May 2025 (development start)	November 2025 (stable build)	~4,680 lines (13 files)	Michael Burdette-Deakin

3. Chronology.rtf — Seed Document (2022)

3.1 Character

Twenty-six numbered entries. First person throughout. The language is unmediated and direct: “my abuser,” “I am assaulted,” “I am arrested.” No analytical apparatus. No appendices. No cross-referencing structure. No index. The document is a numbered sequence of dated events with exhibit page references (MBDo1 through MBD21), compiled in a plain text editor and saved as RTF.

The final entry is dated July 2022, approximately three months before the committal to prison on 13 October 2022. The document was compiled while the civil process under case number GO1NR161 was still active and the author was still subject to the injunction whose procedural foundation the document records.

3.2 Function

This was survival documentation. It was written by someone under live institutional violence — ultra-vires administrative abuse conducted under the colour of law and care — recording what was happening to them in the only format available: a numbered list in an RTF file. It was not written for a reviewer. It was not written for counsel. It was written to preserve a sequential record before the author’s ability to maintain one could be removed.

3.3 Structural Limitations

The RTF format imposed absolute constraints. There was no linking between entries. No evidence could be embedded or cross-referenced beyond page numbers in a separate exhibit bundle. No temporal navigation was possible beyond manual scrolling. No analytical layer could be applied — the document could record that events occurred, but could not expose the structural relationships between them. The 26 entries sat in isolation from one another, connected only by the reader’s willingness to hold the sequence in memory.

The document concludes with the author’s own assessment: “This is a skeleton chronology that does not exhaustively cover the history of abuses.” That statement is both accurate and structurally significant. It records the author’s awareness, at the time of writing, that the document was incomplete and that the full scope of the continuum exceeded what a numbered list could carry.

4. Whiteboard_Report.docx — First Revision (6–8 June 2025)

4.1 Character

Three years after the seed document. Third person — “the tenant” replaces “I.” Structured with formal sections: Executive Summary, Background and Tenant’s Vulnerabilities, Detailed Chronology of Events, Legal Ramifications and Breaches, Cumulative Impact, and Appendices. 298 paragraphs. The same events now carry analytical framing, linked evidence file paths, and institutional context that was absent from the RTF.

4.2 Transitional Gains over the Seed Document

Shift from survival record to instructional presentation. The document is now written for a reviewer, not for the author’s own reference. Events are contextualised with background, vulnerability history, and explanatory notes that allow a reader without prior knowledge of the matter to follow the sequence.

Introduction of linked evidence paths. Entries now reference file paths (e.g., “Supporting Files/NHS Records/Dr Gankerseer Reports.pdf”) rather than exhibit page numbers. This is the first appearance of the evidence-linking pattern that will later become the platform’s linked-evidence indexing system.

Analytical appendices. Analysis of the ASB Officer’s conduct, police misfeasance, and conflicting narratives is separated from the chronology into dedicated appendices. This is the first structural separation of primary evidence from analytical interpretation — a principle that will become a governing constraint of the HTML platform.

Cross-referencing between entries. Crime references, linked evidence folders, and investigative summaries begin to connect entries to one another, exposing relationships that were invisible in the flat numbered list of the RTF.

4.3 Structural Limitations Remaining

The Word document format could not support dynamic navigation. Cross-references were text-based — a reader had to search manually for the referenced entry. No temporal indexing existed; the chronology could not be jumped into by date. The document was approaching 300 paragraphs and the analytical appendices were growing faster than the chronology itself, creating a structural imbalance in which the tail was beginning to wag the dog. The monolithic format was reaching its ceiling.

5. Chronology.docx — Second Revision (10–13 June 2025)

5.1 Character

Produced days after the Whiteboard Report. “Victim” replaces “tenant.” 305 paragraphs. The appendix structure has expanded to include: Appendix A (Analysis of Malicious Intent), Appendix B (Police Misfeasance), Appendix C (Additional Narrative Details), Appendix D (Early Housing and Family Matters), Appendix E (Comprehensive Assessments with sub-sections E.1 through E.3), and Appendix SCLE (Suffolk Constabulary Log Entries).

5.2 Transitional Gains over the First Revision

Heavier legal apparatus. The document now carries formal legal framing — breaches by specific actors are itemised under dedicated headings, and the language has moved closer to the register of a legal submission.

Expanded cross-domain coverage. The addition of the SCLE appendix (Suffolk Constabulary Log Entries) introduces a second institutional domain’s primary records into the chronology alongside the landlord, civil process, and healthcare material. This is the first point at which the document explicitly operates across more than two institutional domains simultaneously.

Index page. The document opens with a structured index of its own contents — the first appearance of the navigational layer that will later become the platform’s jump menu and tab system.

Separation of primary and analytical material. The appendix structure is now clearly stratified: narrative details, institutional assessments, and primary log entries each occupy distinct sections. This separation prefigures the platform’s governing architecture in which primary evidence and analytical representation are maintained as structurally independent layers.

5.3 Structural Limitations Remaining

The document had reached the practical limits of what a static Word file could carry. Cross-references between the main chronology and six appendices required the reader to jump manually between sections with no way to return to the point of departure. Temporal navigation remained impossible — there was no mechanism to jump to a specific date. The SCLE log entries introduced a second institutional timeline that could not be interleaved with the main chronology without destroying the readability of both. The document was structurally ready for what it would become next, and structurally incapable of becoming it within the Word format.

6. Transition to the Interactive HTML Chronology Index

6.1 The Structural Ceiling

The June 2025 Word documents had achieved analytical depth and cross-domain coverage that the RTF seed could never have carried. But they had reached a ceiling that no further revision within the same format could overcome. The specific structural problems that forced the transition were:

No temporal navigation. A reviewer could not jump to a specific date. In a chronology spanning 2000 to 2025 across multiple institutional domains, this made efficient review impossible.

No bidirectional cross-referencing. A reference from the chronology to an appendix was a one-way trip. There was no mechanism to return to the departure point, and no way to see which other chronology entries referenced the same appendix item.

No evidence-type classification. All evidence items — custody records, crime reports, CAD records, oversight documents, adjudicated items — appeared identically in the text. A reviewer could not distinguish document types by inspection.

No structural visibility into chain propagation. The relationships between events — which chains converge at which nodes, which actors recur across which domains, which patterns repeat across which time periods — were present in the data but invisible in the format.

No offline-safe, portable, deterministic delivery. The Word documents depended on the reader's software rendering them correctly. They could not guarantee identical presentation across platforms, could not function offline without the evidence files being separately supplied, and could not enforce a controlled reading path.

6.2 What the HTML Platform Resolved

The interactive HTML chronology index, developed from May to November 2025, resolved every structural limitation identified above. It introduced hash-based temporal navigation with deterministic date-derived anchors. It introduced bidirectional cross-referencing via the jump-link system. It introduced document-type colour coding with a formal classification vocabulary. It introduced the institutional chain marker taxonomy and the tri-axis CHIP/ID visual grammar for structural visibility into chain propagation. And it delivered all of this in a zero-dependency, offline-safe, portable format that runs from a folder in any browser.

The transition was not a discretionary upgrade. It was a structural necessity imposed by the expanding analytical requirements of the evidence corpus. The Word format had carried the chronology as far as it could. The remaining distance — from static document to forensic reasoning instrument — required a different kind of architecture entirely.

7. Lineage Summary

Chronology.rtf (2022) — 26 entries. First person. Survival documentation compiled under live institutional abuse. No analytical apparatus. No cross-referencing. No navigation. The seed.

Whiteboard_Report.docx (6–8 June 2025) — 298 paragraphs. Third person. First analytical framing. First linked evidence paths. First separation of primary evidence from analysis. First appendices. The transition from record to instrument begins.

Chronology.docx (10–13 June 2025) — 305 paragraphs. Formal legal register. Expanded appendix structure. Cross-domain coverage. Index page. The document reaches the structural ceiling of the Word format.

Interactive HTML Chronology Index (May–November 2025) — 13 files, ~4,680 lines. Zero-dependency offline platform. Hash-navigable temporal index. Document-type classification. Institutional chain markers. Tri-axis visual grammar. Single-pass interleaved index construction. The forensic reconstruction platform.

The twenty-six entries in that RTF are the seed of everything that followed. The 54,000-file evidence archive, the 4,680-line platform, the tri-axis grammar, the marker taxonomy, the single-pass indexing engine — all of it traces back to a numbered list compiled in a plain text editor under the colour of law.

Document lineage established from: Chronology.rtf (26 entries, 27,603 bytes); Whiteboard_Report.docx (created 06/06/2025 17:38, modified 08/06/2025 17:03, 298 paragraphs); Chronology.docx (created 10/06/2025 03:47, modified 13/06/2025 16:29, 305 paragraphs); Indexed_Interactive_Chronology_Complete.html; PW Data Systems v2.3x Subsystem Architecture Report; Progression Assessment (May–November 2025).