



APERTURE
RESEARCH & VERIFICATION



APERTURE
RESEARCH & VERIFICATION

MH370 ANNEX G

Master Synthesis

AUTHOR APPROVED COMPLETE RESEARCH EDITION - AWAITING INDEPENDENT SPECIALIST REVIEW

Evidence cut-off: 7 August 2026

External specialist validation: pending

Institutional right of reply: pending

REALITY BEFORE RELIANCE | VERIFICATION BEFORE INTERPRETATION | EVIDENCE BEFORE NARRATIVE

Independent public-source case study - not a client engagement

Document control	Value
Matter	Malaysia Airlines Flight MH370
Aircraft	Boeing 777-200ER, registration 9M-MRO
Operating mode	Independent public-source case study - not a client engagement
Evidence cut-off	7 August 2026, 14:08 UTC / 16:08 SAST
Current dossier state	Version 0.5 Controlled Internal Final / Author Approved Complete Research Edition - Awaiting Independent Specialist Review
External specialist validation	Not completed
Adversarial review execution	Not completed
Institutional right of reply	Not completed
Legal/fairness review	Not completed
Public release	Not authorised
Author approval	Approved by Paul Hattingh on 7 August 2026
Prepared by	Paul Hattingh Aperture Research & Verification
Contact	info@apertureforensic.com www.apertureforensic.com

Professional boundary and status

This is an independent public-source research product. It is not an official accident investigation, legal opinion, engineering certification, accredited forensic examination or substitute for the Malaysian Annex 13 investigation. It does not claim access to non-public evidence. Specialist review, institutional right of reply and final publication approval are not simulated.

Annex G integrates the evidence domains without converting model-dependent inferences into direct observations.

Evidence classification

Classification	Meaning
ESTABLISHED	Directly supported to a sufficiently high factual standard.
VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTED	Strong convergence with little credible contradictory evidence.
STRONGLY SUPPORTED	Substantial evidence supports the proposition, but material uncertainty remains.
SUPPORTED	Evidence favours the proposition but does not permit strong reliance.
INDETERMINATE	Available evidence does not responsibly discriminate between material alternatives.
WEAK	Technically or logically possible but poorly supported.
UNSUPPORTED	No sufficient positive evidence identified.
CONTRADICTED	Material evidence conflicts with the proposition.

Reliance classification

Reliance	Use
R1	Direct factual reliance.
R2	Strong professional analytical reliance.
R3	Conditional or model-dependent reliance.
R4	Hypothesis-level reliance only.
R5	Do not rely upon as an established factual proposition.

G1. Evidence convergence

The case becomes strongest where independent evidence origins converge: radar supports the early diversion; SATCOM supports prolonged flight and southern progression; physical debris supports aircraft identity and Indian Ocean loss.

G2. Broad reconstruction

Normal departure -> loss of normal secondary surveillance -> westward diversion -> final radar phase -> later SATCOM-only reconstruction -> southern route -> end-of-flight in southern Indian Ocean. Confidence remains high at this broad level.

G3. Cause boundary

Aircraft behaviour supports active control more strongly than controller identity. The record supports some purposive aircraft management but does not establish harmful intent or a particular actor.

G4. End-of-flight synthesis

Fuel exhaustion is the best-supported final power explanation. Final BFO behaviour supports substantial descent. Retracted flap evidence weakens conventional flap-extended ditching. These findings collectively constrain but do not fully reconstruct the terminal impact.

G5. Location synthesis

The broad southern Indian Ocean conclusion survives the failure of multiple narrow search models. Search non-findings are used to update specific location confidence rather than to discard strong independent evidence for the broad region.

G6. Governance synthesis

Material institutional failures are established at the level of response, coordination and information handling. A coordinated cover-up requires a much stronger evidentiary chain than the public record provides.

G7. Strongest conclusions

Most resistant to challenge: normal initial flight, loss of secondary surveillance, westward diversion, prolonged later flight, confirmed debris and southern Indian Ocean loss.

G8. Most reversible conclusions

Most sensitive to specialist/new evidence: manual-control wording, 18:25 cause, fuel-exhaustion details, final descent, flap-state impact implications, precise drift/location ranking, search-exclusion confidence and H3/H6 comparative ranking.

G9. Master proposition matrix

Proposition	Classification	Reliance
Normal initial flight	ESTABLISHED	R1
Normal secondary surveillance later ceased	ESTABLISHED	R1
Westward diversion	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2
At least part of initial diversion involved active control	STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2; specialist-dependent
Specific manual transponder shutdown by identified person	NOT ESTABLISHED	R3
18:25 SATCOM log-on occurred	ESTABLISHED	R1
Cause of 18:25 event	INDETERMINATE	R4
Continued multi-hour flight after radar phase	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2
Southern route	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2
Southern Indian Ocean loss	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2
Fuel exhaustion as final power-sequence explanation	STRONGLY SUPPORTED	R2; systems review pending
Final BFOs compatible with substantial rapid descent	STRONGLY SUPPORTED, MODEL-DEPENDENT	R3
Confirmed MH370 debris exists	ESTABLISHED	R1
Right outboard flap most likely retracted at separation	STRONGLY SUPPORTED, SPECIALIST-DEPENDENT	R3
Exact breakup sequence	INDETERMINATE	R4
Explosive destruction as established cause	NOT ESTABLISHED	R4
Around 35S as exact location	NOT ESTABLISHED	R4
Around 25S as solved location	NOT ESTABLISHED	R4
Exact wreckage coordinate	INDETERMINATE	R5
Pilot-in-Command as established actor	NOT ESTABLISHED	R4
Terrorism	UNSUPPORTED	R5
Remote takeover	UNSUPPORTED	R5
Material institutional response/coordination failures	ESTABLISHED	R1
Coordinated Malaysian government cover-up	UNSUPPORTED	R5

G10. Final synthesis

The public evidence supports a strong broad reconstruction but does not close the causal or exact-location questions. The disciplined conclusion is therefore stronger than “nothing is known” and more restrained than “the case is solved.”