

# | PUBLIC-SOURCE TECHNICAL DOSSIER

## Publisher & Media Research Desk: Source Verification Before Publication

### DECISION QUESTION

How can a publisher add disciplined research capacity without pretending the work is a client engagement?

### EXECUTIVE POSITION

A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.

|                         |                                                           |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Product                 | DESK                                                      |
| Sector                  | Publishing / media                                        |
| Jurisdiction            | Global editorial research context                         |
| Evidence cut-off        | 8 September 2026, 07:38 SAST                              |
| Evidence sources        | 12                                                        |
| Controlled propositions | 18                                                        |
| Governing master        | PHW Research AI v11.0 Approved Governing Master           |
| Status                  | CONTROLLED PUBLICATION CANDIDATE - HUMAN APPROVAL PENDING |

Package control & evidence architecture

|                                    |                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prepared by                        | Aperture Research Works                                                                                                              |
| Authorship / final human authority | Paul Hattingh - approval pending for this exact publication candidate                                                                |
| Operating mode                     | Independent public-source case study - not a client engagement                                                                       |
| Evidence cut-off                   | 8 September 2026, 07:38 SAST                                                                                                         |
| Governing master                   | PHW Research AI v11.0 Approved Governing Master                                                                                      |
| Research readiness                 | 95/100 - ready for controlled dossier construction with specified limitations                                                        |
| Evidence sources                   | 6                                                                                                                                    |
| Controlled propositions            | 18                                                                                                                                   |
| Public technical annex             | 15 pages, preserved in full as Annex A                                                                                               |
| Publication state                  | CONTROLLED PUBLICATION CANDIDATE - HUMAN APPROVAL PENDING                                                                            |
| Professional boundary              | No legal advice, audit opinion, engineering/actuarial certification, investment advice or other reserved professional determination. |

Six-document package

|   |                                 |                                                                                                               |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Principal Investigative Dossier | Decision answer, scope, findings, technical analysis, hypotheses, contradictions, gaps and hand-off controls. |
| 2 | Claims-and-Evidence Matrix      | Proposition-by-proposition traceability with status, confidence, reliance and Source IDs.                     |
| 3 | Master Chronology               | Time-ordered record separating baseline, event, update and current-status evidence.                           |
| 4 | Source and Evidence Register    | Visible full URLs plus authority, role, limitation and supported propositions.                                |
| 5 | Public Portfolio Edition        | Public demonstration preserving material caveats and reliance boundaries.                                     |
| 6 | Final Delivery Manifest         | Production conformity, release gates, website synchronization and supersession controls.                      |

## DOCUMENT 1

# Principal Investigative Dossier

## Evidence-chain reading rule

Source (S-ID) -> proposition (C-ID) -> factual status -> evidential confidence -> reliance status -> decision effect. If any link is missing, the proposition is not permitted to carry high-consequence reliance.

## 1. Matter understanding and decision frame

Decision question: How can a publisher add disciplined research capacity without pretending the work is a client engagement?

Executive position: A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.

Product outcome: Add research capacity without adding headcount. Provide background research, chronology and source verification while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher.

## In scope

- A publisher-facing external research desk for background research, chronology and source verification.
- Editorially useful source and claim controls.
- AI-assisted workflow boundaries.
- Escalation where legal, safety or specialist review is required.

## Explicit exclusions

- Editorial control or publication decision-making.
- Defamation/privacy legal advice.
- Anonymous automated article production.
- Guarantee of factual completeness.

## 2. Executive findings and technical operating analysis

The following material is carried forward from the controlled technical baseline. It is preserved here as the current v11 decision layer and remains fully available in Annex A.

### 2.1 Controlled technical record

#### Material findings

##### Finding 1

AP describes verification as embedded in reporting, with corroboration through documents and on-the-record sources and additional checks for digital material.

##### Finding 2

AP's published standards emphasise accuracy, source identification and avoidance of rumor or false information.

##### Finding 3

For a publisher, external research capacity is most useful when it creates inspectable source records rather than ghost-written certainty.

##### Finding 4

Editorial judgment, legal review, source-protection decisions and publication responsibility remain with the publisher and its advisers.

Reliance effect The findings should be carried forward only at the confidence level supported by the source

**record. Where a decision depends on non-public contracts, operating data, engineering records, customer files or current legal status, the missing evidence remains an explicit dependency.**

#### Editorial research queue

The desk should receive bounded questions tied to a story, investigation or editorial decision. Outputs can include chronology, source bundles, claim checks, background dossiers and contradiction registers. Editorial judgment remains with the publisher.

- Story/request identifier.
- Claim or question being tested.
- Publication deadline.
- Source sensitivity and right-of-reply status.
- Output owner and editor.

Control point Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

#### Source verification

Publisher research should distinguish originating evidence from repetition. A claim reported by many outlets may still trace to one press release. The desk should identify the primary source where possible, record independent corroboration and flag circular sourcing.

- Primary records first for material propositions.
- Archive volatile web evidence.
- Record dates and versions.
- Separate direct observation, source claim and inference.

Control point Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

#### AI in newsroom research

AP's 2026 standards reinforce a useful governance principle: AI may assist with bounded tasks, but editorial judgment, verification and accountability remain human responsibilities. For an external desk, model output

should therefore accelerate discovery or summarisation while source checking remains mandatory.

- No AI-generated fact enters output without source review.
- Generated quotations are prohibited unless matched to source.
- Use AI for search expansion, not authority.
- Disclose material AI use if required by client policy.

Control point Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

### **Pre-publication escalation**

Some claims require legal, scientific, technical or security review. The research desk should identify the evidence issue and escalate rather than pretending to supply professional advice outside scope.

- Defamation/privacy risk.
- Technical or scientific dispute.
- Safety-sensitive instructions.
- Confidential/embargoed evidence.

Control point Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

Aperture control: separate source-supported fact from inference, assumption, forecast and missing decision evidence. Preserve the C-ID/S-ID chain when this analysis is transferred into a decision.

### 3. Competing hypotheses, contradiction and gap controls

- H1 - Strong-form narrative  
A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.
- H2 - Narrower evidence position  
The public record supports only the propositions expressly carried by the identified sources and does not establish the excluded matter-specific facts.
- H3 - Change-sensitive position  
A later authoritative record may alter the answer after the evidence cut-off; the decision therefore requires current-status checking before high-consequence use.

#### Contradictions and unresolved gaps carried from baseline

|                                                                                                                                                                                       |                    |                                      |                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Contradictions, unresolved gaps & evidence still required                                                                                                                             |                    |                                      |                                                                                                      |
| A professional dossier should show what remains unresolved, not edit uncertainty out of the answer. The table below identifies issues that would matter in a commissioned engagement. |                    |                                      |                                                                                                      |
| Issue / proposition                                                                                                                                                                   | Current position   | Why unresolved matters               | Evidence / action required                                                                           |
| Many articles repeating a claim equal                                                                                                                                                 | Contradicted       | May be circular sourcing.            | Obtain stronger primary or independent corroboration matter-specific evidence before relying.        |
| AP permits AI to replace verification                                                                                                                                                 | Contradicted       | Human verification remains required. | Obtain stronger primary or matter-specific evidence before relying.                                  |
| External desk should make publication                                                                                                                                                 | Not Editor         | remains responsible.                 | Obtain stronger primary or decision established/undesirable matter-specific evidence before relying. |
| Circular sourcing                                                                                                                                                                     | Open control issue | Creates false corroboration          | Trace originating source.                                                                            |

## 4. Risk, failure modes and decision hand-off

Risk, failure modes & controls

The risk register translates evidence weakness into a practical control. It is not a generic disclaimer list: each row describes how the decision could become wrong if the underlying proposition is overstated or allowed to go stale.

Risk / failure mode Why it matters Control / next action

Circular sourcing Creates false corroboration Trace originating source.

Volatile webpage Evidence disappears/changes Archive and date.

AI hallucination Fabricated fact enters draft Source gate.

Deadline compression Verification skipped Prioritise material claims.

Right-of-reply gap One-sided record Flag when appropriate.

Role confusion Researcher becomes editor/legal adviser Preserve boundary.

### Decision-transfer checklist

Decision and hand-off checklist

The following checklist is the minimum decision hand-off for the public demonstration. A commissioned matter would add client-specific ownership, deadlines, document identifiers and approval gates.

- Assign story/request ID.
- Define material claims.
- Retrieve primary sources.
- Check independent corroboration.
- Archive volatile evidence.
- Flag contradictions and unresolved gaps.
- Escalate legal/specialist issues.
- Retain editorial responsibility with publisher.

Stop condition If a material proposition cannot be supported at the level required by the decision, the correct output is “further verification required”, not a more confident narrative.

Stop condition: if a material proposition cannot be supported at the level required by the decision, the correct output is further verification required, not a more confident narrative.

5. Entity, relationship and quantitative control registers

| ID  | Entity / organisation | Evidence role               | Boundary                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E01 | Associated Press      | Evidence origin / custodian | Relationship established only to the extent shown by the cited record. Do not infer ownership, control, responsibility or contractual privity beyond the source. |
| E02 | Reuters               | Evidence origin / custodian | Relationship established only to the extent shown by the cited record. Do not infer ownership, control, responsibility or contractual privity beyond the source. |

Quantitative / metric control

Any number, percentage, capacity, forecast, timing or count in the baseline remains source-reported unless an explicit calculation is separately identified. Preserve unit, vintage, denominator/population, scenario and whether the number is observed, claimed or projected.

Fairness, privacy, copyright and right-of-reply controls

Public-source material is quoted minimally and otherwise paraphrased. Allegation, proposal, filing, order, approval and completion are not treated as interchangeable statuses. Where publication could materially affect a person or organisation, right-of-reply status must be recorded before release. Silence is not admission.

DOCUMENT 2

Claims-and-Evidence Matrix

Each proposition carries its Source IDs, factual status, confidence and permitted reliance. The matrix is the bridge between narrative and responsible reliance.

| ID  | Controlled proposition                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | S-IDs              | Status                    | Confidence | Reliance                   |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| C01 | AP describes verification as embedded in reporting, with corroboration through documents and on-the-record sources and additional checks for digital material.                                                                                                                                              | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Established               | High       | Direct within stated scope |
| C02 | The desk should receive bounded questions tied to a story, investigation or editorial decision. Outputs can include chronology, source bundles, claim checks, background dossiers and contradiction registers. Editorial                                                                                    | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C03 | Publisher research should distinguish originating evidence from repetition. A claim reported by many outlets may still trace to one press release. The desk should identify the primary source where possible, record                                                                                       | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C04 | AP's 2026 standards reinforce a useful governance principle: AI may assist with bounded tasks, but editorial judgment, verification and accountability remain human responsibilities. For an external desk, model output                                                                                    | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C05 | Some claims require legal, scientific, technical or security review. The research desk should identify the evidence issue and escalate rather than pretending to supply professional advice outside scope.                                                                                                  | S01, S02           | Established               | High       | Direct within stated scope |
| C06 | independent corroboration                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | S01, S02           | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C07 | A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production. | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C08 | The public-source conclusion is bounded to the evidence cut-off and may change when a later authoritative source changes the factual position.                                                                                                                                                              | S01, S02           | Conditional               | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C09 | Matter-specific contracts, internal records, operating data and reserved professional determinations remain outside public-source proof unless separately obtained and authenticated.                                                                                                                       | S01, S02           | Not established           | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C10 | A company or institutional statement is evidence of what that source states; it is not automatically independent proof of performance, causation or future outcome.                                                                                                                                         | S01, S02           | Established               | High       | Direct within stated scope |
| C11 | Where the evidence is insufficient, the correct status is further verification required rather than a stronger narrative.                                                                                                                                                                                   | S01, S02, S03, S04 | Not established / control | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C12 | Controlled proposition 12: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C13 | Controlled proposition 13: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Conditional               | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C14 | Controlled proposition 14: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Not established           | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C15 | Controlled proposition 15: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Established               | High       | Direct within stated scope |
| C16 | Controlled proposition 16: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C17 | Controlled proposition 17: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Supported                 | Moderate   | Conditional                |
| C18 | Controlled proposition 18: the decision should preserve the source date, scope and limitation recorded in the evidence register before reliance is transferred.                                                                                                                                             | S01, S02           | Conditional               | Moderate   | Conditional                |

DOCUMENT 3

Master Chronology

Chronology is a control against stale reliance. The table separates source vintage, event type and current-status use.

| Date / vintage         | Event / source state                                                                                                       | Reliance effect                                                      |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Baseline               | Controlled technical baseline assembled from the listed public sources.                                                    | Establishes the pre-v11 evidence record; preserved in Annex A.       |
| 7 Sep 2026             | Baseline evidence cut-off used by the prior technical dossier.                                                             | Historical baseline only after this supplement.                      |
| 8 Sep 2026             | v11 control supplement issued and source register rechecked / expanded.                                                    | Current controlled publication candidate at this package level.      |
| After evidence cut-off | Any later authoritative change to law, status, market data, facility capability, transaction state or regulatory position. | Requires WATCH/current-status recheck before consequential reliance. |

Chronology rule

A later source does not silently overwrite an earlier source. Both vintages remain visible where the change itself matters. Forecasts remain forecasts; announced milestones remain announcements until evidence establishes completion.

## DOCUMENT 4

## Source and Evidence Register

Every evidence URL below is visible in full and clickable. Source quality is assessed by authority, proximity, independence and scope rather than by volume.

### S01 - Controlled source from baseline dossier

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Associated Press                                                                                                                                   |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.ap.org/solutions/verify/>

### S02 - Controlled source from baseline dossier

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Associated Press                                                                                                                                   |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.ap.org/about/news-values-and-principles/>

### S03 - Controlled source from baseline dossier

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Associated Press                                                                                                                                   |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/behind-the-news/getting-the-facts-right/>

### S04 - Controlled source from baseline dossier

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Reuters                                                                                                                                            |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.reuters.com/fact-check/about/>

### S05 - Controlled source from baseline dossier

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Associated Press                                                                                                                                   |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/announcements/ap-updates-newsroom-standards-for-artificial-intelligence/>

### S06 - Reuters Handbook of Journalism

|                          |                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation / custodian | Reuters                                                                                                                                            |
| Source class             | Organisation-primary / direct                                                                                                                      |
| Authority / confidence   | High for what the organisation states; not independent                                                                                             |
| Evidence use             | Supports only the bounded propositions linked to this source. It does not by itself establish excluded matter-specific facts.                      |
| Material limitation      | Scope, date, jurisdiction and source role must travel with the proposition. Organisation-primary material is not independent proof of performance. |

<https://www.reutersagency.com/en/about/standards-values/>

DOCUMENT 5

Public Portfolio Edition

# Publisher & Media Research Desk: Source Verification Before Publication

Question: How can a publisher add disciplined research capacity without pretending the work is a client engagement?

Answer supported by the public record: A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.

What this demonstrates

Add research capacity without adding headcount. Provide background research, chronology and source verification while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher.

Reliance boundary

This public portfolio edition demonstrates method and evidence control. It is not a client engagement and must not be detached from the stated exclusions, evidence cut-off, source limitations or professional boundaries for consequential use.

Aperture pathway

| Page / contact           | Visible full URL                                                                                                                |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Product page             | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/desk.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/desk.html</a>                             |
| Selected Work            | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/selected-work.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/selected-work.html</a>           |
| Methodology              | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/methodology.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/methodology.html</a>               |
| Evidence Standards       | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/evidence-standards.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/evidence-standards.html</a> |
| Evidence Lineage         | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/evidence-lineage.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/evidence-lineage.html</a>     |
| Reliance Boundary        | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/reliance-boundary.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/reliance-boundary.html</a>   |
| Languages                | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/languages.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/languages.html</a>                   |
| Search                   | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/search.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/search.html</a>                         |
| Enquiry                  | <a href="https://www.apertureforensic.com/enquiry.html">https://www.apertureforensic.com/enquiry.html</a>                       |
| Paul Hattingh - LinkedIn | <a href="https://www.linkedin.com/in/paul-hattingh-79568729">https://www.linkedin.com/in/paul-hattingh-79568729</a>             |

DOCUMENT 6

Final Delivery Manifest & Conformity Record

|                         |                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Filename                | 11_DESK_Publisher_and_Media_Research_Desk.pdf                                                                                           |
| Product                 | DESK                                                                                                                                    |
| Evidence cut-off        | 8 September 2026, 07:38 SAST                                                                                                            |
| Governing master        | PHW Research AI v11.0 Approved Governing Master                                                                                         |
| Research readiness      | 95/100 - ready for controlled dossier construction with specified limitations                                                           |
| Evidence sources        | 6                                                                                                                                       |
| Controlled propositions | 18                                                                                                                                      |
| Controlled annex        | Annex A preserves the complete 15-page prior technical dossier                                                                          |
| Public release          | Pending final human approval of frozen files                                                                                            |
| Website path            | /selected-work/v168/11_DESK_Publisher_and_Media_Research_Desk.pdf                                                                       |
| Supersession            | This v11 package supersedes the prior standalone technical dossier as the governing publication package while preserving it in Annex A. |

Masjien conformity

- PASS / CONTROLLED: Model memory excluded as evidence
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Claim-to-source traceability
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Contradictory evidence and unresolved gaps retained
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Competing hypotheses and falsification controls
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Factual status / evidential confidence / reliance status
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Visible full source URLs
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Professional boundary and specialist escalation
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Current-status / monitoring control
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Document control and supersession
- PASS / CONTROLLED: Final human approval not simulated

# Release gate & Annex A

## Final release controls

| Test                    | Acceptance condition                                                                                                |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hyperlinks              | Evidence URLs and Aperture navigation links must remain preserved and clickable.                                    |
| Bookmarks               | Controlled document and Annex A navigation must remain available in the PDF outline.                                |
| Visual render           | Every supplement page must be rendered and checked for clipping, overlap, blank/sparse artefacts and broken glyphs. |
| Website synchronization | Card metadata, cover image and filename must match the frozen PDF.                                                  |
| Hash freeze             | SHA-256 is calculated only after the final byte freeze.                                                             |
| Human release gate      | Paul Hattingh reviews the exact frozen edition; automation does not simulate approval.                              |

## Annex A - Complete controlled technical baseline

The following 15 pages preserve the prior complete public-source technical dossier in full. It is retained as an audit and evidentiary baseline, not discarded. Where wording or status differs, this v11 control supplement governs the publication package.

Nothing in Annex A is promoted to a stronger factual or reliance status merely by inclusion. Its visible source URLs, technical analysis, proposition matrix, gap/risk registers and decision controls remain part of the combined package.



DESK | PUBLIC-SOURCE TECHNICAL DOSSIER

# Publisher & Media Research Desk: Source Verification Before Publication

## DECISION QUESTION

How can a publisher add disciplined research capacity without pretending the work is a client engagement?

### EXECUTIVE POSITION

A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.

|                   |                                                                   |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PRODUCT           | DESK                                                              |
| INDUSTRY / SECTOR | Publishing / media                                                |
| STATUS            | Independent public-source demonstration - not a client engagement |
| EVIDENCE CUT-OFF  | 7 September 2026, 23:59 SAST                                      |
| ISSUE             | 8 September 2026   Version 1.0                                    |

# Document control & professional boundary

This document is a fully rendered public technical dossier demonstrating how Aperture Research Works would structure a consequential evidence question. It is designed to be inspected as work product, not read as a marketing leaflet.

Facts, source statements, inference, assumptions and unresolved gaps are kept separate. The public-source register is part of the product. Every listed URL is visible and clickable.

**Reliance classification**

Demonstration of governed recurring research capacity; not a substitute for regulated or specialist professional functions.

| Control               | Position                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prepared by           | Aperture Research Works                                                                                                     |
| Governing edition     | English                                                                                                                     |
| Status                | Independent public-source demonstration - not a client engagement                                                           |
| Evidence cut-off      | 7 September 2026, 23:59 SAST                                                                                                |
| Issue date            | 8 September 2026                                                                                                            |
| Human accountability  | Human-led review governs the final reliance statement                                                                       |
| Professional boundary | Illustrative workflow demonstration. Aperture does not replace editorial judgment, media-law counsel or newsroom standards. |

## Core operating rule

AI and automation may accelerate discovery, extraction, comparison and drafting support. They do not become evidence merely because they are fluent. Source authentication, evidence lineage, contradiction control and final human judgment remain mandatory.

# Decision question, scope & executive answer

How can a publisher add disciplined research capacity without pretending the work is a client engagement?

A publisher-facing DESK can absorb recurring background research, chronology building, source verification and pre-publication evidence checks while editorial responsibility remains with the publisher. The strongest model is source-transparent and escalation-aware, not anonymous content production.

## In scope

- A publisher-facing external research desk for background research, chronology and source verification.
- Editorially useful source and claim controls.
- AI-assisted workflow boundaries.
- Escalation where legal, safety or specialist review is required.

## Out of scope

- Editorial control or publication decision-making.
- Defamation/privacy legal advice.
- Anonymous automated article production.
- Guarantee of factual completeness.

### What this demonstrates

A bounded source-traceable answer with explicit reliance limits.

# Material findings

---

## Finding 1

AP describes verification as embedded in reporting, with corroboration through documents and on-the-record sources and additional checks for digital material.

## Finding 2

AP's published standards emphasise accuracy, source identification and avoidance of rumor or false information.

## Finding 3

For a publisher, external research capacity is most useful when it creates inspectable source records rather than ghost-written certainty.

## Finding 4

Editorial judgment, legal review, source-protection decisions and publication responsibility remain with the publisher and its advisers.

### Reliance effect

The findings should be carried forward only at the confidence level supported by the source record. Where a decision depends on non-public contracts, operating data, engineering records, customer files or current legal status, the missing evidence remains an explicit dependency.

# Editorial research queue

The desk should receive bounded questions tied to a story, investigation or editorial decision. Outputs can include chronology, source bundles, claim checks, background dossiers and contradiction registers. Editorial judgment remains with the publisher.

- Story/request identifier.
- Claim or question being tested.
- Publication deadline.
- Source sensitivity and right-of-reply status.
- Output owner and editor.

**Control point**

Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

# Source verification

Publisher research should distinguish originating evidence from repetition. A claim reported by many outlets may still trace to one press release. The desk should identify the primary source where possible, record independent corroboration and flag circular sourcing.

- Primary records first for material propositions.
- Archive volatile web evidence.
- Record dates and versions.
- Separate direct observation, source claim and inference.

**Control point**

Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

# AI in newsroom research

AP's 2026 standards reinforce a useful governance principle: AI may assist with bounded tasks, but editorial judgment, verification and accountability remain human responsibilities. For an external desk, model output should therefore accelerate discovery or summarisation while source checking remains mandatory.

- No AI-generated fact enters output without source review.
- Generated quotations are prohibited unless matched to source.
- Use AI for search expansion, not authority.
- Disclose material AI use if required by client policy.

**Control point**

Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

# Pre-publication escalation

Some claims require legal, scientific, technical or security review. The research desk should identify the evidence issue and escalate rather than pretending to supply professional advice outside scope.

- Defamation/privacy risk.
- Technical or scientific dispute.
- Safety-sensitive instructions.
- Confidential/embargoed evidence.

**Control point**

Do not allow a commercially convenient interpretation to outrun the proposition that the evidence actually establishes.

# Proposition-level evidence matrix

This matrix is the bridge between narrative and reliance. It forces each important proposition to carry its strongest evidence position, a reliance status and the residual limitation that prevents overstatement.

| Proposition                                                     | Evidence position     | Status                    | Residual limitation                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Research desk can add source-verification capacity              | Operating model       | Supported                 | Publisher retains editorial responsibility.  |
| Many articles repeating a claim equal independent corroboration | Source-lineage logic  | Contradicted              | May be circular sourcing.                    |
| AP permits AI to replace verification                           | AP 2026 standards     | Contradicted              | Human verification remains required.         |
| Primary-source retrieval improves defensibility                 | Evidence architecture | Supported                 | Primary source can still be self-interested. |
| External desk should make publication decision                  | Role boundary         | Not established/undisable | Editor remains responsible.                  |
| Escalation is part of good research                             | Governance logic      | Supported                 | Requires defined thresholds.                 |

# Contradictions, unresolved gaps & evidence still required

A professional dossier should show what remains unresolved, not edit uncertainty out of the answer. The table below identifies issues that would matter in a commissioned engagement.

| Issue / proposition                                             | Current position            | Why unresolved matters               | Evidence / action required                                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Many articles repeating a claim equal independent corroboration | Contradicted                | May be circular sourcing.            | Obtain stronger primary or matter-specific evidence before relying. |
| AP permits AI to replace verification                           | Contradicted                | Human verification remains required. | Obtain stronger primary or matter-specific evidence before relying. |
| External desk should make publication decision                  | Not established/undesirable | Editor remains responsible.          | Obtain stronger primary or matter-specific evidence before relying. |
| Circular sourcing                                               | Open control issue          | Creates false corroboration          | Trace originating source.                                           |

# Risk, failure modes & controls

The risk register translates evidence weakness into a practical control. It is not a generic disclaimer list: each row describes how the decision could become wrong if the underlying proposition is overstated or allowed to go stale.

| Risk / failure mode  | Why it matters                          | Control / next action       |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Circular sourcing    | Creates false corroboration             | Trace originating source.   |
| Volatile webpage     | Evidence disappears/changes             | Archive and date.           |
| AI hallucination     | Fabricated fact enters draft            | Source gate.                |
| Deadline compression | Verification skipped                    | Prioritise material claims. |
| Right-of-reply gap   | One-sided record                        | Flag when appropriate.      |
| Role confusion       | Researcher becomes editor/legal adviser | Preserve boundary.          |

## Decision and hand-off checklist

The following checklist is the minimum decision hand-off for the public demonstration. A commissioned matter would add client-specific ownership, deadlines, document identifiers and approval gates.

- Assign story/request ID.
- Define material claims.
- Retrieve primary sources.
- Check independent corroboration.
- Archive volatile evidence.
- Flag contradictions and unresolved gaps.
- Escalate legal/specialist issues.
- Retain editorial responsibility with publisher.

**Stop condition**

If a material proposition cannot be supported at the level required by the decision, the correct output is “further verification required”, not a more confident narrative.

# Method, evidence discipline & reproducibility

The work begins with a decision question rather than a topic. Material propositions are decomposed, sources are ranked by authority and proximity, and statements are traced back to the strongest available originating evidence. Repetition of the same originating claim is not counted as independent corroboration.

Company-primary material is competent evidence of what a company announced, represented or reported. It is not automatically independent verification of performance, causation or future resilience. Official and regulatory material may establish rules, procedural status or official findings, but scope and jurisdiction still matter.

Negative evidence is treated cautiously. Failure to locate a public record is not proof that an event did not occur. Where a conclusion depends on non-public material, the dossier identifies the missing evidence rather than filling the gap with inference.

This public edition is not legal advice, investment advice, engineering certification, actuarial advice, statutory audit, regulated certification or a guarantee of outcome.

## Evidence-status vocabulary

| Status          | Meaning                                                                      |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Established     | Directly supported by identified evidence within scope.                      |
| Supported       | Supported, but subject to a material qualification or dependency.            |
| Claimed         | A source states it; independent confirmation is incomplete or outside scope. |
| Inferred        | Reasoned conclusion from evidence; not directly stated by a source.          |
| Not established | Evidence is presently insufficient for responsible reliance.                 |
| Contradicted    | Material evidence conflicts with the proposition as stated.                  |

# Public-source register

---

Every source below has a visible full URL and a clickable hyperlink. Source inclusion records the evidentiary basis used for this public demonstration; it does not mean every source independently proves every proposition.

## 1. Verification at AP

Organisation: Associated Press | Date: current

Use: Verification methods for documents, sources, visuals and digital material

Limit: AP-specific newsroom practice

<https://www.ap.org/solutions/verify/>

## 2. News values and principles

Organisation: Associated Press | Date: current

Use: Accuracy, source and integrity standards

Limit: AP-specific editorial standards

<https://www.ap.org/about/news-values-and-principles/>

## 3. Getting the facts right

Organisation: Associated Press | Date: current archive

Use: Fact-checking and accuracy orientation

Limit: Historical AP guidance; current newsroom process may evolve

<https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/behind-the-news/getting-the-facts-right/>

## 4. About Reuters Fact Check

Organisation: Reuters | Date: current

Use: Public explanation of source tracing, expert consultation and documentary verification

Limit: Reuters-specific process

<https://www.reuters.com/fact-check/about/>

## 5. AP updates newsroom standards for artificial intelligence

Organisation: Associated Press | Date: 23 Jul 2026

Use: Current AP AI governance principles

Limit: AP-specific policy, useful as a professional reference rather than universal rule.

<https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/announcements/ap-updates-newsroom-standards-for-artificial-intelligence/>

# Aperture pathway, contact & linked pages

This dossier sits inside the Aperture Research Works five-product system. RESEARCH finds the answer. REVIEW tests an answer already in hand. WATCH keeps a changing answer current. DESK adds governed recurring capacity. APERTURE determines what can responsibly be relied upon.

[Aperture Research Works: https://apertureforensic.com/](https://apertureforensic.com/)

[DESK product page: https://apertureforensic.com/desk.html](https://apertureforensic.com/desk.html)

[Selected Work: https://apertureforensic.com/selected-work.html](https://apertureforensic.com/selected-work.html)

[Methodology: https://apertureforensic.com/methodology.html](https://apertureforensic.com/methodology.html)

[Evidence standards: https://apertureforensic.com/evidence-standards.html](https://apertureforensic.com/evidence-standards.html)

[Evidence lineage: https://apertureforensic.com/evidence-lineage.html](https://apertureforensic.com/evidence-lineage.html)

[Reliance boundary: https://apertureforensic.com/reliance-boundary.html](https://apertureforensic.com/reliance-boundary.html)

[Languages: https://apertureforensic.com/languages.html](https://apertureforensic.com/languages.html)

[Search Aperture: https://apertureforensic.com/search.html](https://apertureforensic.com/search.html)

[Discuss a Matter: https://apertureforensic.com/enquiry.html](https://apertureforensic.com/enquiry.html)

[Paul Hattingh on LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/paul-hattingh-79568729](https://www.linkedin.com/in/paul-hattingh-79568729)

Email: [info@apertureforensic.com](mailto:info@apertureforensic.com)

WhatsApp: +27 83 450 5051

## Professional boundary

A commissioned matter would add agreed instructions, authority, confidentiality, jurisdiction/licensing controls, client evidence access, formal workpapers, specialist hand-offs where required and a client-specific reliance statement.

# Publisher and Media Research Desk

## DESK | ANNEX B - SOURCE REGISTER CONSOLIDATION

CONTROL NOTICE. This Annex B is part of the controlled publication package. It expands the earlier Document 4 source register from 6 explicitly numbered source records to a consolidated minimum of 12. Where the earlier cover, document-control page or delivery manifest displays the lower source count, this Annex B supersedes that numeric metadata. No factual-status, confidence or reliance classification is automatically upgraded by adding a corroborative source. The reader must still apply the proposition-level matrix and stated limitations.

| Existing numbered sources     | 6                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Additional controlled sources | 6                                                                                                                |
| Consolidated source count     | 12                                                                                                               |
| Evidence cut-off              | 8 September 2026, 07:38 SAST for substantive dossier; Annex B source consolidation verified 9 September 2026.    |
| Reliance effect               | Coverage strengthened; proposition status changes only where expressly stated in the Claims-and-Evidence Matrix. |

## Additional controlled source records

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S07</b>            | Associated Press<br>Standards around generative AI                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.ap.org/standards-around-generative-ai">https://www.ap.org/standards-around-generative-ai</a>                                                                                                           |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | AP newsroom standards for AI-generated output, verification and accountability.                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope. |

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S08</b>            | Associated Press<br>Updates to generative AI standards                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/behind-the-news/updates-to-generative-ai-standards/">https://www.ap.org/the-definitive-source/behind-the-news/updates-to-generative-ai-standards/</a>                     |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | AP explanation of controlled AI experimentation and human vetting.                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope. |

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S09</b>            | Associated Press<br>2026 AP Stylebook expanded AI chapter                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.ap.org/media-center/press-releases/2026/new-ap-stylebook-features-expanded-artificial-intelligence-chapter/">https://www.ap.org/media-center/press-releases/2026/new-ap-stylebook-features-expanded-artificial-intelligence-chapter/</a> |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | Current 2026 editorial guidance context for AI terminology and practice.                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope.                                   |

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S10</b>            | Thomson Reuters<br>The Trust Principles                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en/about-us/trust-principles">https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en/about-us/trust-principles</a>                                                                                       |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | Primary governance statement on Reuters independence, integrity and freedom from bias.                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope. |

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S11</b>            | Society of Professional Journalists<br>SPJ Code of Ethics                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/">https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/</a>                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | Professional ethics benchmark for verification, independence, harm minimisation and accountability.                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope. |

  

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>S12</b>            | Society of Professional Journalists<br>Proposed revisions to SPJ Code of Ethics - 2026                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Full URL</b>       | <a href="https://www.spj.org/spj-ethics-code-revision-project-2026/">https://www.spj.org/spj-ethics-code-revision-project-2026/</a>                                                                                         |
| <b>Evidence role</b>  | Current 2026 ethics-revision record addressing AI, verification, misinformation and source transparency.                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Supports</b>       | C01-C18                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Reliance limit</b> | Use only for the proposition scope stated. Corporate/vendor sources remain attributed where independent verification is absent; legal/regulatory sources govern only within their actual jurisdiction and instrument scope. |

## Traceability and publication control

The evidence chain for this package is: controlled proposition (C-ID) -> numbered source (S-ID) -> factual status -> confidence -> reliance status -> decision effect. Annex B extends the source side of that chain only. It does not erase contradictions, unresolved gaps, specialist boundaries, right-of-reply needs or the human publication gate recorded elsewhere in the dossier.

PUBLIC PORTFOLIO LIMITATION: Independent public-source case study. Not a client engagement. Not legal advice, audit opinion, engineering/actuarial certification, investment advice or another reserved professional determination.